

Minimization Procedures § 3(a).<sup>46</sup> Following acquisition, the procedures require that, “[a]s a communication is reviewed, NSA analyst(s) will determine whether it is a domestic or foreign communication to, from, or about a target and is reasonably believed to contain foreign intelligence information or evidence of a crime.” Id. § 3(b)(4). “Foreign communication means a communication that has at least one communicant outside of the United States.” Id. § 2(e). “All other communications, including communications in which the sender and all intended recipients are reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of acquisition, are domestic communications.” Id. In addition, domestic communications include “[a]ny communications acquired through the targeting of a person who at the time of targeting was reasonably believed to be located outside the United States but is in fact located inside the United States at the time such communications were acquired, and any communications acquired by targeting a person who at the time of the targeting was believed to be a non-United States person but was in fact a United States person . . . .” Id. § 3(d)(2). A domestic communication must be “promptly destroyed upon recognition unless the Director (or Acting Director) of NSA specifically determines, in writing, that” the communication contains foreign intelligence

---

<sup>46</sup> Of course, NSA’s separate targeting procedures, discussed above, also govern the manner in which communications are acquired.

information or evidence of a crime, or that it falls into another narrow exception permitting retention. See id. § 5.<sup>47</sup>

Upon determining that a communication is a “foreign communication,” NSA must decide whether the communication is “of” or “concerning” a United States person. Id. § 6.

“Communications of a United States person include all communications to which a United States person is a party.” Id. § 2(c). “Communications concerning a United States person include all communications in which a United States person is discussed or mentioned, except where such communications reveal only publicly-available information about the person.” Id. § 2(b).

A foreign communication that is of or concerning a United States person and that is determined to contain neither foreign intelligence information nor evidence of a crime must be destroyed “at the earliest practicable point in the processing cycle,” and “may be retained no longer than five years from the expiration date of the certification in any event.” Id. § 3(b)(1).<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Once such a determination is made by the Director, the domestic communications at issue are effectively treated as “foreign communications” for purposes of the rules regarding retention and dissemination.

<sup>48</sup> Although Section 3(b)(1) by its terms applies only to “inadvertently acquired communications of or concerning a United States person,” the government has informed the Court that this provision is intended to apply, and in practice is applied, to all foreign communications of or concerning United States persons that contain neither foreign intelligence information nor evidence of a crime. Docket No. 702(i)-08-01, Sept. 2, 2008 Notice of Clarification and Correction at 3-5. Moreover, Section 3(c) of the procedures separately provides that foreign communications that do not qualify for retention and that “are known to contain communications of or concerning United States persons will be destroyed upon recognition,” and, like unreviewed communications, “may be retained no longer than five years from the

(continued...)

A foreign communication that is of or concerning a United States person may be retained indefinitely if the “dissemination of such communications with reference to such United States persons would be permitted” under the dissemination provisions that are discussed below, or if it contains evidence of a crime. Id. § 6(a)(2)-(3). If the retention of a foreign communication of or concerning a United States person is “necessary for the maintenance of technical databases,” it may be retained for five years to allow for technical exploitation, or for longer than five years if more time is required for decryption or if the NSA Signals Intelligence Director “determines in writing that retention for a longer period is required to respond to authorized foreign intelligence or counterintelligence requirements.” Id. § 6(a)(1).

As a general rule, “[a] report based on communications of or concerning a United States person may be disseminated” only “if the identity of the United States person is deleted and a generic term or symbol is substituted so that the information cannot reasonably be connected with an identifiable United States person.” Id. § 6(b). A report including the identity of the United States person may be provided to a “recipient requiring the identity of such person for the performance of official duties,” but only if at least one of eight requirements is also met – for instance, if “the identity of the United States person is necessary to understand foreign intelligence information or assess its importance,” or if “information indicates the United States

---

<sup>48</sup>(...continued)  
expiration date of the certification authorizing the collection in any event.”



person may be . . . an agent of a foreign power” or that he is “engaging in international terrorism activities.” Id.<sup>49</sup>

*b. Proposed Minimization Measures for MCTs*

The government proposes that NSA’s minimization procedures be applied to MCTs in the following manner. After acquisition, upstream acquisitions, including MCTs, will reside in NSA repositories until they are accessed (e.g., in response to a query) by an NSA analyst performing his or her day-to-day work. NSA proposes adding a “cautionary banner” to the tools its analysts use to view the content of communications acquired through upstream collection under Section 702. See Aug. 30 Submission at 9. The banner, which will be “broadly displayed on [such] tools,” will “direct analysts to consult guidance on how to identify MCTs and how to handle them.” Id. at 9 & n.6.<sup>50</sup> Analysts will be trained to identify MCTs and to recognize wholly domestic communications contained within MCTs. See id. at 8-9.

When an analyst identifies an upstream acquisition as an MCT, the analyst will decide whether or not he or she “seek[s] to use a discrete communication within [the] MCT,”

---

<sup>49</sup> The procedures also permit NSA to provide unminimized communications to [REDACTED] FBI (subject to their own minimization procedures), and to foreign governments for the limited purpose of obtaining “technical and linguistic assistance.” NSA Minimization Procedures §§ 6(c), 8(b). Neither of these provisions has been used to share upstream acquisitions. Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 61-62.

<sup>50</sup> The banner will not be displayed for communications that “can be first identified through technical means where the active user is NSA’s tasked selector or that contain only a single, discrete communication based on particular stable and well-known protocols.” Aug. 30 Submission at 9 n.6. See infra, note 27, and supra, note 54.

presumably by reviewing some or all of the MCT's contents. Id. at 8.<sup>51</sup> "NSA analysts seeking to use a discrete communication contained in an MCT (for example, in a FISA application, intelligence report, or Section 702 targeting) will assess whether the discrete communication is to, from, or about a tasked selector." Id. The following framework will then be applied:

- If the discrete communication that the analyst seeks to use is to, from, or about a tasked selector, "any U.S. person information in that communication will be handled in accordance with the NSA minimization procedures." Id. Presumably, this means that the discrete communication will be treated as a "foreign communication" that is "of" or "concerning" a United States person, as described above. The MCT containing that communication remains available to analysts in NSA's repositories without any marking to indicate that it has been identified as an MCT or as a transaction containing United States person information.
- If the discrete communication sought to be used is not to, from, or about a tasked selector, and also not to or from an identifiable United States person, "that communication (including any U.S. person information therein) will be handled in accordance with the NSA minimization procedures." Id. at 8-9.<sup>52</sup> Presumably, this means that the discrete communication will be treated as a "foreign communication" or, if it contains information concerning a United States person, as a "foreign communication" "concerning a United States person," as described above. The MCT itself remains available to analysts in NSA's repositories without any marking to indicate that it has been identified as an MCT or that it contains one or more communications that are not to, from, or about a targeted selector.

---

<sup>51</sup> A transaction that is identified as an SCT rather than an MCT must be handled in accordance with the standard minimization procedures that are discussed above.

<sup>52</sup> The Court understands that absent contrary information, NSA treats the user of an account who appears to be located in the United States as "an identifiable U.S. person." See Aug. 30 Submission at 9 n.7 ("To help determine whether a discrete communication not to, from, or about a tasked selector is to or from a U.S. person, NSA would perform the same sort of technical analysis it would perform before tasking an electronic communications account/address/identifier in accordance with its section 702 targeting procedures.").

- A discrete communication that is not to, from, or about a tasked selector but that is to or from an identifiable United States person “cannot be used for any purpose other than to protect against an immediate threat to human life (e.g., force protection or hostage situations).” *Id.* at 9. Presumably, this is a reference to Section 1 of the minimization procedures, which allows NSA to deviate from the procedures in such narrow circumstances, subject to the requirement that prompt notice be given to the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Department of Justice, and the Court that the deviation has occurred. Regardless of whether or not the discrete communication is used for this limited purpose, the MCT itself remains in NSA’s databases without any marking to indicate that it is an MCT, or that it contains at least one communication that is to or from an identifiable United States person. *See id.*; Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 61.
- If the discrete communication sought to be used by the analyst (or another discrete communication within the MCT) is recognized as being wholly domestic, the entire MCT will be purged from NSA’s systems. *See* Aug. 30 Submission at 3.

*c. Statutory Analysis*

*i. Acquisition*

The Court first considers how NSA’s proposed handling of MCTs bears on whether NSA’s minimization procedures are “reasonably designed in light of the purpose and technique of the particular surveillance, to minimize the acquisition . . . of nonpublicly available information concerning unconsenting United States persons consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information.” *See* 50 U.S.C. § 1801(h)(1) (emphasis added). Insofar as NSA likely acquires approximately 2,000-10,000 MCTs each year that contain at least one wholly domestic communication that is neither to, from, nor about a targeted selector,<sup>53</sup> and tens of thousands of communications of or

---

<sup>53</sup> As noted above, NSA’s upstream collection also likely results in the acquisition of tens  
(continued...)



concerning United States persons with no direct connection to any target, the Court has serious concerns. The acquisition of such non-target communications, which are highly unlikely to have foreign intelligence value, obviously does not by itself serve the government's need to "obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information." See 50 U.S.C. § 1801(h)(1).

The government submits, however, that the portions of MCTs that contain references to targeted selectors are likely to contain foreign intelligence information, and that it is not feasible for NSA to limit its collection only to the relevant portion or portions of each MCT – i.e., the particular discrete communications that are to, from, or about a targeted selector. The Court


---

<sup>53</sup>(...continued)

of thousands of wholly domestic SCTs that contain references to targeted selectors. See supra, pages 33-34 & note 33 (discussing the limits [REDACTED])

Although the collection of wholly domestic "about" SCTs is troubling, they do not raise the same minimization-related concerns as discrete, wholly domestic communications that are neither to, from, nor about targeted selectors, or as discrete communications of or concerning United States persons with no direct connection to any target, either of which may be contained within MCTs. The Court has effectively concluded that certain communications containing a reference to a targeted selector are reasonably likely to contain foreign intelligence information, including communications between non-target accounts that contain the name of the targeted facility in the body of the message. See Docket No. 07-449, May 31, 2007 Primary Order at 12 (finding probable cause to believe that certain "about" communications were "themselves being sent and/or received by one of the targeted foreign powers"). Insofar as the discrete, wholly domestic "about" communications at issue here are communications between non-target accounts that contain the name of the targeted facility, the same conclusion applies to them. Accordingly, in the language of FISA's definition of minimization procedures, the acquisition of wholly domestic communications about targeted selectors will generally be "consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information." See 50 U.S.C. 1801(h)(1). Nevertheless, the Court understands that in the event NSA identifies a discrete, wholly domestic "about" communication in its databases, the communication will be destroyed upon recognition. See NSA Minimization Procedures § 5.

accepts the government's assertion that the collection of MCTs yields valuable foreign intelligence information that by its nature cannot be acquired except through upstream collection. See Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 69-70, 74. For purposes of this discussion, the Court further accepts the government's assertion that it is not feasible for NSA to avoid the collection of MCTs as part of its upstream collection or to limit its collection only to the specific portion or portions of each transaction that contains the targeted selector. See id. at 48-50; June 1 Submission at 27.<sup>54</sup> The Court therefore concludes that NSA's minimization procedures are, given the current state of NSA's technical capability, reasonably designed to minimize the acquisition of nonpublicly available information concerning unconsenting United States persons consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information.



In any event, it is incumbent upon NSA to continue working to enhance its capability to limit acquisitions only to targeted communications.



ii. *Retention*

The principal problem with the government's proposed handling of MCTs relates to what will occur, and what will not occur, following acquisition. As noted above, the NSA minimization procedures generally require that, "[a]s a communication is reviewed, NSA analyst(s) will determine whether it is a domestic or foreign communication to, from, or about a target and is reasonably believed to contain foreign intelligence information or evidence of a crime," see NSA Minimization Procedures § 3(b)(4), so that it can be promptly afforded the appropriate treatment under the procedures. The measures proposed by the government for MCTs, however, largely dispense with the requirement of prompt disposition upon initial review by an analyst. Rather than attempting to identify and segregate information "not relevant to the authorized purpose of the acquisition" or to destroy such information promptly following acquisition, NSA's proposed handling of MCTs tends to maximize the retention of such information, including information of or concerning United States persons with no direct connection to any target. See id. § 3(b)(1).

The proposed measures focus almost exclusively on the discrete communications within MCTs that analysts decide, after review, that they wish to use. See Aug. 30 Submission at 8-10. An analyst is not obligated to do anything with other portions of the MCT, including any wholly domestic discrete communications that are not immediately recognized as such, and communications of or concerning United States persons that have no direct connection to the targeted selector. See id.; Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 61. If, after reviewing the contents of an

entire MCT, the analyst decides that he or she does not wish to use any discrete communication contained therein, the analyst is not obligated to do anything unless it is immediately apparent to him or her that the MCT contains a wholly domestic communication (in which case the entire MCT is deleted).<sup>55</sup> See Aug. 30 Submission at 8-10.

Except in the case of those recognized as containing at least one wholly domestic communication, MCTs that have been reviewed by analysts remain available to other analysts in NSA's repositories without any marking to identify them as MCTs. See *id.*; Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 61. Nor will MCTs be marked to identify them as containing discrete communications to or from United States persons but not to or from a targeted selector, or to indicate that they contain United States person information. See Aug. 30 Submission at 8-10; Sept. 7, 2011 Hearing Tr. at 61. All MCTs except those identified as containing one or more wholly domestic communications will be retained for a minimum of five years. The net effect is that thousands of wholly domestic communications (those that are never reviewed and those that are not recognized by analysts as being wholly domestic), and thousands of other discrete

---

<sup>55</sup> The government's submissions make clear that, in many cases, it will be difficult for analysts to determine whether a discrete communication contained within an MCT is a wholly domestic communication. NSA's recent manual review of a six-month representative sample of its upstream collection demonstrates how challenging it can be for NSA to recognize wholly domestic communications, even when the agency's full attention and effort are directed at the task. See generally Aug. 16 and Aug. 30 Submissions. It is doubtful that analysts whose attention and effort are focused on identifying and analyzing foreign intelligence information will be any more successful in identifying wholly domestic communications. Indeed, each year the government notifies the Court of numerous compliance incidents involving good-faith mistakes and omissions by NSA personnel who work with the Section 702 collection.