1. *Do you have your own data sources or do you want industry to provide the data sources for this effort? Does CTCEU have their own specific data sources?*

   We do have our own data sources available through our existing systems. We are looking at current information, public databases and social media; however, there is other information out there (i.e. proprietary information pertinent to individual companies that would be helpful.)

   The Government reviews case management systems and currently reviews social media and open sources. Because many data sources are proprietary and we do not have access to that information, the Government cannot take what data sets are out there and use them as their own, they can only view open source and social media.

2. *We are building the SAPPHIRE program for topographical/geographical incidents and individual policy (currently in SBIR Phase II and moving to Phase III) for the Navy. Would ICE consider using an existing program such as this that could be brought over?*

   We need to look at it to determine if it is useful. We would be open to taking a look at it so we can better identify where we need to be and better understand what is available in the marketplace.

   We need industry to get to the end product and how we can get to the end results. We need to know what industry has and get stronger vetting procedures.

3. *Have you given consideration to the contract vehicles, timeline, company size, etc. (contracts perspective) you will use to get to the end contract? Are you defining any determination such as SB or SDVOSB or any other category? Are you determining that first or are you waiting to see what is available before you determine acquisition strategy?*

   We want to see what the capabilities are and where they reside. Once we learn more about what is available that will then dictate/influence where and how we compete the contract. The first priority is to determine where the capabilities reside and then determine the path forward.

   The Government has not determined how we will go with this requirement; no specific set-asides have been determined. The Government will have to see where the procurement process takes us and how to get it done in the end.

4. *You spoke of bringing additional information into the systems. The Government talks about how there is backlog today in cases. How does the Government load up the computer systems and will there be any consistencies in the process? Can you speak to the backlog and bringing additional information into the system?*

There is a backlog. Most information is provided by [our] partners and as we look at the current backlog, we notice that the information is old. We want to make sure we are in line with other stakeholders but when you have over a million cases a year it will cause backlog. However, certain backlogs can also be daily based on the system being used and how many analysts are available. However, for VSP it doesn't really affect business since their backlogs are much less existent (MANTIS has a backlog because it is a manual process.)

The Government wants to be sure we are in line with CBP and other stakeholders. There is a backlog. There are over 2.2 million people in the system that could be potential backlogs. MANTIS is more manual and only Austin has 100's of backlogs. PATRIOT has only 20 per day and a work list which is for the day. Surges can make us overwhelmed and we can get backlogged but normally we do not have a big backlog and, unless we have deadlines, we tend to clear out the backlogs. We hope to eliminate backlogs.

5. *Are you working with HQ information sharing nodes/working groups? Is there any interest in uniting with USCIS? Is ICE partnering with groups at the DHS level?*

We have not gone that far yet. At this point we have an existing vetting contract that we wish to enhance and want to bring the two programs together. We have also met with USCIS and, if we can leverage existing systems, then that is the direction we want to go. We have a very aggressive timeframe so we don't want to develop new systems, we want to reach out and see what is readily available.

There are existing contract vehicles in place for the work that we do. We have met with CBT and USCIS which may be a point in the future for us to develop and work [towards] a new goal. There are always new ways to do things out there but we don't want to develop this if it is already in place.

6. *In terms of role-based types of access (i.e. you have your analysts supporting field ops or in case management you have an agent who might want to hold onto information) is there some thought of how you want to potentially partition information and keep it separated when not involving US person type information? / Some of the current Government data sets involve specific partnership access with analysts that are supporting these data sets. Is there a thought on how ICE wants to partition information and keep it segmented?*

We continue to use the existing ICM capabilities.

HSI has case management systems and I mentioned [for] case management that we work and use a built in system that is already in place.

7. *Could you speak more about your social media pilot, its tools and how you exploit the information?/ Can you speak on social media and the process on how you do this process?*

In 2014, when we started using this capability we used a two-prong approach to use social media to help locate individuals. There is a "scraping" tool with the issue being

quantity. We need something that can ingest those leads and prioritize them. However, we saw there was no real tool that solved everything. We've established an open source team of analysts that use this information to dive deeper. Now, we use social media to derive derogatory information to help investigators with their investigations. Last August we launched a pilot program with VSP to see how social media would play a part in a continuous monitoring of individuals to help VSP on the front end. Previously, VSP was using social media reactively; now this allows for a proactive approach. However, from a social media perspective, it is difficult to find someone who does everything well. There are people who do facets well but not everything well. Congress wants more social media programs and to exploit this area further.

When we set up a program we use quantity and because of the amount of leads we receive there is no one tool that will give us a finished product. We look at this and use social media to identify criminal investigations and how this can be used in this aspect. CTCEU partners with SEVP on certain VISA applications and how social media plays a part with this. The Government uses social media as a proactive dataset to help form all components and mechanisms. We have seen it in past experiences and social media is important. This is an important piece and Congress wants us to have one overarching contract or a piece of that. However, nothing is there yet.

8. *What new constraints are we under for non-US persons that might "scrap" US persons in that process (social media vetting process)? What are the analytics used for this?/ The Government provides outside sources. What constraints are we under to gather information for the Government and othersources? What kind of constraints are there?*

The biggest constraint, because we are a vetting/screening operation, is that we are required to work with what is publically available. We cannot go in and set up accounts and go thru firewalls. Under our restraints we cannot go into the dark Web. We want more of the deep Web information that is publically available out there.

Our program is not an undercover unit and we work with what we have available in social media, Google, open source pages, etc. We thought we would be limited [with this constraint] but the analysts we have are good and found a work around to get more information. [We are looking to see] how we can [acquire] more information that is out there or [if we] will be able to search the deep dark web for all the information we can extrapolate. We want that capability.

9. *On social media, the data sources from certain providers listed have changed dynamically as has their use in cases for the US Government. Would you be open in the initial SOO to presenting those providers since those may change as the target set changes over time?/ The Government is pretty dynamic on sourcing of the actual sources and they have changed recently. Will you be announcing the sourcing and will it be provided as it changes over time?*

We are open to anything right now. We'd have to run it thru Privacy but the idea is to be nimble here. We don't want to be restrictive so we don't want to strictly limit it to certain

datasets. We recognize things are changing all the time as is our ability to navigate thru new permissions to enhance law enforcement's ability to do their job. We expect that to continue in the near term to get the job done.

We do not want to be restrictive and that is what the SOO basically does for us. The Government has to be adaptive at providing information and how it is presented. We realize that it is changing, what has changed in the past [as well as] with the current administration. We realize that it might change over time as it evolves but [even with] various policy changes ICE and CBP can [still] do their jobs with the investigative work that needs to happen.

10. *Five years ago the FBI tried to accomplish the objectives that are being stated here and the ACLU shut it down. / The FBI tried to [do] this type of contract in the past and the ACLU shut them down. Does ICE realize the problems of the past and what happened before?*

A big difference is we are vetting foreign nationals. The FBI's constraints on citizens are different than when dealing with foreign individuals. The prediction is that in the near future there will be legislation addressing what you can and can't do. However, a system where an agent can apply for a warrant is more what we are talking about. We will continue to do it until someone says that we can't.

[The] FBI's constraints on citizens are different, as they follow a different set of rules. With a new administration's policy, there could be new policy in place and this will determine what we can and cannot do with the new president's policies. Agents have an ever-changing environment and we cannot look and just do nothing. We remember the San Bernardino case where the data was not there. We want to do what we can to help move forward and we don't know yet [what that might look like], but we have to figure out a solution.

11. *You mentioned the [social media] tool in the past is used to ingest and provide a data output. Is this output produced from data/requirements being provided or is the data output yet to be defined?/ In looking in the past, we gave the data to get what you need, so how are we going to do this in moving forward?*

We've been working with that company from the contract to define those criteria. We began using that tool for one (1) purpose and it has evolved over time. As policies change we want the flexibility to change things and if there are changes in the current administration's policy. we need work on defining it better as the administration's policy changes. We will move forward with this and find the tools that work for us and continue to expand on a new way of obtaining data sets.

12. *Will there be a national security classification assigned to this?*

This will be unclassified.