

[redacted]
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2009 6:46 AM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Fw: NSI Review Document

b6
b7C
b7E

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Wed Nov 25 06:44:35 2009
Subject: RE: NSI Review Document

[redacted]
Federal Bureau of Investigation
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 6:42 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: NSI Review Document

b6
b7C
b7E

eGuardian was NEVER intended to receive only federal SARs. It has always been planned and designed to receive SARs from local, state, tribal, federal and military law enforcement agencies. [redacted]

[redacted]
I will defer to [redacted] for the technical design and architecture question.

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Sent: Tue Nov 24 18:00:16 2009
Subject: RE: NSI Review Document

b6
b7C

EGuardian-320

[redacted]

To follow-up on what [redacted] said below, what I'm hoping to get from eGuardian is more information on the automated SLT SAR intake that I didn't know about until recently, as well as overall eGuardian design, architecture, and CONOPs info. The SLT SAR intake seems to expand on eGuardian's original scope of being the web interface to receive federal SARs... I'd really like to know more about it. If the sensitivity of this information is an issue, I have a classified email account (different from this one) to receive it on, if necessary.

- [redacted]

[redacted]

Policy and Planning Staff, Office of the CIO
U.S. Department of Justice
Work: [redacted]
Fax: [redacted]
[redacted]

b6
b7c

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 3:30 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: NSI Review Document
Importance: High

[redacted]

As you may already know [redacted] and I will be meeting with [redacted] on Dec 2 to discuss the draft NSI paper.

[redacted] and I want to make sure we have given OMB and the NSC staff a complete review of the current NSI environment.

b6
b7c

In that vain:

1. Do you have anything you wish to add, delete or modify in the current draft of the NSI document? (Documents we can review)
2. Do you wish e-Guardian to be addressed as:
 - a. A complimentary SAR application feeding the NSI federal and SLT data
 - b. A competing NSI architecture with a smaller IT footprint and lower TCO
 - c. Both of the above.
 - d. Neither. No mention of e-Guardian is needed as this is an NSI EE review document.
3. When your e-Guardian web services ingest pilot is over in two months do you plan on publishing an analysis of the test results to compare with the NIS EE paper due on Dec 30th.

Please respond by COB November 30th so we may address your issues, concerns and positions in relation to e-Guardian and the NSI EE.

Thank you.

Have a great Thanksgiving.

EGuardian-321

Best Regards,



Information Technology Branch
Federal Bureau of Investigation

b6
b7C

EGuardian-322