

records would seriously interfere with and thwart the orderly and unbiased conduct of the investigation and impede case preparation. Permitting the access normally afforded under the Privacy Act would provide the subject with valuable information that would allow interference with or compromise of witnesses or render witnesses reluctant to cooperate with investigators; lead to suppression, alteration, fabrication, or destruction of evidence; endanger the physical safety of confidential sources, witnesses, law enforcement personnel, and their families; and result in the secreting of or other disposition of assets that would make them difficult or impossible to reach to satisfy any Government claims growing out of the investigation.

(4) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(1) requires an agency to maintain in agency records only "relevant and necessary" information about an individual. This provision is inappropriate for investigations because it is not always possible to detect the relevance or necessity of each piece of information in the early stages of an investigation. In some cases, it is only after the information is evaluated in light of other evidence that its relevance and necessity will be clear. In other cases, what may appear to be a relevant and necessary piece of information may become irrelevant in light of further investigation.

In addition, during the course of an investigation, the investigator may obtain information that relates primarily to matters under the investigative jurisdiction of another agency, and that information may not be reasonably segregated. In the interest of effective law enforcement, OIG investigators should retain this information because it can aid in establishing patterns of criminal activity and can provide valuable leads for Federal and other law enforcement agencies.

(5) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(2) requires an agency to collect information to the greatest extent practicable directly from the subject individual, when the information may result in adverse determinations about an individual's rights, benefits, and privileges under Federal programs. The general rule that information be collected "to the greatest extent practicable" from the target individual is not appropriate in investigations. OIG investigators should be authorized to use their professional judgment as to the appropriate sources and timing of an investigation. It is often necessary to conduct an investigation so the target does not suspect that he or she is being investigated. The requirement to obtain the information from the

targeted individual may put the suspect on notice of the investigation and thwart the investigation by enabling the suspect to destroy evidence and take other action that would impede the investigation. This requirement may also prevent an OIG investigator from gathering information and evidence before interviewing an investigative target in order to maximize the value of the interview by confronting the target with the evidence or information. In certain circumstances, the subject of an investigation cannot be required to provide information to investigators and information must be collected from other sources. It is often necessary to collect information from sources other than the subject of the investigation to verify the accuracy of the evidence collected.

In addition, the statutory term "to the greatest extent practicable" is a subjective standard. It is impossible to define the term adequately so that individual OIG investigators can consistently apply it to the many fact patterns present in OIG investigations.

(6) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(3) requires an agency to inform each person whom it asks to supply information on a form that can be retained by the person of the authority under which the information is sought and whether disclosure is mandatory or voluntary, of the principal purposes for which the information is intended to be used, of the routine uses that may be made of the information, and of the effects on the person, if any, of not providing all or some part of the requested information. The application of this provision could provide the subject of an investigation with substantial information about the nature of that investigation that could interfere with the investigation. Moreover, providing such a notice to the subject of an investigation could seriously impede or compromise an undercover investigation by revealing its existence and could endanger the physical safety of confidential sources, witnesses, investigators, and their families, by revealing their identities.

(7) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4) (G) and (H) require an agency to publish a **Federal Register** notice concerning its procedures for notifying an individual at his or her request, if the system of records contains a record pertaining to him or her, how to gain access to such a record, and how to contest its content. Because this system of records is being exempted from subsections (d) and (f) of the Privacy Act concerning access to records and agency rules, respectively, these requirements are inapplicable to the extent that the system of records will be exempted from these

requirements. However, OIG has published some information concerning its notification, access, and contest procedures. Under certain circumstances, OIG could decide it is appropriate for an individual to have access to all or a portion of his or her records in the system.

(8) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(4)(I) requires an agency to publish notice of the categories of sources of records in the system of records. To the extent that this provision is construed to require more detailed disclosure than the broad, generic information currently published in the system notice, an exemption from this provision is necessary to protect the confidentiality of sources of information, to protect privacy and physical safety of witnesses and informants, and to avoid the disclosure of investigative techniques and procedures. OIG will continue to publish such a notice in broad generic terms as is its current practice.

(9) 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(5) requires an agency to maintain its records with such accuracy, relevance, timeliness, and completeness as is reasonably necessary to ensure fairness to the individual in making any determination about the individual. Much the same rationale is applicable to this proposed exemption as that set out previously in item (4) (duty to maintain in agency records only "relevant and necessary" information about an individual). Although the OIG makes every effort to maintain records that are accurate, relevant, timely, and complete, it is not always possible in an investigation to determine with certainty that all of the information collected is accurate, relevant, timely, and complete. During a thorough investigation, a trained investigator would be expected to collect allegations, conflicting information, and information that may not be based upon the personal knowledge of the provider. When OIG decides to refer the matter to a prosecutive agency, for example, that information would be in the system of records and it may not be possible until further investigation is conducted, or indeed in many cases until after a trial (if at all), to determine the accuracy, relevance, and completeness of some information. This requirement would inhibit the ability of trained investigators to exercise professional judgment in conducting a thorough investigation. Moreover, fairness to affected individuals is ensured by the due process they are accorded in any trial or other proceeding resulting from the OIG investigation.

(10) 5 U.S.C. 552a(g) provides for civil remedies if any agency fails to comply with the requirements concerning