

VIA FACSIMILE

March 6, 2020

David M. Hardy, Section Chief
Record/Information Dissemination Section
Federal Bureau of Investigation
170 Marcel Drive
Winchester, VA 22602-4843
Fax: (540) 868-4997
Attn: FOIA Request

Dear Mr. Hardy:

This letter constitutes a request under the Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”), 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(3), and is submitted on behalf of the Electronic Privacy Information Center (“EPIC”) to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”).

EPIC seeks records related to the agency’s use of Clearview AI technology.¹

Documents Requested

1. Emails and communications about Clearview AI, Inc., including but not limited to the following individuals and search terms:
 - a. Clearview
 - b. Clearview AI
 - c. Hoan Ton-That
 - d. Tor Ekeland
 - e. Third parties with an email address ending in “@clearview.ai”
2. All contracts or agreements between the FBI and Clearview AI, Inc.;
3. All presentations mentioning Clearview;
4. All Clearview sales materials;
5. All privacy assessments, including but not limited to Privacy Threshold Analysis and/or Privacy Impact Assessments, that discuss the use of Clearview AI technology.

Background

A recent *New York Times* investigation revealed that a secretive New York-based company, Clearview AI, Inc., has developed an application that allows law enforcement agencies to identify people in public spaces without actually requesting identity documents or without a legal basis to

¹ Clearview AI, Inc., <https://clearview.ai/>.

determine the person's identity.² Clearview AI uses a secret algorithm and billions of facial images collected without consent.³ Clearview conducts matches surreptitiously.⁴ Whenever an image is uploaded onto the app, the company also stores the image in its servers.⁵ Clearview has scraped more than 3 billion images from websites and social media platforms such as Facebook, Youtube, Venmo, and Twitter.⁶ Within the past year, more than 600 law enforcement agencies have started using the Clearview AI app.⁷

Several major technology companies including Twitter, LinkedIn, Venmo, Facebook, Youtube, and Google have issued cease and desist notices asking the company to stop its data scraping practices.⁸ New Jersey recently banned statewide law enforcement agencies from using Clearview AI services and are looking into how the state's law enforcement agencies have used the app.⁹ Apple has also suspended the app from its developer program for violating its policies.¹⁰

On February 26, 2020, *The Daily Beast* reported that Clearview AI suffered a massive data breach that revealed its client list, number of user accounts its clients set up, and the total number of searches its clients have conducted.¹¹ Clearview stated that it fixed the vulnerability and that law enforcement agencies' search history was not compromised.¹² But government officials remain skeptical that Clearview can safeguard the information it has gathered.¹³

While the company stated that its technology is strictly used for law enforcement purposes in the United States and Canada, a subsequent report reveals that its clients include companies,

² Kashmir Hill, *The Secretive Company That Might End Privacy as We Know It*, N.Y. Times (Feb. 10, 2020), <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/18/technology/clearview-privacy-facial-recognition.html>.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Gisela Perez & Hilary Cook, *Google, YouTube, Venmo and LinkedIn Send Cease-and-Desist Letters to Facial Recognition App that Helps Law Enforcement*, CBS News (Feb. 5, 2020), <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/clearview-ai-google-youtube-send-cess-and-desist-letter-to-facial-recognition-app/>.

⁹ Kashmir Hill, *New Jersey Bars Police From Using Clearview Facial Recognition App*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 24, 2020), <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/24/technology/clearview-ai-new-jersey.html>.

¹⁰ Rishi Iyengar, *Apple Suspends Controversial Facial Recognition App Clearview AI From Its Developer Program*, CNN (Feb. 28, 2020), <https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/28/tech/clearview-ai-apple-account-disabled/index.html>.

¹¹ Betsy Swan, *Facial-Recognition Company that Works with Law Enforcement Says Entire Client List was Stolen*, Daily Beast (Feb. 26, 2020), <https://www.thedailybeast.com/clearview-ai-facial-recognition-company-that-works-with-law-enforcement-says-entire-client-list-was-stolen>.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ Dell Cameron, *Data Breach at Controversial Face Recognition Firm Shows Company Can't Be Trusted, Officials Say*, Gizmodo (Feb. 26, 2020), <https://gizmodo.com/data-breach-at-controversial-face-recognition-firm-show-1841938311>.

educational institutions, banking institutions, and individuals around the world.¹⁴ According to documents reviewed by *Buzzfeed News*, Clearview has already shared and or sold its technology to more than “2,200 law enforcement departments, government agencies, and companies across 27 countries.”¹⁵ These clients include:

- U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”)
- U.S. Attorney General’s Office for the Southern District of New York
- Federal Bureau of Investigations
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”)
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”)
- U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”)
- U.S. Secret Service
- Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”)
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives
- U.S. Marshals
- Interpol
- Hundreds of local police departments¹⁶

There is now support for a ban on facial recognition in the United States. Members of Congress of both parties, technical experts, scholars, advocates, and the public have expressed concern at the use of this secretive technology is intrusive, unreliable, and a threat to civil liberties. A recent federal study found that a majority of face surveillance software exhibits racial bias.¹⁷ Currently, there are state or local level facial recognition bans in Massachusetts, Oregon, and in California.¹⁸

Request for Expedited Processing

EPIC is entitled to expedited processing of this request under the FOIA and the DOJ’s FOIA regulations. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1). Under the DOJ’s FOIA regulation, a FOIA request should be granted expedited processing when (1) there is “an urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged Federal Government Activity,” and (2) the request is “made by a person who is primarily engaged in disseminating information.” 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(ii). EPIC’s request satisfies both of these requirements.

¹⁴ Ryan Mac, Caroline Haskins, & Logan McDonald, *Clearview’s Facial Recognition App Has Been Used by the Justice Department, ICE, Macy’s, Walmart, and the NBA*, *Buzzfeed News* (Feb. 27, 2020), <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanmac/clearview-ai-fbi-ice-global-law-enforcement>.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ Patrick Grother, Mei Ngan, & Kayee Hanaoka, Nat’l Inst. of Standards and Tech., U.S. Dep’t of Commerce, *Face Recognition Vendor Test (FRVT) Part 3: Demographic Effects*, NISTIR 8280 (Dec. 2019), <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ir/2019/NIST.IR.8280.pdf>.

¹⁸ See EPIC, *Face Surveillance By Country: United States*, <https://epic.org/banfacesurveillance/index.php?c=United%2BStates#country>.

First, there is “urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” The “actual . . . Federal Government activity” is the FBI’s use of Clearview’s facial recognition app for law enforcement purposes. 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(ii).

There is “clear urgency” to release the requested information because the federal government’s use of Clearview’s controversial facial recognition app has been the subject of intense scrutiny from the media, lawmakers, and the public. On January 23, 2020, Senator Markey sent a letter to Clearview stating that “Clearview’s products appears to pose particularly chilling privacy risks, and I am deeply concerned that it is capable of fundamentally dismantling Americans’ expectation that they can move, assemble, or simply appear in public without being identified.”¹⁹ Moreover, the company currently faces several class action lawsuits alleging violation of both Illinois and California privacy laws.²⁰ Clearview has been secretive about how its proprietary algorithm works and who its clients are until leaked information recently revealed the extent of its relationship with not only law enforcement but also companies and international entities. To date, these relationships continue to exist and government agencies will continue to use this controversial, potentially privacy invasive facial recognition app to carry out government activities.

Second, EPIC is an organization “primarily engaged in disseminating information.” As the Court explained in *EPIC v. DOD*, “EPIC satisfies the definition of ‘representative of the news media’” entitling it to preferred fee status under FOIA. 241 F. Supp. 2d 5, 15 (D.D.C. 2003). EPIC is a non-profit organization committed to privacy, open government, and civil liberties that consistently discloses documents obtained through FOIA on its website, EPIC.org, and its online newsletter, the *EPIC Alert*.²¹

In submitting this request for expedited processing, EPIC certifies that this explanation is true and correct to the best of its knowledge and belief. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(vi); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(3).

Request for “News Media” Fee Status and Fee Waiver

EPIC is a “representative of the news media” for fee classification purposes. *EPIC v. DOD*, 241 F. Supp. 2d 5 (D.D.C. 2003). Based on EPIC’s status as a “news media” requester, EPIC is entitled to receive the requested record with only duplication fees assessed. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II); 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(c).

¹⁹ Letter from Senator Edward J. Markey to Hoan Ton-That, Chief Exec. Officer, Clearview AI (Jan. 23, 2020), <https://www.markey.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Clearview%20letter%202020.pdf>.

²⁰ See Daniel R. Stoller & Sara Merken, *Clearview AI Faces California, Illinois Lawsuit After Breach*, Bloomberg Law (Feb. 28, 2020), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/privacy-and-data-security/clearview-ai-faces-california-illinois-lawsuit-after-breach>; Devin Coldewey, *Class Action Suit Against Clearview AI Cites Illinois Law that Cost Facebook \$550M*, TechCrunch (Feb. 14, 2020), <https://techcrunch.com/2020/02/14/class-action-suit-against-clearview-ai-cites-illinois-law-that-cost-facebook-550m/>.

²¹ EPIC, *About EPIC*, <https://epic.org/epic/about.html>.

Further, any duplication fees should also be waived because disclosure is (1) “in the public interest because it is likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government” and (2) “not primarily in the commercial interest of” EPIC, the requester. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii); 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(1). EPIC’s request satisfies this standard based on the DOJ’s three factors for granting a fee waiver. 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2).

The DOJ considers the following three factors in their analysis: (i) the “subject matter of the request” concerns “identifiable operations or activities of the Federal Government with a connection that is direct and clear, not remote or attenuated;” (ii) disclosure “would be likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of those operations or activities;” and (iii) “disclosure [is] not be primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 28 C.F.R. 16.10(k)(2)(i)-(iii).

First, the implementation and use of Clearview’s software for law enforcement purposes by the FBI is a “direct and clear...identifiable operation of the Federal Government.” 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e)(1)(ii). Specifically, it has been reported that Clearview has credentialed individual users at the FBI to access the company’s database of more than 3 billion photos.²²

Second, disclosure is “likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of those operations or activities.” 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2)(ii)(A)–(B). Disclosure would “be meaningfully informative about government operations or activities” because little new information has been released about the FBI’s relationship with Clearview and how the agency is implementing Clearview’s software. The records requested will help inform the public on the extent of the FBI’s use of this facial recognition software.

Furthermore, disclosure will “contribute to the understanding of a reasonably broad audience of persons interested in that subject,” because, it “shall be presumed that a representative of the news media,” like EPIC, satisfies this consideration. 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2)(ii)(B).

Third, disclosure of the requested information is “not primarily in the commercial interest” of EPIC. 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2)(iii)(A)–(B). Again, EPIC is a non-profit organization committed to privacy, open government, and civil liberties.²³ Moreover, the DOJ “components ordinarily will presume that when a news media requester has satisfied the requirements of paragraphs (k)(2)(i) and (ii) of this section, the request is not primarily in the commercial interest of the requester.” 28 C.F.R. § 16.10(k)(2)(iii)(B). As described above, EPIC is a news media requester and satisfies the public interest standard.

For these reasons, a fee waiver should be granted.

²² Mac et al, *supra* note 14.

²³ EPIC, *About EPIC*, <https://epic.org/epic/about.html>

Conclusion

Thank you for your consideration of this request. EPIC anticipates your determination on its request within ten calendar days. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(ii)(I). For questions regarding this request contact Enid Zhou at 202-483-1140 x104 or zhou@epic.org, cc: FOIA@epic.org.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Enid Zhou

Enid Zhou
EPIC Open Government Counsel

/s/ Jeramie Scott

Jeramie Scott
EPIC Senior Counsel