

**COMPARISON CHART: USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 v. Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014
v. House Judiciary USA FREEDOM Act of 2014**

<p>Green: new bill is better than or identical to previous bills. Yellow: new bill is better than one of the old bills and worse than the other, or is otherwise a draw. Red: new bill is worse than both of the old bills.</p>	<p>USA FREEDOM Act 2015</p>	<p>Senate USA FREEDOM Act (2014, S. 2685)</p>	<p>House USA FREEDOM Act (2014, as reported out of House Judiciary Committee, H.R. 3361)</p>
<p>SECTION 215 TANGIBLE THINGS AND CALL DETAIL RECORDS</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>Bulk Collection Ban Under Patriot Act Section 215 Orders for Tangible Things</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is as good as old Senate bill and better than old House bill.</p> <p>USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 and the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 are essentially the same, and both are better than the House Judiciary Committee USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, which had a much weaker definition for SST.</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: A “term that specifically identifies a person, account, address [including an IP address], or personal device, or any other specific identifier” and “that is used to limit, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope” of information sought, but is not a term such as an electronic or remote computing service provider (ECSP or RCSP), or a broad geographic region, including the US, a city, county, state, zip code, or area code. (Sec. 107”(k)(4)(A))”</p> <p>Application Requirements: SST must be used as the basis for production. (Sec. 103(a))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: The same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, except it says “narrowly limited to the greatest extent reasonably practicable” as opposed to “limit to the greatest extent reasonably practicable.” (Sec. 107”(k)(3)(A))”</p> <p>Application Requirements: SST must be used as the basis for production. (Sec. 103(a))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: “A term used to uniquely describe a person, entity, or account.” (Sec. 107”(k)(2))”</p> <p>Application Requirements: SST must be used as the basis for production. (Sec. 103(a))</p>

<p>Bulk Collection Ban Under Patriot Act Section 215 Orders for Call Detail Records (CDRs)</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is better than both old bills.</p> <p>USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 is slightly better than the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 because it clarifies the “hops” problem, but otherwise, they are the same, and both are better than the House Judiciary Committee USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, which had a much weaker definition for SST.</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: A term that “specifically identifies an individual, account, or personal device.” (Sec. 107“(k)(4)(B)”)</p> <p>Application Requirements: Application for information based on SST relates to authorized investigation into international terrorism, and includes a statement of facts that information sought is relevant to investigation and there is reasonable articulable suspicion (RAS) that SST is associated with a foreign power or agent of a foreign power engaged in international terrorism or preparation thereof. (Sec. 101(a)(3))</p> <p>Hops: CDRs of session identifying information and calling card numbers identified by the STT may be used as the basis for the collection of a second set of CDRs. (Sec. 101(b)(3) “(F)(iv)”) </p> <p>Emergency Authority: If there is an emergency, you can collect without FISC approval for up to 7 days, but by the 7th day approval is required or production must terminate and information cannot be used in any governmental proceeding. (Sec. 102(a))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: Substantively the same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 107“(k)(3)(B)”) </p> <p>Application Requirements: Substantively the same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 101(a)(3))</p> <p>Hops: CDRs with a direct connection to the initial production based on the SST can be used as the basis for collection of a second set of CDRs. (Sec. 101(b)(3) “(F)(iii)”) </p> <p>Emergency Authority: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 102(a))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: “A term used to uniquely describe a person, entity, or account.” (Sec. 107“(k)(2)”) </p> <p>Application Requirements: Application for information based on SST relates to an authorized investigation, and there are facts giving rise to a RAS that SST is associated with a foreign power or agent of a foreign power. (Sec. 101(a)(3)(C))</p> <p>Hops: Using the results of the production of any SST that satisfies the RAS standard as the basis of production for another production. (Sec. 101(a)(3)(F)(iii))</p> <p>Emergency Authority: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 102(a))</p>
<p>Enhanced Minimization Procedures for Patriot Act Section 215 Orders for Tangible Things</p> <p>Conclusion:</p>	<p>Minimization Procedures: None.</p>	<p>Minimization Procedures: If the SST “does not specifically identify an individual, account, or personal device,” cannot disseminate the information and must destroy it within a reasonable time, unless the</p>	<p>Minimization Procedures: None.</p>

<p>New bill is worse than old Senate bill, same as old House bill.</p> <p>Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 is best, because it is the only bill to include the enhanced minimization procedures.</p>		<p>information relates to a person who is, is reasonably likely to have information about the activities of, or is in contact with or known to, a subject of an investigation, a foreign power or suspected agent of a foreign power. (Sec. 103(c))</p>	
<p>PEN REGISTER AND TRAP AND TRACE DEVICE REFORMS; NATIONAL SECURITY LETTERS REFORMS</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>Bulk Collection Ban Under Pen Register and Trap and Trace Device (PRTT) Authorities</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is as good as old Senate bill and better than old House bill.</p> <p>USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 and the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 are the same, and both better than the House Judiciary Committee USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, which had a much weaker definition for SST.</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: A term that “specifically identifies a person, account, address [including IP address], or personal device, or any other specific identifier” and “that is used to limit, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, the scope” of information sought, but is not a term such as an ECSP or a RCSP, or a broad geographic region, including the US, a city, county, state, zip code, or area code. (Sec. 201(b))</p> <p>Application Requirements: SST must be used as the basis for production. (Sec. 201(a)(3))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 201(b))</p> <p>Application Requirements: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 201(a)(3))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Definition: “A term used to uniquely describe a person, entity, or account.” (Sec. 201(b))</p> <p>Application Requirements: SST must be used as basis for selecting telephone line or facility. (Sec. 201(a))</p>
<p>Privacy Procedures Applied to Pen Register and Trap and Trace Device (PRTT) Authorities</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is as good as old Senate bill and better than old House bill.</p> <p>USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 and the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014</p>	<p>The Attorney General must establish policies and procedures to protect U.S. persons’ personal information. Rule of construction that FISC may also apply additional privacy protections, and authorization for FISC to engage in compliance assessments during the production. (Sec. 202)</p>	<p>Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 202)</p>	<p>The Attorney General must establish procedures to protect U.S. persons’ personal information, “consistent with the need to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information,” if it is evidence of a crime that has been, is being, or is about to be committed. FISC may engage in compliance review during execution of the order. (Sec. 202)</p>

<p>are the same, and both are better than the House Judiciary Committee USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, had a criminal exception.</p>			
<p>Bulk Collection Ban Under National Security Letters (NSLs) Authorities</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is as good as old Senate bill and better than old House bill.</p> <p>USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 and the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 are the same, and both better than the House Judiciary Committee USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, which had a much weaker definition for SST.</p>	<p>Electronic Communications Privacy Act NSLs: The term used as the basis of collection must specifically identify a “person, entity, telephone number, or account.” (Sec. 501(a))</p> <p>Right to Financial Privacy Act NSLs: The term used as the basis of collection must specifically identify a “customer, entity, or account.” (Sec. 501(b))</p> <p>Fair Credit Reporting Act NSLs: The term used as the basis of collection must specifically identify a “consumer or account.” (Sec. 501(c) and (d))</p>	<p>Electronic Communications Privacy Act NSLs: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 501(a))</p> <p>Right to Financial Privacy Act NSLs: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 501(b))</p> <p>Fair Credit Reporting Act NSLs: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 501(c) and (d))</p>	<p>Specific Selection Term (SST) Defined: “A term used to uniquely describe a person, entity, or account.” (Sec. 501(e))</p> <p>Electronic Communications Privacy Act NSLs: SST used as the basis of collection. (Sec. 501(a))</p> <p>Right to Financial Privacy Act NSLs: SST used as the basis of collection. (Sec. 501(b))</p> <p>Fair Credit Reporting Act NSLs: SST used as the basis of collection. (Sec. 501(c) and (d))</p>
<p>TRANSPARENCY</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>Third Party Reporting</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is better than the old House bill in one respect, but worse than both old bills in another respect.</p> <p>USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 is better than the House Judiciary Committee USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 because it offers a fourth reporting option</p>	<p>Waiting Period for Reporting on New Technology: 540 Days (Sec. 603 “Sec. 604(b)(1)(B)”)</p> <p>OPTION 1: Semiannual reports in bands of 1000 (0-999) of the number of: NSLs received and customer selectors targeted; orders or directives for contents received, combined, and customer selectors targeted; orders for noncontents, and customer selectors targeted</p>	<p>Waiting Period for Reporting on New Technology: 540 Days (Sec. 603(a) “(Sec. 604)(b)(1)(C)”)</p> <p>OPTION 1: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 except that instead of reporting on “customer selectors targeted” for NSLs, reporting is on “accounts affected.” (Sec. 603(a) “(Sec. 604)(a)(1)”)</p>	<p>Waiting Period for Reporting on New Technology: None.</p> <p>OPTION 1: Semiannual reports in bands of 1000 (0-999) of the number of NSLs received and customer accounts affected; the number of content orders, customer accounts affected under Title I, and customer selectors targeted under Title VII; orders for noncontents,</p>

<p>allowing for reporting in a smaller range of numbers.</p> <p>However, it is worse than the both of the previous bills because although those bills at least in some cases allowed for reporting on “accounts affected”, the new bill only allows for reporting on “customer selectors targeted”, which might be read more narrowly absent strong legislative history to the contrary.</p>	<p>under, respectively, FISA PRTT, Section 215 Tangible Things, and Section 215 CRDs. (Sec. 603 “(Sec. 604(a)(1))”</p> <p>OPTION 2: Semiannual reports in bands of 500 (0-499) of the number of: NSLs received and customer selectors targeted; orders or directives for contents, combined, and the number of customer selectors targeted; and orders for noncontents, and customer selectors targeted under orders for noncontents. (Sec. 603 “(Sec. 604(a)(2))”</p> <p>OPTION 3: Semiannual reports in bands of 250 (0-249) of the number national security process received, including the number of NSLs, and orders or directives, combined, and the number of customer selectors targeted. (Sec. 603 “(Sec. 604(a)(3))”</p> <p>OPTION 4: Annual reports in bands of 100 (0-99) of the number of orders, directives, and NSLs combined, and the number of customer selectors targeted. (Sec. 603 “(Sec. 604(a)(4))”</p>	<p>OPTION 2: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 except that instead of reporting on “customer selectors targeted” for NSLs, reporting is on “accounts affected.” (Sec. 603(a) “(Sec. 604)(a)(3))”</p> <p>OPTION 3: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 except that instead of reporting on “customer selectors targeted” for NSLs, reporting is on “customer selectors targeted.” (Sec. 603(a) “(Sec. 604)(a)(2))”</p> <p>OPTION 4: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 except that instead of reporting on “customer selectors targeted” for NSLs, reporting is on “customer selectors targeted.” (Sec. 603(a) “(Sec. 604)(a)(4))”</p>	<p>and customer accounts affected under, respectively, Title I, FISA PRTT, Section 215 Tangible Things, and Section 215 CRDs, and the number of customer selectors targeted under title VII. (Sec. 604(a)(1))</p> <p>OPTION 2: Semiannual reports in bands of 500 (0-499) of the number of NSLs received and customer accounts affected; content orders and customer selectors targeted; and noncontent orders and customer selectors targeted. (Sec. 604(a)(3))</p> <p>OPTION 3: Semiannual reports in bands of 250 (0-249) of the number of national security process received, including NSLs, and the number of customer selectors targeted. (Sec. 604(a)(2))</p> <p>OPTION 4: None.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>Government Reporting</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is worse than old Senate bill, better than old House bill.</p> <p>The USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 is weaker than the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 because it no longer includes important categories of reporting on Section 702 surveillance, has cut a provision regarding discretionary DNI reporting, and has added a new carve-out so that the FBI does not have to report on certain pen register surveillance that does not involve acquisition of email addresses or phone numbers. However, the new bill does include additional reporting on Section 215 orders for tangible things that cover more than one person. Otherwise, reporting is essentially the same as in the Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, and both are far better than House Judiciary Committee’s USA FREEDOM Act of 2014, which included no mandatory or discretionary DNI reporting.</p>	<p>New Reporting on Section 215 Tangible Things: Summary of compliance reviews; total number of applications made; number of orders granted, modified, or denied; the number of applications not pertaining to a specific individual, account, or personal device, and the number of those orders that were granted, modified, or denied; and if FISC proscribed additional minimization procedures. (Sec. 601(a) and (b))</p> <p>New Reporting on Section 215 CDRs: Summary of compliance reviews; and the total number of applications made, number of orders granted, modified, or denied (Sec. 601(a))</p> <p>Annual Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts Reports: Report separately on the number of applications under sections 105, 304, 402, 501, 702, 703, and 704; the number of orders granted, modified, or denied; and the number and names of amicus appointments; and the number of times an amicus was not appointed. (Sec. 602(a) “Sec. 603(a)”) </p> <p>Mandatory Annual Reports by the Director of National Intelligence: (Sec. 603(a) “Sec. 603(b)”) <u>REGARDING FISA AMENDMENTS ACT:</u> Report on the number of orders issued under titles I and III, and sections 703 and 704, and a</p>	<p>New Reporting on Section 215 Tangible Things: Summary of compliance reviews; total number of applications made; and number of orders granted, modified, or denied. (Sec. 601)</p> <p>New Reporting on Section 215 CDRs: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 601)</p> <p>Annual Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts Reports: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 602(a) “Sec. 603(a)”) </p> <p>Mandatory Annual Reports by the Director of National Intelligence: (Sec. 602(a) “Sec. 603(b)”) <u>REGARDING FISA AMENDMENTS ACT:</u> Report on the number of orders issued under titles I and III, and sections 703 and 704, and a</p>	<p>New Reporting on Section 215 Tangible Things and CDRs: Summary of compliance reviews for orders for tangible things, electronic surveillance, physical searches, or the installation of PRTT; total number of applications made; and number of orders granted, modified, or denied. (Sec. 601 and 602(a))</p> <p>New Reporting on Section 215 CDRs: Report on total number of applications made; and number of orders granted, modified, or denied. (Sec. 601)</p> <p>Annual Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts Reports: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 603)</p> <p>Mandatory Annual Reports by the Director of National Intelligence: None.</p>
---	--	--	---

	<p>good faith estimate of the number of targets; the number of orders issued under section 702 and a good faith estimate of the number of search terms concerning a US person that were used to get contents, and the number of queries concerning a non-US person to get noncontents. *FBI excluded from reporting on section 702.</p> <p><u>REGARDING PRTT AND SECTION 215 TANGIBLE THINGS:</u> Report on the number of orders, and a good faith estimate of the number of targets and the number of unique identifiers. *FBI excluded from reporting on PRTT if acquisition does not include email addresses or phone numbers.</p> <p><u>REGARDING SECTION 215 CDRs:</u> Report on the number of orders, and good faith estimates of the number of targets, the number of unique identifiers, and the number of search terms that included U.S. person information. *FBI excluded from reporting.</p> <p><u>REGARDING NSLS:</u> Report on the number of NSLs issued and the</p>	<p>good faith estimate of the number of targets; the number of orders issued under section 702 and a good faith estimate of the number of targets, the number of individuals whose information had been collected, the number of unique identifiers belonging to a person in the U.S., and the number of search terms and the number of search queries that included U.S. person information. *FBI excluded from reporting on section 702.</p> <p><u>REGARDING PRTT AND SECTION 215 TANGIBLE THINGS:</u> Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 except that instead of good faith estimates of “unique identifiers” reporting is on good faith estimates of “the number of individuals whose communications were collected.” *FBI excluded from reporting.</p> <p><u>REGARDING SECTION 215 CDRs:</u> Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 except that instead of good faith estimates of “unique identifiers” reporting is on good faith estimates of “the number of individuals whose communications were collected.” *FBI excluded from reporting.</p> <p><u>REGARDING NSLS:</u> Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>number of requests for information contained within those NSLs.</p> <p>Discretionary Annual Reports by the Director of National Intelligence: None.</p>	<p>Discretionary Annual Reports by the Director of National Intelligence: Each April, either certify in writing that the following reporting cannot be done, or report good faith estimates of (FBI is exempt) the number of individuals whose communications were collected who were located in the U.S. under: titles I and III, and sections 703 and 704; section 702; FISA PRTT authorities; Section 215 Tangible Things orders; and Section 215 CDR orders. (Sec. 602(a) “Sec. 603(c)”) </p>	<p>Discretionary Annual Reports by the Director of National Intelligence: None.</p>
<p>FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT (FISC) REFORMS</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>
<p>Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) Decision Disclosure</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is worse than old Senate bill, better than old House bill.</p> <p>Senate USA FREEDOM of 2014 is slightly stronger because it breaks out with more specificity what must be included in a summary, but the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015 is far better than the House, which has no summary requirements.</p>	<p>The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Attorney General, will review for declassification every FISC decision, order, or opinion that includes a significant construction or interpretation of law, including a significant interpretation of SST. The document must either be released in redacted form, or the Attorney General must prepare a summary of the significant construction or interpretation of law, and, consistent with national security, a description of the context of the matter. (Sec. 402(a))</p>	<p>Same declassification review as in USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. If a summary is released, it must include the significant construction or interpretation of law, including, to the extent consistent with national security, each legal question addressed and how each question was resolved, the general context of the matter, and a description of the construction or interpretation of law. (Sec. 402(a))</p>	<p>Same declassification review as in USA FREEDOM Act of 2015, and a summary must be released but the bill does not include any requirements regarding the contents of the summary. (Sec. 402(a))</p>

<p>Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC) Special Advocate or Amicus Curiae Provisions</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is worse than old Senate bill, better than old House bill.</p> <p>The Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 is the strongest. It establishes an advocate who is stronger and may have more access to information than in the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. It also defines “novel or significant interpretation of law,” where this year’s bill does not. Otherwise, they are substantially the same. The House Judiciary Committee’s amicus provision is very weak since there is no duty to advocate for privacy, the trigger for the amicus’ involvement in a case is also undefined, and amicus’ access to needed materials is unaddressed.</p>	<p>Amicus Designation: FISC judges appoint at least 5 people, and may consult with others, including the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB). (Sec. 401“(i)(1)”)</p> <p>Appointment: FISC must appoint amicus to serve in any case that “presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law,” or issue a written finding that an appointment is not appropriate. FISC may also appoint other individuals or organizations to serve as amicus (Sec. 401“(i)(2)”)</p> <p>Novel or Significant Interpretation of Law Defined: None.</p> <p>Duties: As appropriate, provide FISC with legal arguments that advance the protections of privacy and civil liberties, information relating to intelligence collection or technology, or any other relevant legal arguments. (Sec. 401“(i)(4)”)</p> <p>Access to Relevant Information: Amicus will have access to all legal or other materials that the FISC deems relevant to the amicus’ duties. (Sec. 401“(i)(6)”)</p>	<p>Special Advocate Designation: FISC must consult with PCLOB and appoint at least 5 attorneys (Sec. 401(i)(1))</p> <p>Appointment: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 401(i)(2))</p> <p>Novel or Significant Interpretation of Law Defined: “Application of settled law to novel technologies or circumstances,” or “any other novel or significant construction or interpretation” of law, including the interpretation of SST. (Sec. 401(i)(3))</p> <p>Duties: Advocate, as appropriate, supporting legal interpretations that advance privacy and civil liberties. (Sec. 401(i)(4))</p> <p>Access to Relevant Information: Advocate will have access to all legal or other materials that the FISC deems relevant to the amicus’ duties and may have access to classified materials. (Sec. 401(i)(4))</p>	<p>Amicus Designation: FISC judges appoint at least 5 people as eligible to serve as amicus curiae. (Sec. 401(i)(2))</p> <p>Appointment: FISC judge must appoint an amicus curiae to assist in the consideration of a case that “presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law,” or issue a written finding that an appointment is not appropriate. (Sec. 401(i)(1))</p> <p>Novel or Significant Interpretation of Law Defined: Undefined, and will be determined by the opinion of the Court. (Sec. 401(i)(1))</p> <p>Duties: Amicus must “carry out the duties as assigned” by the FISC. (Sec. 401(i)(3))</p> <p>Access to Relevant Information: Not addressed.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>SECTION 702 AMENDMENTS AND OTHER AMENDMENTS:</p> <p>Conclusion: New bill is worse than both old bills.</p> <p>House Judiciary Committee’s USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 was the strongest because it included the same limitations on the use of 702 as the other bills, but also clarified the prohibition on reverse targeting and added new statutorily required minimization procedures concerning wholly domestic communications.</p> <p>Senate USA FREEDOM Act of 2014 is next strongest because, like last year’s House bill, it did not include a new “roamer” authority to temporarily monitor foreign targets who enter the US or a new “reverse roamer” authority allowing continued Title I electronic surveillance of targets who leave the US, nor new authority allowing Title I electronic surveillance of individuals who aide or abet in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.</p> <p>Both of the old bills also have shorter sunset periods than the new bill.</p> <p>The new Senate bill also adds an unrelated title with sections implementing a nuclear anti-proliferation treaty (Sec. 811-812), and sections dealing with acts of</p>	<p>Limitation on Use of Section 702 Information: No U.S. person information collected pursuant to Section 702 may be used in any governmental proceeding, or further used or disclosed, unless the Attorney General approves its use because it indicates a threat of death or serious bodily harm. (Sec. 301)</p> <p>Prohibition on Reverse Targeting Under Section 702: None</p> <p>Section 702 Minimization Procedures: None.</p> <p>Continued Surveillance When Foreign Targets Move Into the U.S.: Surveillance of a target who enters into the U.S. may continue for up to 72 hours if the lapse of surveillance would pose a threat of death or serious bodily harm. If subsequent authorization for surveillance is not obtained, information collected may not be retained. (Sec. 701)</p>	<p>Limitation on Use of Section 702 Information: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 301)</p> <p>Prohibition on Reverse Targeting Under Section 702: None</p> <p>Section 702 Minimization Procedures: None.</p> <p>Continued Surveillance When Foreign Targets Move Into the U.S.: None.</p>	<p>Limitation on Use of Section 702 Information: Same as USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. (Sec. 303)</p> <p>Prohibition on Reverse Targeting Under Section 702: Cannot target someone if a purpose of collection is collecting U.S. person communications. (Sec. 301)</p> <p>Section 702 Minimization Procedures: Establish procedures that “minimize the acquisition, and prohibit the retention and dissemination” of any wholly domestic communication, and limit the use of any communication of a US person or someone in the U.S., except to protect against an imminent threat of death. (Sec. 302)</p> <p>Continued Surveillance When Foreign Targets Move Into the U.S.: None.</p>
---	---	---	---

<p>piracy (Sec. 801-805), but upon review, that addition has not impacted OTI's evaluation of the bill.</p>	<p>FISA Definition for Agent of a Foreign Power: Amends definition to include individuals who work in the US as an agent of a foreign power, regardless of whether they are currently in the US. This would enable continued surveillance under FISA Title I even if the target has left the US. (Sec. 702)</p> <p>Also expands definition to include persons who aid or abet a foreign power in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. (Sec. 703)</p> <p>Penalties for Material Support Convictions: Increases maximum penalty from 15 years to 20 years. (Sec. 704)</p> <p>Sunsets: Extended to December 15, 2019. (Sec. 705)</p>	<p>FISA Definition for Agent of a Foreign Power: None.</p> <p>Penalties for Material Support Convictions: None.</p> <p>Sunsets: Extended to December 31, 2017. (Sec. 701)</p>	<p>FISA Definition for Agent of a Foreign Power: None.</p> <p>Penalties for Material Support Convictions: None.</p> <p>Sunsets: Extended to December 31, 2017. (Sec. 701)</p>
---	---	--	--