

Port of Seattle Biometric Technology External Advisory Group



Biometric Technology External Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary Friday February 7, 2020 12:30 PM – 2:30 PM

The second of four biometric technology external advisory group meetings took place at the Port of Seattle on February 7, 2020. The purpose of this meeting was for the group to understand the Biometric Air Exit use case and respond to a draft of applied policy recommendations created by the Port of Seattle's Biometric internal working group. A list of attendees is below.

Attendance

Name	Organization	Attending
Brian Kooiker	US Customs and Border Protection	Yes
Eric Holzapfel	Entre Hermanos	Yes
Ian Baigent-Scales	Virgin Atlantic Airways	Yes
Irene Plenefisch	Microsoft	Yes
Javon Hutson	University of Washington	Yes
Jason Hausner	Delta Airlines	yes
Savannah Sly & Medha Raman	ACLU	Yes
McKenna Lux	CAIR-WA	Yes
Nina Moses	US Transportation Security Administration	Yes
Rich Stolz	One America	Yes
Scott Kennedy	Alaska Airlines	Yes
Sheri Sawyer	Office of Washington State Governor Jay Inslee	Yes
Suzanne Juneau	Puget Sound Business Travel Association	Yes
Yazmin Medhi	Office of US Representative Pramila Jayapal	Yes
Jacquelyn Krones	Microsoft	Yes
Sasha Bernhard	Office of US Representative Suzan DelBene	Yes
Scott Ingham	Delta Air Lines	Yes
Tony Gonchar	Delta Air Lines	Yes
Michael Bol	US Customs and Border Protection	Yes
Jeni Best	US Customs and Border Protection	Yes
Clay Thomas	US Customs and Border Protection	Yes

Biometric Air Exit Process

Defined as: "the use of facial recognition to confirm the identities of departing international airline passengers", the group received a presentation by Port of Seattle staff to explain the use of biometric air exit and respond to clarifying questions by the group.

Biometric Air Exit Recommendations

In advance of the meeting, the group received a set of draft biometric air exit policy recommendations organized by the seven guiding principles. Additionally, the group also received a consolidated "worksheet" meant to capture key words, jurisdiction, and language found in the full document.

In this meeting, the group reviewed the respective policy recommendations principle by principle. The following is a summary of responses and feedback on the draft recommendations

JUSTIFIED
Key Words: Approval
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to clarify the criteria in which the Aviation Managing Director (AMD) will use to decide if a request will be accepted. • Clarification needed to understand which requests go to the Port Commission versus which go to the AMD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distinction has to do with procurement • Beyond the process, policy recommendations need to specify the situations <u>warranting the use</u> • Language recommended to state that a request is justified if the request addresses a specific operational need and is not mass surveillance. • Clarify <u>operational need</u>

PRIVATE
Key Words: Encryption; Disclosure; Storage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define duration of image storage • What audit procedures exist to ensure that policies are being met. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CBP will soon audit signage in place; cybersecurity standards, and retention + connection • Clarity over the security of the data and the extent of access to the data by vendors or third parties • Could the Port have insights into audit results?

EQUITABLE
Key Words: Accurate Rates; Training
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the Port review airline training? Seek partnership and learning from others • Port can request data from CBP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CBP sends regular reporting, including usage data + match rates • Compare against CPB accuracy • Clarify benchmarking against other airports

- Regarding "compare and review CBP accuracy rates before approval" clarify what is being compared with what?

TRANSPARENT

Key Words: Communication Plan & Accountability Report

- Regarding recommendation 15b: Clarity on what "regular basis" means
- Clarity on what data is shared or requested (also applicable to private)
- What is included in Accountability Report? And who is responsible for oversight?
- Will the Accountability Report review the public's experience?
 - proactive survey rather than reactive to complaints
- Ask if people (public) understand what is happening?

LAWFUL

Key Words: State & Federal Regulations

- Clarify what "advocate" means
- Statement that says port should comply with state and federal law
- What tools/recourse does consumer have in data breach? What is the Port's role in this situation?
 - CBP has congressional notification

ETHICAL

Key Words: Multiple Languages; Culturally Appropriate Engagement Plan; Training

- Port can explain what opt-out procedures are. Partner with groups beyond the airlines

VOLUNTARY

Key Words: Camera Locations to Prevent Unintended Capture

- Build out opt-in and opt-out procedures
- Recommendations need to consider opt-in and opt-out procedures with equal consideration
- How can consideration of opt-in and opt-out procedures be taken to consumers to understand preference?

- Consider how operational needs are balanced with the distinction between opt-in and opt-out
- Port should consider worst-case scenarios for opt-in and opt-out

The image below is of the notes taken during the exercise with the External Advisory Group.

BIOMETRIC TECHNOLOGY EXTERNAL ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #2 2/7/2020						
JUSTIFIED	PRIVATE	EQUITABLE	TRANSPARENT	LAWFUL	ETHICAL	VOLUNTARY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does Aviation Mgr decide? Clarify criteria What opt-in to commission vs AMS? Involvement Specify the situations warranting use Justified if addresses specific <u>operational need</u>, not mass surveillance Clarify <u>operational need</u>, must save this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> define duration of image storage What audit procedures happen? CBP storage in place, cybersecurity, retention, connections Security of data, Vendor access: Clarify business requirements Will port have insight into audit results? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can port review airline training? Seek Partnership = learning from others Port can request data from CBP CBP sends regular reporting, including usage + match rates compare against CBP accuracy Clarify benchmarking against other airports Clarify what is being compared with what 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarity on what "regular basis" means Clarity on what data is shared or not shared What is included in Accountability Report? Oversight? Does report review the public experience? Proactive survey, not reactive complaints ASK if people (pubs) understand what is happening 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify what "advocacy" means Port should comply w/ State + Federal Law What tools/ recourse does consumer have in data breach? CBP has congressional notification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Port can explain what opt-out procedures are Partner beyond airlines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build out opt-in + opt-out procedures opt-in + opt-out procedures need equal consideration Consider <u>operational need</u> How to take it to consumers to understand preferences? Port should consider worst-case scenarios for opt-in and out