

program must remain unchanged if an extension is to be granted. Each party to the agreement must certify that the program has been conducted in compliance with the matching agreement. Requests for extensions shall be submitted through channels to the Board.

(e) *Altered matching program.* (1) An altered matching program is one that is already established, but with such a significant change proposed that it requires revision of the matching notice and approval of the Defense Data Integrity Board, OMB and Congress. A significant change is one which does one or more of the following:

(i) Changes the purpose for which the program was established.

(ii) Changes the matching population either by including new categories of subjects of record, or by greatly increasing the numbers of records matched.

(iii) Changes the legal authority under which the match was being conducted.

(iv) Changes the records (data elements) that will be used in the match.

(2) A proposal to alter an established matching program shall be submitted through channels to the Defense Data Integrity Board for review and approval.

(f) *Non compliance sanctions.* (1) The agency shall not disclose any record for use in a matching program as a source agency to any recipient agency (within or outside the Department of Defense) if there is reason to believe that the terms of the matching agreement/MOU or the due process requirements are not being met by the recipient agency. The Defense Privacy Office, DA&M, shall be informed immediately, through channels, should any such incident occur. Normally consulting with the recipient agency should resolve the problem, but the responsibility rests with the source.

(2) No source agency shall renew a matching agreement/MOU unless the recipient agency (within or outside the Department of Defense) has certified that it has complied with the provisions of the agreement/MOU and the agency has no reason to believe otherwise.

(3) A willful disclosure of records from a system of records for any unau-

thorized computer matching program may subject the responsible officer or employee to criminal penalties. Civil remedies are also available to matching program subjects who can show they were harmed by an agency's violation of the Act as set forth in subpart J of this part.

#### § 317.97 Cost-benefit analysis.

(a) *Purpose.* The requirement for a cost-benefit analysis by the Act is to assist the agency in determining whether or not to conduct or participate in a matching program. Its application is required in two places: As an agency conclusion in the matching agreement containing the justification and specific estimate of savings; and in the Data Integrity Board review process where it is forwarded as part of the matching proposal. The intent of this requirement is not to create a presumption that when agencies balance individual rights and cost savings, the latter should inevitably prevail. Rather, it is to ensure that sound management practices are followed when agencies use records from Privacy Act systems in matching programs. It is not in the government's interest to engage in matching activities that drain agency resources that could be better spent elsewhere. Agencies should use the cost-benefit requirement as an opportunity to re-examine programs and weed out those that produce only marginal results.

(b) *Cost-benefit analysis.* The agency, when proposing matching programs, must provide the Board with all information which is relevant and necessary to allow the Board to make an informed decision including a cost-benefit analysis. The Defense Data Integrity Board shall not approve any matching agreement unless the Board finds the cost-benefit analysis demonstrates the program is likely to be cost effective.

(1) The Board may waive the cost-benefit analysis requirement if it determines in writing that submission of such an analysis is not required.

(2) If a matching program is required by a specific statute, then a cost-benefit analysis is not required. However, any renegotiation of such a matching agreement shall be accompanied by a

cost-benefit analysis. The finding need not be favorable. The intent, in this case, is to provide Congress with information to help it evaluate the effectiveness of statutory matching requirements.

(3) The Board must find that agreements conform to the provisions of the Act and appropriate guidelines, regulations, and statutes.

**§ 317.98 Appeals of denials of matching agreements.**

(a) *Disapproval by the Board.* If the Defense Data Integrity Board disapproves a matching agreement, a party to the agreement may appeal the disapproval to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503. Appeals must be made within 30 days after the Defense Data Integrity Board's written disapproval. The appealing party shall submit with its appeal the following:

(1) Copies of all documentation accompanying the initial matching agreement proposal.

(2) A copy of the Defense Data Integrity Board's disapproval and reasons.

(3) Evidence supporting the cost-benefit effectiveness of the match.

(4) Any other relevant information, e.g., timing considerations, public interest served by the match, etc.

(b) *OMB approval.* If the Director of the Office of Management and Budget approves a matching program it will not become effective until 30 days after the Director reports his decision to Congress.

(c) *Recourse by the Inspector General.* If the Defense Data Integrity Board and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget both disapprove a matching program proposed by the Inspector General of the denial agency, the Inspector General may report that disapproval to the head of Department of Defense and to the Congress.

**§ 317.99 Proposals for matching programs.**

(a) *Who initiates the action.* The recipient DoD component (or the DoD component source agency in a match conducted by a non-Federal agency); or the recipient activity within the DoD component for internal matches, is re-

sponsible for reporting the match for Board approval. The responsible official should contact the other participants to gather the information necessary to make a unified report.

(b) *New or altered matching programs.* Determine if the match is a new program or an existing one. A new match is one for which no public notice has been published in the FEDERAL REGISTER. An altered matching program is an established (published public notice) match with such a significant change that it requires amendment. An altered matching program should not be confused with a request for an unchanged extension of an established program.

(c) *Contents of report (original and one copy).* (1) A proposed new matching program report shall consist of an agency letter of transmittal with the following attached documents:

(i) Completed agreement between the participants.

(ii) Benefit/cost analysis.

(iii) Proposed FEDERAL REGISTER matching notice for public review and comment.

(iv) Copies of all the appropriate forms (e.g., applications) of the participating parties providing direct notice to the individual or any other means of communication used.

(v) Copy or copies of the appropriate FEDERAL REGISTER system(s) of record notice(s) containing an appropriate routine use providing constructive notice to the individual.

(2) A report on a proposed alteration to an established matching program shall consist of an agency letter of transmittal with the following attached documents:

(i) A report containing the significant change(s) and the following additional information:

(A) What alternatives to matching the agencies considered and why a matching program was chosen.

(B) The date the match was approved by each participating Federal agency's Data Integrity Board.

(C) Whether a cost-benefit analysis was required and, if so, whether it projected a favorable ratio.

(ii) Proposed FEDERAL REGISTER matching notice for public review and comment.