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Handling Official Use Only Material

Materials and information are to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with US DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public, or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" reason without prior approval from the originator. It is important to note that the caveat “For Official Use Only” is NOT a security classification, however, FOUO material must be safeguarded.

- FOUO material should not be left unattended on desks and should be placed out of sight when not in use unless it is in a room that has physical access control measures, as required by DHS MD 11042.1, section 1.1. (Jan. 6, 2005).
- Unauthorized personnel should not be allowed in the area when FOUO material is being reviewed.

*Reminder: This course material is FOUO*
Handling Official Use Only

Materials and information are to be controlled, handled, transmitted, distributed, and disposed of in accordance with US DHS policy relating to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information and is not to be released to the public, or other personnel who do not have a valid "need-to-know" reason without prior approval from the originator. It is important to note that the caveat “For Official Use Only” is NOT a security classification, however, FOUO material must be safeguarded.

• FOUO material should not be left unattended on desks and should be placed out of sight when not in use unless it is in a room that has physical access control measures, as required by DHS MD 11042.1, section 1.1 (Jan. 6, 2005).
• Unauthorized personnel should not be allowed in the area when FOUO material is being reviewed.

*Reminder: This course material is FOUO

The CARRP process and all materials related to CARRP are FOUO, and should be handled accordingly.

If you don’t know what FOUO means now, you will in another 30 slides or so.
This Presentation is intended solely to provide training and guidance to USCIS personnel in performing their duties relative to the adjudication of immigration benefits. It is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create or confer any right(s) or benefit(s), substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any individual or other party in benefit applications before USCIS, in removal proceedings, in litigation with the United States, or in any other form or manner. This Presentation does not have the force of law, or of a DHS directive.
This Presentation is intended solely to provide training and guidance to USCIS personnel in performing their duties relative to the adjudication of immigration benefits. It is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create or confer any right(s) or benefit(s), substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any individual or other party in benefit applications before USCIS, in removal proceedings, in litigation with the United States, or in any other form or manner. This Presentation does not have the force of law, or of a DHS directive.

OCC requires you to read this aloud to the class
• This presentation may not be reproduced or further disseminated without the express written consent of FDNS Training.

• Please contact the National Security Division, FDNS for additional information.
About this Presentation

- Author: FDNS National Security Division
- Date of last revision: December 2015
- This presentation contains no sensitive Personally Identifiable Information (PII).
- Any references in documents or text, with the exception of case law, relate to fictitious individuals.
Terminal Performance Objective

At the end of this training session, the USCIS Officer will have an understanding of the CARRP process.
Course Overview

- Module 1: National Security Division Overview
- Module 2: Handling and Protecting Sensitive Information
- Module 3: CARRP Overview
  - CARRP Terminology
  - Policy and Procedure
  - CARRP Core Concepts
  - Deconfliction
- Module 4: Identifying National Security Concerns
- Module 5: Determining Eligibility and Vetting National Security Concerns
- Module 6: Adjudicating National Security Concerns
- Module 7: Review and Test
Module 3: CARRP

GOALS

- Build a common vocabulary for discussing CARRP cases.
- Understand USCIS policies impacting CARRP cases.
- Identify the personnel involved in the CARRP process.
- Learn the four phases of the CARRP process.
- Recognize the differences between KST processing and non-KST processing.
- Characterize the discrete elements of an NS concern.
- Position CARRP with other USCIS policies.
- Be able to have a deconfliction conversation.
- This is module 1, your introduction to CARRP
- These are the goals of this module
- Think of this section as an overview – your 50,000ft look in to the CARRP process
- Everything we talk about here – roles in the process, DS entry, etc. – will be covered in greater detail as we look at the individual stages of the CARRP process
- The definitions part of this is particularly important – it will not be a gloss-over section
- In order for any of the rest of this to make sense, speaking the same language of national security is important
- We all need to be using vocabulary accurately and consistently
- They way we're going to get through this is in 4 sections, each with an exercise
CARRP Terms (Volume I):

- Controlled Application Review and Resolution Program (CARRP).
- National Security (NS) Concern.
- Known or Suspected Terrorist (KST).
- Non-Known or Suspected Terrorist (Non-KST).
- Non-KST NS Confirmed.
- Non-KST NS Not Confirmed.
- We'll start with terms so that we're all speaking the same language going through this thing
- These are some of the terms you're going to see repeated throughout this presentation
- They are also the status and sub status values you will be selecting in FDNS DS as you work CARRP cases
CARRP: Controlled Application Review and Resolution Program

- The USCIS policy for identifying and processing cases with national security (NS) concerns.
CARRP: Controlled Application Review and Resolution Program

- The USCIS policy for identifying and processing cases with national security (NS) concerns.

- CARRP is a system
- It's a repeatable process that's designed to standardize how USCIS assesses and handles NS concerns
- It's a way of slowing ourselves down, taking some extra time to think eligibility, think about derogatory information
- You can think of it as a yellow traffic light or sign – it means we're taking caution with something
- It allows us to bring additional resources to bear on cases
- In CARRP we get to do more than just a quick TECS check
National Security (NS) Concern

• Exists when an individual or organization has been determined to have an articulable link to prior, current or planned involvement in, or association with, an activity, individual or organization described in 212(a)(3)(A), (B), or (F), 237(a)(4)(A) or (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

• This determination requires that the case be handled in accordance with CARRP policy.
National Security (NS) Concern

- Exists when an individual or organization has been determined to have an articulable link to prior, current or planned involvement in, or association with, an activity, individual or organization described in 212(a)(3)(A), (B), or (F), 237(a)(4)(A) or (B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).
- This determination requires that the case be handled in accordance with CARRP policy.

There are three critical pieces to this definition
- You have to have an individual or organization
- You have to have a nexus to national security, as defined in the INA
- And you have to be able to link that organization or activity to the NS ground
- The other key part of this is that “prior, current, or planning involvement” line
- There is some confusion about statutory versus non-statutory indicators –
  - This is a meaningless distinction
  - The statutory part of our NS concerns are the NS inadmissibility and removability sections from the INA
  - In order to have an NS concern, one of these INA NS grounds has to be present
  - The non-statutory part is the connection – everything that links the person to the ground
- There is also some confusion about forms like N-400’s that don’t rely on 212 or 237 for eligibility
  - What we are talking about right now is not eligibility related
- We are trying to decide if an NS concern is present and if the case should be in CARRP
- The grounds that we’re talking about here give us a list of what’s related to national security and what’s not
- That the grounds come from inadmissibility and removability sections doesn’t matter for determining if a concern exists

  - Instructors: Don’t get into the weeds, especially on articulable link – there is an entire section later on indicators and A.L.
CARRP Terms,

Individual / Organization + Connection to + NS ground from INA =

National Security Concern

Handled under CARRP
- For those of you who are mathematically inclined, you can break that previous slide down this way
- When we talk about a National Security Concern, these are the elements that have to be there
- And when we have these elements and have an NS concern, those are the cases we handle in CARRP
- Note that an NS indicator is different from an NS concern is different from an NS ground
- This is not the first time you will be seeing this slide... hint hint
# National Security Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of National Security Concern Include:</th>
<th>Section of the INA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Espionage</td>
<td>§212(a)(3)(A), and §237(a)(4)(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabotage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporting sensitive goods, technology, or information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overthrowing the U.S. government by force or violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijacking or sabotaging transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostage-taking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack or assassination of any government official (U.S. or any other government)</td>
<td>§212(a)(3)(B), and §237(a)(4)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using other weapons to harm people or cause damage (other than for personal monetary gain)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons or groups the Secretaries of State and/or Homeland Security have found to be engaged in terrorist activity or associated with a terrorist organization.</td>
<td>§212(a)(3)(B), (a)(3)(F), and §237(a)(4)(B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are the NS grounds that you’re considering in the last part of our equation (previous slide)

You’ll note that these sections ARE NOT all of 212(a)(3)

There are additional security inadmissibility's that don’t rise to the level of NS concern

Human rights abuses, for example, are not listed here, but are part of 212(a)(3)

Drugs and alien smuggling are listed elsewhere in 212 and are not NS grounds

A lot of these relate to terrorism, but please do not think that all NS cases relate to terrorism

Please remember again that these grounds help us decide is an NS concern is present – they do not mean that we’re going to find the person removable, nor does it mean that we’re going to deny the benefit
Known or Suspected Terrorist (KST)

- KST is a category of individuals who have been nominated and accepted for placement in the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB),
- Are on the Terrorist Watch List,
- AND have a specially coded lookout posted in the TECS and/or the Consular Lookout Automated Support System (CLASS), as used by the Department of State.
Known or Suspected Terrorist (KST)

- KST is a category of individuals who have been nominated and accepted for placement in the Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB),
- Are on the Terrorist Watch List,
- AND have a specially coded lookout posted in the TECS and/or the Consular Lookout Automated Support System (CLASS), as used by the Department of State.

- KST is a term used government wide by the law enforcement and intel communities
- We'll get in to more detail on the TSDB and Watchlist latter on
- We'll also discuss how to identify a KST when we dig in to Stages 1 and 2
- For the moment, just know that a KST is a Known or Suspected Terrorist, and is one type of NS concern
Non-Known or Suspected Terrorist (Non-KST) NS Concern

- Is a category of the remaining cases with NS concerns, regardless of source, including but not limited to associates of KST(s), unindicted co-conspirators, terrorist organization members, persons involved with providing material support to terrorists or terrorist organizations, and agents of foreign governments.

- Individuals and organizations who fall into the Non-KST grouping may also pose a serious threat to national security.
Non-Known or Suspected Terrorist (Non-KST) NS Concern

• Is a category of the remaining cases with NS concerns, regardless of source, including but not limited to associates of KST(s), unindicted co-conspirators, terrorist organization members, persons involved with providing material support to terrorists or terrorist organizations, and agents of foreign governments.

• Individuals and organizations who fall into the Non-KST grouping may also pose a serious threat to national security.

- Non-KST is the other type of NS concern
- It is also something of a USCIS term of art – other agencies are not going to know what you’re talking about if you call and start saying this
- The key to this is to think back to our NS grounds from the INA and realize that there are more things here than just being associated with a KST
- Being a non-KST can involve the individual doing any number of things that impact national security

Instructors: emphasize that non-KSTs are not inherently “less bad” then KSTs
  - A non-KST concern is every bit as serious as a KST concern, and they are handled the same way
  - There is not such thing as “CARRP Lite” processing of non-KSTs
  - Even TRIG case that overlap with CARRP, even when there is an exemption, are treated as serious concerns (more on TRIG later in this module)
Non-KST NS Concern - Confirmed

- There is a nexus to a national security ground, and a clear link exists between the individual or organization and the national security ground
- Articulable Link = NS Confirmed
Non-KST NS Concern - Confirmed

- There is a nexus to a national security ground, and a clear link exists between the individual or organization and the national security ground
- Articulable Link = NS Confirmed

Individual / Organization + Articulable Link + NS ground from INA

- There are two sub-categories of non-KST – confirmed and not confirmed
- Which one you pick depends on your articulable link – the middle part of our equation
- If we have a nexus to NS and we can clearly articulate a link between the person and the NS ground, then it’s NS confirmed
- Basically, NS confirmed is what we pick when all three parts of this equation are clear
- We’ll talk more in Stage I about exactly how to recognize if you have a clear articulate link and what to write down if you have one
- You can also think of NS confirmed in terms of Fraud and FDNS-DS
  - NS Confirmed is comparable to you “Case”
  - Our next slide, NS Not Confirmed, is comparable to you “Lead”
Non-KST NS Concern – Not Confirmed

• There is a nexus to a national security ground, but there is not a clear link between the individual or organization and the national security ground

• Indicators of connection = NS Not Confirmed

Individual / Organization + Indicators of a Link + NS ground from INA
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Non-KST NS Concern – Not Confirmed

- There is a nexus to a national security ground, but there is not a clear link between the individual or organization and the national security ground
- Indicators of connection = NS Not Confirmed

Individual / Organization + Indicators of a Link + NS ground from INA

- If NS confirmed means that we have a clear link between a person and an NS ground, NS not confirmed means that some part of the equation is a little fuzzy
- There are indicators of something going on, because of travel, because of associations, because of activities, because of some characteristic – but it’s not a clear connection
- So now you may be thinking to yourselves why we would put that in CARRP
- The reason goes back to the description of what CARRP is… a process for vetting and resolving NS concerns
- We do not need a fully formed articulable link – we just need an individual and an NS ground and a INDICATIONS or SUSPICIONS of a link between them
- We can use the CARRP process to build our articulable link
- So think of NS Not Confirmed as a kind of hazy articulable link, rather than the perfectly clear link that would lead to an NS Confirmed determination
CARRP Terms:

- Non-NS
- NS Concern
  - Non-KST NS Concern
    - Non-KST NS Concern Confirmed
    - Non-KST NS Concern Not Confirmed
  - KST NS Concern

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public's trust and respect. Use them wisely.

Unclassified // FOUO / Law Enforcement Sensitive
- This is a visualization of our first bunch of terms
- Cases are entered into CARRP because there’s a nexus to a national security concern
- Non-KST and KST are two exclusive subsets of an NS concern
- An NS concern is one or the other – KST or non-KST
- A case can go back and forth from non-KST to KST and vice versa, but it can’t be both things at once
- As we get in to CARRP Stage 1 we’ll talk about how to tell the difference
- Likewise, Confirmed and Not Confirmed are the two subsets of Non-KST
- Please remember that you always have to be in one of these categories to be in the CARRP process – if a case ever becomes Non-NS, then we don’t handle it in CARRP
- But within these categories, we expect that you’ll do some bouncing around and changing
- You can go from NS Not Confirmed to NS confirmed
- You can go from KST to non-KST NS
- You can go from KST to not national security at all!
Application Exercise 3.1

“NS / Non-NS Open Source Fact Patterns”
"NS / Non-NS Open Source Fact Patterns"

Materials: Word document link-list
Estimated Time: 20 mins.
CARRP Terms (Volume II):

- Screening
- Systems Checks
- Security Checks
- Vetting
- Deconfliction
- Designated Officer
Here's our second batch of terms that you'll see throughout the presentation

**CARRP Terms (Volume II):**
- Screening
- Systems Checks
- Security Checks
- Vetting
- Deconfliction
- Designated Officer
Screening

• Systematic examination or assessment, done especially to detect a potential threat or risk.

• May include background checks based on biographic or biometric information.

• May also include physical searches or examinations.
Screening

- Systematic examination or assessment, done especially to detect a potential threat or risk.

- May include background checks based on biographic or biometric information.

- May also include physical searches or examinations.

- From DHS Lexicon, 2013 edition, page 214
- Screening is the overarching thing we do with CARRP, with NaBISCOP, with Watchlisting
- It’s a big, holistic way that we go about our business in order to determine risks
- Screening encompasses systems checks, security checks, and vetting – it’s the strategic level word here
- From a USCIS perspective, “Screening” is very closely aligned with “Background Checks – for us, they are pretty much the same thing and may be used interchangeably in this presentation
- Background checks are really just one type of screening, though – and for other agencies, the distinction between them is critical
- Think of the example of TSA at the airport – if they scan your driver’s license and see what comes up, that’s a background check and is part of the screening process
- If they run your luggage through an X-ray belt, though... that’s still screening, but it’s not really a background check
- So we can use the terms internally to mean the same thing, but be aware that for other agencies there may be a substantive difference
Systems Checks

• A query of any system of record to determine if the system holds information related to the subject.

• Can include:
  • CLAIMS 3
  • CIS
  • FDNS-DS
  • TECS
- Systems checks are one of our screening tools
- When you look someone up in CIS, or CLAIMS3, or FDNS-DS, or TECS – those are all systems checks
- When you ask for an FBI Name Check, you are essentially asking the FBI to perform a system check of all of their records and systems to see if an individual matches anything
- The manner in which we run security checks and the specific things we look at are all proscribed in NaBISCOP and component guidance
- You’ll notice that systems checks are just the act of seeing if the system has information
- There’s nothing in this definition about what you DO with the information
- Systems checks are a subset of screening
- This is also an entire sub-tab in FDNS-DS where you record when you run these things
Security Checks

- A type of systems check utilizing a system that may contain security related information.

- Security checks may include:
  - FBI Fingerprint Check or Name Check
  - TECS / NCIC
  - Automated Biometrics Identification System (IDENT)
Security Checks

- A type of systems check utilizing a system that may contain security related information.

- Security checks may include:
  - FBI Fingerprint Check or Name Check
  - TECS / NCIC
  - Automated Biometrics Identification System (IDENT)

- So we just talked about what a systems check was
- A security checks is a type of systems check focusing on security
- It’s the act of looking at the systems that give us security-related information about an individual
- These systems can be TECS, FBI Name check or fingerprint check, USVITSIT, or looking at a RAP sheet
- You can think of security checks as the pre-CARRP work: some form of security check is done to pretty much every application we handle, and they’re usually our first indication that we need to pull something into the CARRP process
Vetting

• A review of all the information uncovered about an individual.

• Sources of information can include:
  • Systems checks
  • Interviews
  • Open source information
  • Conversations with record owners

• You can vet an individual or a discrete piece of information
Vetting

- A review of all the information uncovered about an individual.

- Sources of information can include:
  - Systems checks
  - Interviews
  - Open source information
  - Conversations with record owners

- You can vet an individual or a discrete piece of information

- Vetting is distinct from systems checks, and usually comes after systems checks
- In systems checks, you locate the information
- In vetting, you assess and evaluate the information that you’ve found
  - You determine how a piece of information affects eligibility
  - You make a decision as to whether a piece of information is national security related
  - Vetting is the thinking portion
- You’re leveraging systems checks, and you’re also bringing in interviews, testimony, open source, and conversations with record owners
- You’re considering the reliability and applicability of the information you have
- How many of you have called an FBI agent to ask about a TECS record?
  - What you’re doing is vetting – you’re going to ask the FBI agent if there’s any more information, if the information pertains to the person you’re asking about, if the information is derogatory
Deconfliction

- The coordination between USCIS and another governmental agency owners of NS information (record owners).

- The goal is to ensure that planned adjudicative activities do not compromise or impede an ongoing investigation or other record owner interest.
Deconfliction

- The coordination between USCIS and another governmental agency owners of NS Information (record owners).

- The goal is to ensure that planned adjudicative activities do not compromise or impede an ongoing investigation or other record owner interest.

- Deconfliction is a conversation with the stakeholders – the people who own the info that we’re seeing

- Some activities that can be deconflicted:
  - Interview
  - Request for evidence
  - Site visit
  - Decision to grant or deny a benefit
  - Timing of the decision

- How would the timing of a decision be relevant to an LEA?
Designated Officer

- An officer identified by local management to be trained, competent and knowledgeable in CARRP procedures.

- “Designated officers” may be:
  - Fraud Detection and National Security - Immigration Officer (FDNS-IO);
  - CARRP trained Immigration Services Officer (CARRP-ISO);
  - Supervisory Immigration Services Officer (SISO);
  - FDNS-Supervisory Immigration Officer (FDNS-SIO);
  - Field Office Director (FOD); or,
  - CARRP trained Refugee and Asylum Officers.
Designated Officer

- An officer identified by local management to be trained, competent and knowledgeable in CARRP procedures.

- “Designated officers” may be:
  - Fraud Detection and National Security - Immigration Officer (FDNS-IO);
  - CARRP trained Immigration Services Officer (CARRP-ISO);
  - Supervisory Immigration Services Officer (SISO);
  - FDNS-Supervisory Immigration Officer (FDNS-SIO);
  - Field Office Director (FOD); or,
  - CARRP trained Refugee and Asylum Officers.

- This is a term straight from the CARRP policy guidance
- It pops up in the delineation memo of Jun 5, 2009 (which will be covered a few slides from now)
- Anyone can become a designated officer (IO, IA, ISO, AO, etc.) provided they are identified by local management and trained in CARRP
- And really, a designated officer doesn’t even have to be an Officer!
- All that’s required is that you are trained in CARRP and perform CARRP work
- So… by the end of this course, you will all be designated officers!

Instructors: Note to the class many different types of people who play a role in CARRP – this is a theme that will be developed more as the course goes on
Application Exercise 3.2
“Applying Terminology”
Application Exercise 3.2
“Applying Terminology”

“Applying Terminology” Exercise

Materials: next 3 slides
Estimated time: 5 mins.
"Dear SA Black,

Are you able to provide more detailed information on the investigation referenced in your TECS lookout?"

"Hello, SA White. I am calling to make sure that adjudicating a pending N-400 will not impact your investigation into Mr. Blah Blah…"
What is this an example of?
Applying Terminology Exercise

Word Bank:
Screening
Systems Checks
Security Checks
Vetting
Deconfliction
Designated Officer

1) ____________________
2) ____________________

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public's trust and respect. Use them wisely.
What two words fit this image?
Applying Terminology Exercise

Word Bank:
- Screening
- Systems Checks
- Security Checks
- Vetting
- Deconfliction
- Designated Officer

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public's trust and respect. Use them wisely.

Unclassified // FOUO / Law Enforcement Sensitive
What is this an example of?

Two more vocab terms to consider: “Resolved” and “Indicators”
We use resolved synonymously with “overcome” – a concern is resolved when we have overcome the reasons for the referral
We use indicators synonymously with “facts” or “evidence” – there are indicators of a concern when there are facts or evidence suggesting it
CARRP Terms (Volume III):

- Indicator
- Confirm [with Terrorist Screening Center]
- Resolved
- U.S. Person (USP)
- NS CME
- POAF
And here's our third batch of terms that we'll discuss
We're not actually going to define any of these
Instead, we're going to talk synonyms for them, how to use them, and what they practically mean to you
Indicator

Synonymous with “fact” or “evidence”

- i.e. “We have indicators of an NS concern” can also be stated “we have evidence of an NS concern.”

- i.e. indicator in the sentence “Travel pattern is one potential indicator that could be used to identify a concern” could be replaced by fact to read “Travel pattern is one potential fact that could be used to identify a concern.”
Confirm [with TSC]

Synonymous with “verify”

• i.e. “When encountering a LE record, you must contact the TSC to confirm the record” is the same as “When encountering a LE record, you must contact the TSC to verify that the individual is a match to the database.”
Resolved

Synonymous with “overcome”

• i.e. “We **resolved** the NS concern” is clearer when you think of it as “We **overcame** the NS concern.”

• i.e. “This non-KST was closed as **resolved**” can be restated as “The facts underlying the initial non-KST determination were **overcome** by new evidence acquired during vetting. The individual is no longer a non-KST.”
U.S. Person (USP)

- Generally, a permanent resident or U.S. citizen
- But... even LPR and USC are understood differently in different parts of the government
- So... if you are contacted and asked if someone is a USP, provide the immigration status, and leave the USP determination to the requesting entity
U.S. Person (USP)

- Generally, a permanent resident or U.S. citizen
- But... even LPR and USC are understood differently in different parts of the government
- So... if you are contacted and asked if someone is a USP, provide the immigration status, and leave the USP determination to the requesting entity

- This is not a definition at all, but more of a caution
- If you’re asked if an individual is a USP… don’t
- Just provide the immigration status and let the requestor determine what that status means for the individual in question
NS CME

- CME = Case Management Entity
- An NS CME is the starting point for documenting all NS concerns in FDNS-DS
- The NS CME is the top level, person-centric outline of your CARRP case
- The instruction in our practical exercise s “Build an NS CME” means go the and start creating the first layer of CARRP documentation
POAF

- Refers to the top-level application tabs
- POAF is a mnemonic for the tabs that need to be queries prior to creating a new CME
POAF

• Refers to the top-level application tabs,
• POAF is a mnemonic for the tabs that need to be queries prior to creating a new CME

- are unique because they are...
- contains CME's
- What are the other tabs that contain CME's, rather than... ?
  - 
  - 
  - 
- So POAF is our mnemonic, and to remember POAF itself, think of it like a superhero cartoon punch...
Application Exercise 3.3

“Querying FDNS-DS”
Application Exercise 3.3
“Querying FDNS-DS”
This section contains:

5 key policy documents
4 stages of CARRP
3 pronged teaching approach
2 expanded workflow charts
1 application exercise
This section contains:

- 5 key policy documents
- 4 stages of CARRP
- 3 pronged teaching approach
- 2 expanded workflow charts
- 1 application exercise

- This next section is your process and policy
- It contains an overview of 5 key policy documents (although there are WAY more than 5 in all)…
- A review of the 4 stages of CARRP (plus deconfliction)
- An explanation of three things to focus on within each stage
- 2 workflow charts with 2 key differences
- 1 teaching heuristic (where we tell you this course will be taught)
• “Policy for Vetting and Adjudicating Cases with National Security Concerns”, Signed April 11, 2008
  • Established KST vs. Non-KST categories
  • Decentralized non-KST processing to the field
  • Defined CARRP terms (“deconfliction,” “external vetting,” etc.)
  • Described the 4 stages of CARRP

• “Clarification and Delineation of Vetting and Adjudication Responsibilities for Controlled Application Review and Resolution Program (CARRP) Cases in Domestic Field Offices,” Signed June 5, 2009
  • Identified the roles of “designated officers” in CARRP
  • Outlined the actions and FDNS-DS documentation responsibilities within each role

Unclassified // FOUO / Law Enforcement Sensitive

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public’s trust and respect. Use them wisely.
- Think of policy as a story of where we’ve come from and where we’re going – how CARRP was born and how it evolved

- The story begins in 2008 with a memo called “Vetting and Adj. Cases with NS Concerns…”

  - Once upon a time, everything having anything to do with NS was sent to HQ FDNS and adjudicated by a unit called NSAU. The 2008 memo changed all that. The policy gave order to NS adjudications – it defined terms, it established the 4 stages of CARRP that we use today, it mandated that all the subjects of CARRP-land use FDNS-DS to record casework, and it told us what the field would do and what HQ would do.

  - A little over a year later, another memo came out that further defined the roles in each stage of CARRP within field offices. This is the memo that gave us the outline for this presentation – Roles, Actions, and DS responsibilities are clearly outlined in the memo. The memo closes with a reminder that you should all heed – play nice with the other subjects of CARRP land. Just because FDNS-IO’s and CARRP ISO’s have different, delineated roles doesn’t mean you shouldn’t communicate and work closely together.
“Revision of Responsibilities for CARRP Cases Involving Known or Suspected Terrorist”, Signed July 26, 2011

- Revised the 2008 memo to allow the field to perform external vetting of KST cases without a requirement to consult HQ FDNS

“Updated Instructions for Handling LE Records, Signed May 23, 2012

- Provided background on the watchlisting process
- Designated exclusion code LE records and exclusion code LE records as non-KST’s
- Outlined vetting processes for LE and LE records


- Identified new form types subject to CARRP
- Fast-forward a little bit now to 2011, where much had changed in CARRP land. Many field offices now had JTTF representatives, and offices nationwide had gained great experience in working NS cases. As a result, the field was allowed to take over external vetting in the third stage of CARRP. No longer was HQ involved involvement required in even what are ostensibly the highest-risk cases: KSTs. This memo enabled the field to work almost every aspect of a KST case. It also provided the scenarios under which you could still reach out to HQ FDNS for assistance.

- At this point, the story begins to get confusing
  - The next memo published was in 2012, and deals with watchlisting issues in KST and non-KST cases
  - The major takeaway is that are non-KSTs
  - Just remember that one piece of information for now and we'll return to it in detail in the Stage 1 portion of the program

- The last memo impacted a part of our NS equation that we haven't really touched on – the organizations or individuals who may be linked to an NS concern
  - With the rise in concern over the EB5 program, this memo added the following forms as being subjected to CARRP:
There are a couple of trends that run through the policy story:

- Decentralization out of HQ
- Increased field ownership of personnel and resources

KST’s vs. non-KST’s:

- At first, we assumed that KST’s were inherently riskier, or at the very least harder to work – hence why the external vetting stage for KSTs was the last thing to be delegated to the field, and why, as you saw in the last slide, FOD’s can approve non-KSTs, but the Deputy Director has to approve KSTs.

- Now, there’s increasing realization that KSTs and non-KSTs can carry similar levels of challenge and risk. In the articulable link session, we like to point out that not all NS is created equal. But the division is not along neat KST / non-KST lines.
  - The export of LE to downstream systems is one way the entire USG is realizing that non-KSTs may need to be scrutinized just as carefully as KSTs.
  - The application of CPIA to both KSTs AND non-KST NS Confirmed cases is another USCIS specific example.
CARRP Process: The 4 Stages

**External Vetting Activities:**
- Liaison with partner agencies
- Follow-up activities

**CARRP Adjudication Activities:**
- Make a decision on the benefit
- Obtain necessary concurrence from local leadership, HQ component leadership, or the Senior Leadership Review Board
- Determine what other information is needed
- This chart is your 50,000ft overview
- For right now—there are 4 stages in the CARRP process
- There should probably be an additional couple of words in each stage box—“and document”
- For example, Stage I should read “Identify the NS concern… and document it”
- Stage II should “Internally Vet… and document,” etc.
- **Instructors:** provide examples of some of the activities that happen in each stage, but don’t get bogged down in great detail
- This chart is overly simple—it’s a teaching aid—in the real world, it doesn’t really look like this
- CARRP is much messier
  - The stages expand and contract
  - They get smashed together, they overlap, they get rearranged
  - Sometimes we skip entire steps or omit entire stages
- This is all OK, because the entire agency does the substantive functions of all of these stages—they may look a little different, they may be affected by local SOP or directorate guidance, but everyone is doing the main ingredients of CARRP
Instructors – this is a key point – even RAIO, IPO, etc. are doing CARRP – it may look a little different, but it’s still CARRP

- So – when you get back in to the real world, the CARRP process isn’t going to look quite like this… it’s more likely to look like a game of chutes and ladders *(click)*
Instructors: Do not get in the weeds with these two charts! (this and the next slide)

- This is just a more detailed version of the 4 phases of CARRP – it illustrates the roles in each phase in addition to the activities
- The next chart you’re going to see is the non-KST workflow
- Keep in mind that cases MAY move back and forth between KST and non-KST while in CARRP, but they cannot be both
- As long as an individual is still an NS concern, you’re always making a determination between either KST or non-KST
- These charts are not form-specific, nor do they cover every single bump in the road that a CARRP case can hit
- They are overlays
Confirm NS Concern According to Op Guidance (FONS 10)

No, NNS

Internal Vetting (FDNS I/O)/ Eligibility Assessment (ISO)

Eligible for Benefits?

Yes

NS Concern Remains & Eligible for Benefits Sought


Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate

You have the Public's trust and respect. Use them wisely.
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Instructors: This should be used to illustrate the major difference between KST and non-KST processing:

In KST processing, the senior official who must concur with APPROVING is the Deputy Director of USCIS / in non-KST processing, the senior official who must concur can be the FOD

- Beyond that, the CARRP process is pretty much the same in terms of what systems checks and vetting we do

Reemphasize: Both KSTs and non-KSTs are serious NS concerns – there is not such thing as CARRP lite – the only difference is the approval level required

- These are charts are also only KST and non-KST
- There’s nothing about Confirmed and Not Confirmed
- That’s because for the field, Confirmed vs. not Confirmed doesn’t also change how you process
CARRP Process: Prioritization Workflow

Prioritization

Field Offices and Centers enter NS Concerns into FDNS-DS

Automated IBOT produced; alerts HQ Intel Division (ID) Case Prioritization and Intelligence Assessment (CPIA) Branch of new NS Concern

CARRP Process

Case Prioritization and Intelligence Assessment (CPIA) produces Score Card and Intelligence Assessment; sends to HQ National Security Division (NSD) Case Resolution Branch (CRB) for processing

Case Resolution Branch (NSD)

National Security Division Case Resolution Branch (CRB)

CARRP Adjudications (Approval or Denial)

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public’s trust and respect. Use them wisely.
Instructors: do not get in the weeds with this slide

- This chart is here to demonstrate that you are not alone
- The CARRP process that was shone in the last two slides is represented by a single box on this chart
- But ideally, while you are doing the process, other things are happening at the HQ level
- This chart will come up again, but it’s in this section so that you have the idea in the back of your mind that there are other things going on outside your office as part of CARRP
- Some of the decisions and the reasons for doing things that we’ll get to later are because there are other things being done at HQ that will impact you down the line of a case
For every CARRP stage, consider:

- **WHAT** is being done?
  i.e. vetting, adjudication, eligibility

- **WHO** is doing it?
  i.e. CARRP ISO, FDNS IO, Asylum Officer, Field Office Director

- **HOW** is it being documented?
  i.e. Activities Tab, Special Actions Tab, Deconflictions Tab
As we get into detail breaking down each phase, think about:

- What gets done in each phase
- Who does it
- How is it documented

You'll hear the instructors talk about action, role, & DS
- Action is the What - the things that are going to be done
- Role is who is doing the things
- DS is the how we are documenting everything in FDNS-DS

Each stage has designated activities that are performed, designated roles for each individual in the process, and specific data entry points in FDNS-DS
Application Exercise 3.4

“CARRP Process Timeline”
Core Concepts Outline:

- Benefits of CARRP
- CARRP as a holistic process
- TRIG and CARRP
- How CARRP ends
- Deconfliction
- FDNS-DS
- What CARRP is not
- This next section is called Core Concepts
- These are some of the overarching things that are important to understand about CARRP from a 50,000ft level before diving into what happens in each of the stages
Two Major Benefits to CARRP:

#1 – It provides additional resources to work a national security case

#2 – It results in highly detailed, consistent documentation

Studies in National Security:

The Boston Marathon bombers were handled for a time under CARRP. When their identities came out, and people realized that one of them had naturalized and the other was pending, people asked why. One of the first places that HQ looked to answer that was FDNS-DS.
Two Major Benefits to CARRP:

#1 – It provides additional resources to work a national security case

#2 – It results in highly detailed, consistent documentation

Studies in National Security:

The Boston Marathon bombers were handled for a time under CARRP. When their identities came out, and people realized that one of them had naturalized and the other was pending, people asked why. One of the first places that HQ looked to answer that was FDNS-DS.

- There are two huge benefits to CARRP
  - First – you get more resources – time, systems, personnel, experience, etc.
  - Second – everything is documented like crazy
  - That second one may not sound so much like a benefit when you consider that all of that documentation is through FDNS-DS
    - DS can be tedious, redundant, excessive, etc.
  - In response, there is a recurring segment throughout this training called “Studies in National Security” that will illustrate (with stories) why we do some of the things we do
  - The first story or “study” is about FDNS-DS, why all of that documentation is important, and why we do it:
    - HQ was staffed 24x7
    - Couldn’t get the A-files, because everyone wanted them
    - Needed to support law enforcement with addresses, contacts, etc.
    - Also to needed to evaluate our performance – did we do everything we were supposed to do as an agency? How did one of those guys naturalize?
A holistic, intertwined set of policies:

- Watchlisting
- NaBISCOP
- CARRP
- TRIG
- TECS Policy
- Social Media

Feedback to system / nominator

Derog entered into a system

Standard background checks locate derog

Immigration action concluded

Case worked as an NS Concern

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public’s trust and respect. Use them wisely.
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We just took a look into what makes up an NS, and therefore a CARRP, case.
- But the agency does a lot of things that aren’t NS – most of our cases do not go into CARRP.
- So let’s take a step back and look at CARRP as a policy, a single component of the adjudication process.
- CARRP does not work in a vacuum.
- It is impacted by and works in tandem with a host of other USCIS policies.
- Watchlisting, NaBISCOP, and TRIG are all closely associated with CARRP.
- The last two bullets – social media and TECS policy – are upcoming developments to give FDNS officers more tools within the CARRP process.
- All of these policies help us to see the activities that take place before a case is put in CARRP and after the immigration action is completed.
- So consider CARRP as one step in the broader lifecycle of an immigration application.
- For simplicity sake, begin at the top of the cycle.
- Derog gets entered into a system.
- In a lot of CARRP cases, that system the consolidated terrorist watchlist.
- The intelligence community and DHS I&A tell the USG what can and cannot
go on the watchlist

- So we have watchlisting guidance that affects what derog is entered in systems for us to find
- How do we find the derog initially? Probably not CARRP
- A lot of your derog comes from FBI namecheck or from TECS or from Fingerprints
- What tells us that we run all of those checks? NaBISP COP
- So NaBISP COP tells us what to run depending on the form, and then based on those results, we identify our NS concerns and begin to develop them in CARRP
- At some point in the future, we’ll have more policy governing exactly what FDNS IO’s can do under CARRP, including Social Media and TECS policy
- But all that info we develop goes to support the immigration action – approve or deny
- What happens after the immigration action? Do we never hear from or interact with the person again?
- No! We document the immigration side, and what we did and what we looked at
- We talk to law enforcement through deconfliction and tell them what we’re going to do or have done from an immigration standpoint
- And sometimes we provide feedback to the watchlist and the people who maintain to create better initial records
- But let’s say that top red box isn’t the watchlist – it’s DS
- Could our feedback to a system holding derog be tracking a 485 in DS? And then when the person files for Natz in 5 years, we see that derog in DS?
- CARRP is a small piece of the big puzzle
- It’s a process, but it’s not the only one – there’s a lot of other policy and process it works in tandem with
Core Concept: CARRP

TRIG is an inadmissibility

CARRP
INA § 212(a)(3)(a), (b) & (e)

TRIG and CARRP
INA § 212(a)(3)(b)

CARRP is a national security process
Should a case with a TRIG ground but no other areas of NS concern be in CARRP?
- Having just defined what CARRP is and how it interacts with other programs, we will now take a brief diversion into what CARRP is not
- This is an incredibly simple chart with an incredibly important message
- TRIG = Terrorist Related Grounds of Inadmissibility
- CARRP and TRIG are not the same thing – there is overlap in many cases (i.e. some things with TRIG concerns may fall in to CARRP, like terrorist activities or membership) but they are fundamentally different things
- TRIG is an inadmissibility – it is a straight up application of the law
- CARRP is a national security program – it is a subjective assessment of threat to national security
- It is possible to have a case in CARRP with no TRIG concerns
- It is possible to have TRIG concerns but not be working a case in CARRP
- It is possible to resolve a CARRP issue but still have TRIG inadmissibility's
- It is possible to get an exemption for TRIG inadmissibly but still work a case in CARRP
- **TRIG but not CARRP:**
  - If you work in a hospital and care for everyone who comes in, and some of them are government soldiers and some of them are fighting against the government.
  - If you’re a refugee in a camp, and the camp leaders come around and collect a small “tax” on each household, and you know that the “tax” goes to pay people to bring supplies over the mountains to the rebels fighting in your home country.
  - If you give a ham sandwich to a terrorist.

- **CARRP but not TRIG:**
  - If you steal a bunch of classified information and give it to a foreign country.
  - If you export centrifuges to Pakistan.

- **Both:**
  - If you own a condo and you lease one room of it to a guy you know to be planning a terrorist attack.
    - It’s TRIG because you provided material support to a terrorist.
    - It’s CARRP because you’re closely associated with someone who poses a threat to NS.
  - Someone who ran arms between the CIA and Mujahidin in Afghanistan in the 80’s.
    - May be able to resolve the NS concerns.
    - May also be able to get a TRIG exemption.
    - But at first blush, it doesn’t matter who the person was working on behalf of or supporting – it’s both a TRIG inadmissibility and a case that would be handled under CARRP.

(mouse click)

- Think about the answer to this question as we go through the next slide.
Core Concept: CARRP and TRIG

If an exemption will be granted & no other NS = NO!
If there is no exemption or another NS issue = YES!
DP, AC

- So, this is your quick decision making tree
- Guidance tells us that if it’s TRIG and there’s no exemption, we handle under CARRP
  - This is your guy knowingly renting a condo to a terrorist
  - It’s likely in a lot of these that we won’t find additional derog in vetting – there may be no other NS ground besides the TRIG concern
  - There may also be no one to deconflict with
  - And it’s also entirely possible that many will be resolved as non-NS fairly quickly (with or without exemption)
  - For example:
    - we know now that there is a medical exemption for TRIG, but there didn’t used to be
    - Policy also tells us that if there’s an exemption that won’t be granted, we handle under CARRP
- This could be your Mujahedeen contact
- Let's say there's a group exemption available for the organization he was associated with, but we're not going to grant him the exemption because we think he did some other stuff too

- If you know that the exemption is going to be granted, then there's no requirement to process under CARRP
  - This is your guy who gave a ham sandwich to someone who ended up maybe being a terrorist
  - The lawyers tell you its slam dunk on the It seems pretty clear that the applicant qualifies for an exemption
  - And you, being a good FDNS officer, know that there's no nexus to a national security ground

- And finally, if there's no TRIG issue... that's the subject of the rest of this course!

- This whole discussion also raises the old chicken and egg question: which comes first, CARRP or TRIG?
- Do you resolve the NS concern before determining eligibility for an exception?
- Or do you grant the exception, which may mean that CARRP vetting is unnecessary?
- The answer, once again, is it depends
- Most of the time, CARRP will come first, because we usually run systems checks before we interview, and TRIG concerns usually arise from applicant testimony... usually
- But that's not hard and fast, because we know that applicant testimony and no exemption means that we're opening a CARRP case

(mouse click)
- So now we can answer the original question – Should a case with a TRIG ground but no other area of NS concern be in CARRP?
- Remember: many TRIG cases for which no exemption is available but that have no area of NS concern besides the TRIG issue can move through CARRP quite quickly
- For any and all question that may arise with regard to TRIG, please work through your directorate TRIG POC
Core Concept: How CARRP works

CARRP as a Process (with a defined end)

That end can be one of four outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Security Issue</th>
<th>Adjudicative Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS Concern Resolved</td>
<td>Approval of benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denial of benefit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CARRP as a Process (with a defined end)

That end can be one of four outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Security Issue</th>
<th>Adjudicative Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS Concern Resolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of benefit</td>
<td>Denial of benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Concern Ineligious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- As a process, CARRP has a beginning, and it should have an end
- We’ve seen that it’s a broad cycle that often times goes around and around many times… so where is the end?
- CARRP ends when the NS concern is resolved or we adjudicate
- So, there are four potential outputs from those ends
- The left hand column (eligible for the benefit) requires a determination as to whether the NS concern can be resolved – that’s the purpose of CARRP in a nutshell
- In the upper left hand box, resolving the NS concern enables adjudication, because the subject is otherwise eligible
  - It’s this outcome that demonstrates CARRP is a not a denial program
  - Subjects do emerge from CARRP cleared of any concerns
- In the entire right hand column it doesn’t really matter if we resolve the concern if the individual isn’t eligible anyway
  - If someone is ineligible due to an unlawful entry, we aren’t going to ask FBI about their investigation into the subject
  - If the benefit is going to be denied, it doesn’t matter if the subject is on the watchlist or off the watchlist
“covert agency program”

“potentially endless delays”

“a civil rights violation”

“Immigration authorities are instructed to follow the FBI direction as to whether deny, approve or hold in abeyance”

“Recruitment tool for the FBI”

“AUTOMATIC DESIGNATION EVEN FOR ROUTINE TRAVEL SUCH AS A FAMILY VISIT”
- These are all things that have been said or written about CARRP
- When we do our jobs right, they are all misconceptions
- We’ve already touched on a couple of these
  - Potentially endless delays – we’ve already covered that the process *should* end and the different ways it can – throughout the rest of these materials we’ll talk about how to get there
  - Follow FBI direction – did we talk about that during deconfliction? At any point did we say to follow whatever the FBI’s direction was?
- Please keep these in the back of your head as we go through the curriculum, because by the end of this class, you’re going to be able to intelligently refute every one of these and describe what the process actually does
Core Concept: FDNS-DS

The NS Concerns Tab
- The last slide showed the one of the major benefits of CARRP was consistent case documentation
- The way we do that documentation and manage our CARRP cases is FDNS-DS
- You have probably heard a lot of terrible things about DS, but the on thing its good at is capturing a lot of detail about a case
- Some of that detail may take hours to input... but it's important if one of these NS concerns actually goes and does something
- There is one tab where all of your NS entries will go – NS Concerns
Core Concept: FDNS-DS

Building a CME:
Application Exercise 3.5

“Creating a CME”
Core Concept: Deconfliction

Deconfliction
Can happen within each phase multiple times

1. IDENTIFYING NS CONCERN
2. INTERNAL VETTING/ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT
3. EXTERNAL VETTING
4. CARRP ADJUDICATION

Conducted by Field or HQDNS depending on type of NS concern

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public’s trust and respect. Use them wisely.
Before we get into the individual stages, we’re going to talk about deconfliction because deconfliction applies to EVERY stage

- Why is deconfliction done during all CARRP stages?
  - An adjudication may come in CARRP stage 4, or Stage 2
  - A site visit or interview may be part of Internal vetting in Stage 2, or External in Stage 3, or Adjudication in Stage 4
  - There could be an abeyance request throughout the lifecycle
Core Concept: Deconflict

• **What** is deconfliction?
  
  – An outward-facing process for sharing what USCIS knows
  
  – A **conversation** between USCIS and an owner of NS information.
  
  – **Coordination** between two agencies of the USG.
  
  – An opportunity to **educate** about USCIS.

• **When** do you deconflict?
  
  – During any stage of CARRP.
  
  – In response to a variety of case activities:
    
    • Prior to issuing an RFE or NOID.
    
    • Prior to conducting a site visit or interview.
    
    • Prior to a decision on the case (approval OR denial).
    
    • If USCIS receives additional information from other sources.
Deconfliction is outwardly oriented – it's USCIS sharing information outward
This is in contrast to vetting, which we’ll talk about later, where USCIS is trying to obtain information

Conversation: build rapport
Coordination: discuss what activities both sides are planning (this can overlap with external vetting)

There are no requirements for the number of times you have to deconflict, but best practice suggests some times where it might be in USCIS interest:
- Prior to issuing an RFE or NOID
- Prior to conducting a site visit or interview  
  (Gives the LEA a chance to submit questions – must be material to the immigration benefit)
- Prior to a decision on the case (approval OR denial)  
  (Gives the LEA a chance to request abeyance)
Core Concept: Deconflict

• **Who** are you deconflicting with?
  - External law enforcement partners
  - Record owners
  - Case agents

• **Why** deconflict?
  - Ensure that record owner is aware that the individual has a benefit pending with USCIS.
  - Ensure that planned adjudicative activities do not compromise or impede an ongoing investigation or other record owner interest.
Core Concept: Deconflict

- **Who** are you deconflicting with?
  - External law enforcement partners
  - Record owners
  - Case agents

- **Why** deconflict?
  - Ensure that record owner is aware that the individual has a benefit pending with USCIS.
  - Ensure that planned adjudicative activities do not compromise or impede an ongoing investigation or other record owner interest.

Who do we NOT deconflict with?
- **LE** (this will come up again later)
- Generally speaking, the **LE**
- We deconflict with **LE** when they own records or are investigating, but if they are not involved, there is no requirement to deconflict with them
  - E.g. what if there's a **LE** with no **LE** POC that does nothing but reference **LE** information?
- Deconfliction with **LE** is not required – we would want to deconflict with **LE**
- We deconflict with **LE** when they are involved in a case, but there is no requirement to deconflict with them otherwise
  - FDNS officers are allowed to work directly with other law enforcement
Core Concept: Deconfliction

- **Where** can you perform deconfliction?
  - Unclassified phone / email
  - Classified phone / email
  - In person, including JTTF

- **How** do law enforcement agencies benefit from deconfliction?
  - Deconfliction does not only help USCIS.
  - Benefits to other agencies may include:
    - Information from A-files
    - Ability to submit interview questions (must be pertinent to the benefit application)
    - Requests for evidence
    - Abeyance
Where can you perform deconfliction?
- Unclassified phone / email
- Classified phone / email
- In person, including JTTF

How do law enforcement agencies benefit from deconfliction?
- Deconfliction does not only help USCIS.
- Benefits to other agencies may include:
  - Information from A-files
  - Ability to submit interview questions (must be pertinent to the benefit application)
  - Requests for evidence
  - Abeyance

- Part of the education component of deconfliction can include what the LEA can get out of talking to us
- Make sure it's in your office policy, but there are a lot of benefits to LEA's
- This is also where we handle abeyance requests
  - Designated officers in receipt of LEA requests for abeyance must refer the request to the USCIS chain of command.
  - Request must be in writing, in accordance with the Operational Guidance.
  - On a case-by-case basis, the Field Director will determine whether the request comports with the requirements for abeyance (8 CFR 103.2(b)(18)) or warrants expedited processing.
  - Case will be held in abeyance for 180 days or until the investigation is completed, whichever is sooner.
  - The withholding of adjudication period may be extended further.
  - Be aware the abeyance is not binding on a court – explain to the LEA that a mandamus action may compel us to act even if there is an abeyance request
Core Concept: Deconfliction

× Deconfliction is not USCIS asking permission to do something

× Deconfliction is not USCIS seeking concurrence with our decisions

× Deconfliction is not an opportunity for LEAs to critique USCIS adjudications

× Deconfliction is not asking what an LEA thinks about our activities
Step 1: Introduce yourself and your agency.

Step 2: Provide the record owner with the case number, TECS ID number, or any other identifying information you have regarding their case.

Step 3: Find out whether case is still open.

Step 4: Indicate what applications or petitions subject has pending with USCIS.

Step 5: Indicate what possible action you are going to take with the case.

**Step 6: Ask whether action will impede their investigation.**
Step 1: Introduce yourself and your agency.

Step 2: Provide the record owner with the case number, TECS ID number, or any other identifying information you have regarding their case.

Step 3: Find out whether case is still open.

Step 4: Indicate what applications or petitions subject has pending with USCIS.

Step 5: Indicate what possible action you are going to take with the case.

**Step 6: Ask whether action will impede their investigation.**

Step 3 sounds a whole lot like external vetting... but it's not
Why do we ask that question?
Step 6 is your bread and butter – you ask this every time, all the time
SA Johnson,

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is currently reviewing an application for lawful permanent resident status for ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP (DPOB: 1/1/74 - Oceana). Immigration officers from USCIS are planning to conduct a site visit to the address Mr. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP provided on his application: 123 Broadway Drive, Washington, DC. I am writing to ensure that this site visit for the purpose of processing the pending immigration application will not impact your current investigation into Mr. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP (TECS record LE).

Please confirm that a USCIS site visit will not affect your investigation. I am available to answer any questions on this matter.
SA Johnson,

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is currently reviewing an application for lawful permanent resident status for ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP (DPOB: 1/1/74 - Oceana). Immigration officers from USCIS are planning to conduct a site visit to the address Mr. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP provided on his application: 123 Broadway Drive, Washington, DC. I am writing to ensure that this site visit for the purpose of processing the pending immigration application will not impact your current investigation into Mr. ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOP (TECS record [:::]).

Please confirm that a USCIS site visit will not affect your investigation. I am available to answer any questions on this matter.

- Deconfliction doesn’t only need to be over the phone
- This is an example of a deconfliction email I sent an ICE agent
- What do you notice about it?
  - Spells out USCIS
  - Provides enough information to identify the person (would I need to encrypt this email because of PII?)
  - States specifically the action that I am deconflicting – a site visit
  - Asks our big question – Does this impact your investigation?
Dear SA Smith,

Given that your investigation into xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx has concluded, does your agency have any objection to the continued adjudication of the pending N-400 application? Xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx appears ineligible based on false statements, so the adjudication may result in a denial. **Will this have an impact on your investigative interest?**

Thank you,
Dear SA Smith,

Given that your investigation into xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx has concluded, does your agency have any objection to the continued adjudication of the pending N-400 application? xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx appears ineligible based on false statements, so the adjudication may result in a denial. **Will this have an impact on your investigative interest?**

Thank you,

- Here's another example
- This one is a little more familiar in tone
- In this example, the officer has already worked with SA Smith and has had prior discussions about the case in question
- But the major points don't change
  - It identifies the subject
  - It states what action USCIS is going to take
  - And it asks if the agent has an objection or if the action will impact an investigation
Core Concept: FDNS-DS

Entering Deconfliction:
Core Concept:  

Entering Deconfliction:
what was the conversation about?
- So there are a couple here to highlight
- That's great communication right there and perfect example of how deconfliction is externally oriented – we are providing information outward
Application Exercise 3.6
“Deconfliction Sub-Tab”
Application Exercise 3.6
“Deconfliction Sub-Tab”

“CARRP Process Timeline” exercise
Module 3 Wrap-up

✓ Build a common vocabulary for discussing CARRP cases.
✓ Understand USCIS policies impacting CARRP cases.
✓ Identify the personnel involved in the CARRP process
✓ Learn the four phases of the CARRP process.
✓ Recognize the differences between KST processing and non-KST processing.
✓ Characterize the discreet elements of an NS concern.
✓ Position CARRP with other USCIS policies.
✓ Be able to have a deconfliction conversation.

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate
You have the Public’s trust and respect. Use them wisely.

Unclassified // FOUO / Law Enforcement Sensitive
- These were our goals for this module – did we touch on all of them?
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U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate

You have the Public’s trust and respect. Use them wisely.

Unclassified // FOUO // Law Enforcement Sensitive

Confidential - Attorney-Eyes-Only
On slide 62, all quotes are from the following three sources:


