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Articulable Link Training
Rules of Engagement:

The Moderator will:
• Mute the participants' microphones during the presentation
• Take questions at designated times
• Call on participating offices to respond to hypothetical fact patterns

During the call: send a message to the presenter through Connect

After the call:
• Send any additional questions to: SharkTank_NSD@sptaas.dhs.gov
• Send your name to FDNS Training to receive credit for participating

We will have several Q&A periods
We'd like to keep each Q&A period to 5 minutes so we don't get bogged down
But you can still use the messaging or the email box if we have you muted or if we don't get to a question
To send a message to the presenter –
Right click on the presenter's name in Connect
Click on "send message"
Later on the in the briefing, there will be hypothetical fact patterns
We would like to get all of your offices involved in making a determination on the facts
So please send me a message right now (if you haven't already) with the office you're participating from
Briefing Overview:

1. The Current Project (non-KST NS cases only):
   - Date forward case entry vs. cases entered before March 11, 2013
   - Review of currently pending cases

2. FDNS-DS Changes:
   - New FDNS-DS Sub-Status Values
   - Recommendation Action Value to confirm an NS Concern

3. Articulable link training / discussion

- Shark Tank is going add additional tools to the CARRP toolbox, but we only want to apply them to cases that are truly NS
- When we report to the D1 what’s a pending NS case, right now we don’t know why it’s pending
- Is it really NS? Or do we just not know enough to decide yet?
- That’s why we are adding two new sub-status values to FDNS-DS to get more specificity on the non-KST population
- Since we’re going to make DS changes, date forward you can just select the new values in the system when appropriate
- But we also have to update cases which were entered before these new values existed in DS
- The Director tasked all of the components with completing a review of these pending cases by April 26th
- This review will determine if an articulable link to NS exists, if more work needs to be done, or if there is clearly no articulable link
- To help with this process, HQ FDNS is proving training and clarification on what exactly constitutes an articulable link
Where We Are Now:

**Issue**
- Cases have been entered in FDNS-DS where there is not a clear articulable link to national security
- Descriptions of articulable links are not being captured in reports

**Reason**
- There has been a lack of articulable link training and clarification
- Articulable links are updated under various sub-tabs in FDNS-DS

**Result**
- The true population of pending non-KST NS casework in FDNS-DS cannot be accurately determined

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

We have an issue...
That's because of this reason...
Which has resulted in...
The Way Forward:

Solution:

- Establish a structured framework for determining an articulable link to National Security concern(s)

- Consistently describe the articulable link in the “Comments” field of the “Recommendation” sub-tab in FDNS-DS

- Establish two new sub-status values:
  - NS Confirmed
  - NS Not Confirmed

The structured framework will be later in this training
Current Sub-Status (prior to March 11, 2013):

Current Sub-status values are:

- NS Concern Resolved
- NS Concern Unresolved

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

For Official Use Only
As of March 11, 2013, there will be 4 sub-status values:

Current Values:
- NS Concern Resolved
- NS Concern Unresolved

Additional Values:
- NS Confirmed
- NS Not Confirmed

The default for the sub-status will still be blank.
When entering or updating a case, select the appropriate value.
If it’s the early stages of CARRP or you’re entering a new case, it’s probably going to be NS Not Confirmed.
NS Not Confirmed isn’t bad – it just means we suspect it’s NS, but need more information to articulate a link.
If your selection is NS confirmed… there’s one more step.
Recommended Action:

- Review the A-file, and determine NS Confirmed or NS Not Confirmed
- When NS is Confirmed, under the [redacted]:
  - Create a recommendation that NS is confirmed
  - State the articulable link to NS [redacted]

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Recording the articulable link:

- Officer will annotate in the articulable link to an NS Concern

- Don't put classified info in DS!!!- If classified is the basis for the link, just reference where the classified is
- Do not use classified facts when articulating your link to NS
Confirming the articulable link:

- Supervisor or second officer review the determination using FDNS-DS
- Supervisor or second officer annotates their concurrence with either the NS Confirmed or NS Not Confirmed designation and confirm that the Sub-Status reflects this designation.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

This second officer concurrence is required for ALL cases which were entered prior to March 11th (review portion of the project)
The second officer can be another FDNS IO in the field office or BCU, an HQ FDNS IO, or an FDNS SIO
This process does not require A-file review – it only requires looking at the information in DS
The whole point of this second set of eyes is to make sure the link is well articulated
We’re dealing with judgment calls here – some are obvious, some aren’t
If there’s any difference in the application of what’s an articulable link and what’s not – talk it out between the officers
The point of this is to make sure that we’re really thinking about what’s NS and what’s not
Reporting through the BCAA:

- Articulable link is captured in BCAA

Placing these comments is extremely important
When the articulable link shows up on the BCAA
When it's somewhere else, it cannot be pulled in reports
Reporting through the BCAA:

* Articulable link is captured in BCAA

This is what HQ sees on the BCAA reports

are highlighted, but again, the synopsis doesn't show up

HQ will be checking quality assurance and reporting to the D1 on the basis on these reports and how well you write up your links
Action Plan:

For cases entered into FDNS-DS PRIOR to March 11th –

1. Primary Officer reviews the case file

2. Determine if there are still NS indicators:
   - If NS indicators are present, leave the case open
   - If there are no NS indicators, or they have been resolved, close the case

3. Update the Sub-Status for Open cases with the correct value:
   - NS Not Confirmed: NS indicator present at the time of entry into FDNS-DS, but no clear link can be articulated
   - NS Confirmed: Officer can articulate a link between the individual and an area of national security concern
Action Plan:

For cases entered into FDNS-DS PRIOR to March 11th –

4. Primary officer creates a new recommendation in the recommendations sub-tab for the sub-status value selected, and explains the selection in a comment
   - If the selection is NS Confirmed, articulate the link to NS
   - If the selection is NS Not Confirmed, explain why the link cannot be articulated at present

5. Secondary officer reviews the FDNS-DS entry

6. Secondary officer creates a new recommendation in the recommendations sub-tab to concur with the determination of the primary officer

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Once again, the point of the second officer review is to make sure we’re applying articulable link standards consistently.
We should be discussing and thinking about ambiguous or challenging cases.
This isn’t because we don’t trust people or think you’re doing it wrong.
And we don’t want the second officer to be re-working the entire case.
Action Plan:

For new cases entered into FDNS-DS AFTER March 11th –

1. Primary Officer reviews the case file

2. Determine if NS indicators are present:
   - If NS indicators are present, enter an NS Concern in FDNS-DS
   - If there are no NS indicators, return the case to adjudications

3. Select a Sub-Status value for new non-KST NS cases:
   - NS Not Confirmed: NS indicator(s) present at the time of entry, but a link between the individual and the NS concern cannot be clearly articulated
   - NS Confirmed: Office can articulate a link between the individual and an area of national security concern

Process is pretty much the same as the review of pending cases, except...
Second officer concurrence is only required for NS Confirmed (don’t need it for “NS Not confirmed”)
Action Plan:

For new cases entered into FDNS-DS AFTER March 11th –

4. Primary officer creates a new [redacted] the sub-status value selected, and explain the selection in a comment
   - If the selection is NS Confirmed, articulate the link to NS
   - If the selection is NS Not Confirmed, explain why the link cannot be articulated at present

5. If NS Confirmed is selected, secondary officer reviews the FDNS-DS entry

6. Secondary officer creates a new recommendation in the [redacted] concurring with the determination of the primary officer

Secondary review will go on date forward for at least several months after articulable link training is completed to ensure consistency

The difference between date forward processing and the pending case review is:
Date forward only NS Confirmed need the second set of eyes
This is because most cases will probably be entered initially as Not Confirmed until more vetting is done
Wrap up:

- FDNS-DS now offers additional nuance:
  - "Open" with a sub-status of "NS Confirmed"
  - "Open" with a sub-status of "NS Not Confirmed"

- When you first identify a potential National Security case and are working to articulate the link, select a sub-status of "NS Not Confirmed" in FDNS-DS.

- As you complete systems checks and external vetting, when you can articulate a link to national security, change the sub-status to "NS Confirmed" in FDNS-DS.
5 Minute Q&A:

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

For Official Use Only
Articulating Links To National Security Concerns
A Structured Framework

- Disclaimers:
- Nothing we're about to go over changes the burden of proof
- It does not change the threshold for referring a case to FDNS or entering a concern in FDNS-DS
- This training does not represent a change or a deviation from current CARRP policy
The goal is to make sure that we are consistent in identifying cases as NS Confirmed
Hypothetical #1

So, we’re about to take you through the structured framework for articulating a link. And then we’re going to have fact patterns like this at the end to review. Keep this example in mind as we’re going through the rest of training. We’ll give you the HQ FDNS thought process at the end.
Articulable Link:

- An articulable link exists when:
  
  You can describe ... 
  
  in *a few simple sentences* ... 
  
  *a clear connection* between a *person* ... 
  
  and 
  
  an *activity* that threatens the safety and integrity of the United States or another nation.

- Cases with an articulable link to national security must be handled according to CARRP.

- This connection has NOTHING to do with the type of benefit application
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>§212(a)(3)(F), and §237(a)(4)(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People or groups the Secretaries of State and/or Homeland Security have determined are terrorists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to articulate a link to a national security concern, we need to review what things are areas of NS concern. One important note: this chart mostly doesn’t specify targets. Bombing a government building in country X is the same as bombing a government building in country Y for the purposes of articulating a link, even when country Y is a state sponsor of terror and country X is an ally.
Articulable Link (Continued):

- A connection may be:
  - Conducting a criminal act;
  - Belonging to or speaking for a particular organization;
  - Providing money or material support; or
  - Many other associations between an individual and an area of NS concern.

- An articulable link requires more than a “gut feeling.”

- The key is whether you can define the nature of the connection.

- Caveat: It is impossible to list all of the ways that an individual might have an “articulable link” to a national security concern. What follows are examples of how subjects can be linked.

- Criminal behavior may be an NS concern, but it's not a prerequisite
- There could be behavior or NS links that are not overtly criminal
Putting the Pieces Together:

Subject has now articulated a link between Bob and a National Security Concern.

Belongs To

Gives Money to

Speaks For

Launders Money For

Gives Money to

Supports

Helps Conduct

Conducts

Plans

Again, these links must be fact-based.
Hypothetical #2
More food for thought...
The strongest link comes when the Subject is actively participating in those activities:

- "Bob Smith has filed an I-485, and was arrested for trying to plant a bomb at the United Nations."

Here, you can draw a single, direct line between the Subject and the national security activity.

Now, we all know that real life isn't quite this simple.

But the goal of the structured framework is to get everything thinking in the same way.

These simple cases ramp up to more complicated ones, but the method if thinking of them is the same.
Indirect Link – Multiple Links:
Links Requiring Further Work:
No Articulable Link:
Hypothetical #3
Even more food for thought...
Law Enforcement Determinations:

- If a law enforcement or intelligence agency tells us that their investigation uncovers a threat to national security, we will consider that case a national security concern
  - This concern could be NS Confirmed or NS Not Confirmed, depending on the specific information the other agency provides.

- The opposite, however, is not necessarily true: Even if a law enforcement agency tells us that an individual does not threaten the national security, USCIS can still handle a case under CARRP
  - If you identify an area of national security concern, and suspect that the applicant may be involved with it, USCIS can still try to articulate a link.

Similar to law enforcement determinations: country determinations
It doesn't matter if the country accusing you is credible – if a foreign government designates you a terrorist, than that's an articulable link
It may be disproven in the course of vetting
We may grant a waiver for the activity because it was on our behalf
But it's still an articulable link
Classified Information:

- Classified LHM's often raise NS concerns, but...
  - Classified information ≠ "NS Confirmed"
  - An articulable link is still required for selecting NS Confirmed

- To base an articulable link on classified information, both officers should write in the comment field of their recommendation:
  
  "Discussed case with Officer --------. An articulable link is present. The articulable link is based upon classified information in an LHM."

- You should still discuss the articulable link with a second officer!

- The last slide talked about law enforcement determinations
  - Just like law enforcement determinations, just because there is classified doesn't automatically mean NS Confirmed, or even that there is an NS concern at all
  If the FBI interviewed an applicant about conditions in their home country intelligence collection purposes...that could be Non-NS or NS Not Confirmed
  If there is no POC listed in the LHM or you contacted the POC but have no received a response... that could be NS Not Confirmed
Ongoing Review:

- Many times, articulating a link (or determining that no link can be articulated) cannot be done purely from a file review.
- This may require contact with another agency, or research in another system.
- As new information is received, officers should review and determine whether or not the evidence supports an articulable link.
- Until a definitive judgment is reached about whether an articulable link exists, the case must remain open.
Any questions?
We are about to use the rest of our time to go over some examples
We would like your participation and feedback
These examples are written to provoke a discussion of which designation you would select
Disclaimer: Some are based on real cases, some are completely made up
They are not a definitive guide, but a tool to practice applying the articulable link framework on some fact patterns that you might see in your everyday work
What follows are 10 hypothetical fact patterns (including the 3 you've already seen) which address issues in this training.

There are no wrong answers here.

The point to think consistently and logically about articulating a link to NS.

HQ FDNS will model the thought process for the first example, including determining if it’s an NS Concern and how to articulate the link.

After that, we’d like to call on you all by office, and have someone in that particular office walk us through the determination and thought process they would have.
Hypothetical #6
Hypothetical #7
Parting Thoughts:

* Send any additional questions to:
  dhs.gov

* Send your name to FDNS Training to receive credit for participating

* These slides will be available under “CARRP Update Questions” at this ECN site:
  http:

Any questions?
We are about to use the rest of our time to go over some examples
We would like your participation and feedback
These examples are written to provoke a discussion of which designation you would select
Disclaimer: Some are based on realy cases, some are completely made up
They are not a definitive guide, but a tool to practice applying the articulable link framework on some fact patterns that you might see in your everyday work
Articulating Links To National Security Concerns
BONUS Hypothetical Fact Patterns

What follows are 10 hypothetical fact patterns (including the 3 you've already seen) which address issues in this training.
There are no wrong answers here.
The point to think consistently and logically about articulating a link to NS.
HQ FDNS will model the though process for the first example, including determining if it's an NS Concern and how to articulate the link.
After that, we'd like to call on you all by office, and have someone in that particular office walk us through the determination and thought process they would have.
BONUS Hypothetical #3