

INVESTIGATIVE STANDARDS WORKING GROUP

PROPOSED CHANGES TO DCID 1/14

1. Effective date is contingent upon final approval.
2. Editorial.
3. Editorial.
4. Editorial.
5. Key words are added in this paragraph to provide more specificity to the security standards and to buttress the adjudication guidelines in Annex A.
6. Editorial.
7. Editorial.
8. The footnote reflects an investigative requirement for information pertaining to persons with whom unmarried subjects are living in a husband-wife relationship.
9. Editorial.
10. See 8 above.
11. Added to assist in clarifying that the paragraph 6 exceptions refer specifically to paragraph 5b.
12. Editorial.
13. To state more specifically where police records shall be checked.
14. To provide more investigative flexibility.
15. To state more specifically where an individual's financial status may be verified.
16. Change in coverage from 5 years to 7 years is recommended to conform with limits of current laws.
17. Change reduces minimum requirements for verification of college education to the past 15 years and for high school attendance to the past 10 years. This recommendation is based on recent findings by the Working Group that education sources rank very low relative to other sources of investigative information.
18. Editorial change to reflect a more descriptive term.
19. To place added emphasis on developed sources of older information without decreasing emphasis on an individual's recent past.
20. Previously approved by SECOM in June 1981. The 5-year period of coverage is reduced to one year in order to provide better continuity of an individual's activities and behavior patterns.
21. To provide more investigative flexibility.
22. See 20 above.
23. Editorial.

24. Previously approved by SECOM in June 1981. As in Item 8, the requirement to check criminal files of the FBI is necessary to assist an adjudicator in properly evaluating the relationship of a spouse or cohabitant to the SCI nominee.
25. Previously approved by SECOM in June 1981. The phrase clarifies the fact that appropriate investigation may be extended to all provisions of paragraph 5b.
26. Previously approved by SECOM in June 1981. Annex A expands on this paragraph.
27. To clarify that paragraphs 11 and 12 refer specifically to paragraph 10.
28. Editorial.
29. To make the personal interview mandatory when an SIO determines the necessity to authorize SCI access prior to completion of the fully prescribed investigation.
30. To add an opportunity for investigative personnel to conduct the personal interview of a nominee.
31. To flag individuals who have not yet been fully investigated and adjudicated under DCID 1/14 standards. Organizations to which such individuals are being certified will thus be alerted of that fact so that appropriate controls may be applied to information which is made available.
32. Editorial.
33. Clarity. To distinguish paragraph 13 and 14 reinvestigations from the type of reinvestigation in paragraph 12.
34. To eliminate the footnote as redundant.
35. To provide explicit instructions.
36. To provide the SIO with more flexibility to expand the periodic reinvestigation when necessary.
37. Editorial.
38. New paragraph is added as road map to Annex B.
39. In 1980 the SECOM published "Minimum Standards for Security Awareness Programs in the U.S. Intelligence Community." Paragraphs 17 and 18 refer to that publication. It has been "dressed up" as an SCI document and attached as Annex C. The Investigative Standards Working Group believes that such an arrangement will provide a closer tie of security awareness standards to DCID 1/14 through the DCI's endorsement. This recommendation has been made at the request of the Security Awareness Working Group.
40. Editorial.
41. Editorial.
42. Editorial.
43. Editorial.
44. To provide more flexibility for adjudicators. This addition should permit the adjudicator to bridge the grey area between security and suitability problems concerning an SCI nominee's employers.