

Proposed Revisions to Detainee Review Procedures in Afghanistan

OUSD(P)/Office of Detainee Policy May 13, 2009

UNCLASSIFIED

Bagram-Policy 9



Proposed Revisions to Detainee Review Procedures in Afghanistan

- DoD is working to enhance the existing detainee review process, both substantively and procedurally
- □ Existing detainee review procedures (UECRBs) were established to support GTMO transfer decisions
 - High-Level/Low-Level Enemy Combatant status determinations are tied to GTMO transfer criteria; but linkage between the BTIF and GTMO has been severed over time
- ☐ Enhanced procedures will improve DoD's ability to assess:
 - · Whether each detainee meets the criteria for lawful detention
 - · Level of threat the detainee poses
 - Detainee's potential for rehabilitation, reconciliation and reintegration
- □ Proposed revisions also enhance the detainee's ability to challenge his or her detention
- □ Concurrently, DoD is working to transition BTIF operations to the TIFRC model used successfully in Iraq
 - New BTIF to open in Fall of 2009
 - (b)(1),Sec. 1.4(a)
 - · New detainee review procedures designed to facilitate this shift

UNCLASSIFIED



Overview of Proposed Changes

	Substantive changes:					
•	Authority to detain mirrors definition in DOJ's March 13 habeas filing					
	(b)(1),Sec. 1.4(a)					

- Status determinations and threat assessments no longer tied to GTMO transfer criteria
- Board makes final status determination (not just recommendation to the commander)

□ Procedural changes:

- Judge Advocates participate in capturing unit's initial, 72-hour review and BTIF commander's review of request to transfer detainee to BTIF for internment
- Requirements of AR 190-8 serve as baseline for initial and periodic review boards, plus several features not required by AR 190-8:
 - > Board follows written script to ensure detainee's meaningful participation
 - > Open proceedings, except during deliberations/voting or for security reasons
 - > Detainee allowed to call reasonably available witnesses and present relevant documentary evidence
 - Personal representative appointed to assist detainee (including during closed sessions)
 - > Enhanced notification procedures, to ensure detainee fully understands the basis for his detention, the review process, and his role in the process
 - > Judge Advocate serves as legal advisor to the board, as required
 - > Judge Advocate conducts legal sufficiency review of board determinations

<u> UNCLACCIFIED</u>



Comparison of Detainee Process Models

	Article 5 (AR 190-8)	UECRB (existing)	UECRB (proposed)
Purpose	To determine whether person is EPW	To recommend combatant status and disposition	To determine whether detainee meets criteria for internment and recommend disposition
Nature	Non-adversarial	Non-adversarial	Non-adversarial
Standard	Article 4, GPW	Unlawful Enemy Combatant	Detainable Person, as defined in March 13, 2009 DOJ filing
Possible Findings	EPW, RP, innocent civilian, CI	☐ Status: HLEC, LLEC, NLEC ☐ Disposition: GTMO, continued detention at the BTIF, transfer, release w/o conditions	☐ Status: does/does not meet criteria for internment, plus threat assessment ☐ Disposition: continued internment at the BTIF, transfer for prosecution or reconciliation, release w/o conditions
Timing	Not specified	Capturing unit review within 72 hours; transfer request within 14 days; initial board within 75 days; periodic boards every 6 months	Capturing unit review within 72 hours (w/ JAG); transfer request within 14 days (w/ JAG); initial board within 60 days; periodic reviews every 6 months

UNCLASSIFIED



Comparison of Detainee Process Models (cont.)

	Article 5 (AR 190-8)	UECRB (existing)	UECRB (proposed)
Composition	☐ 3 officers, at least 1 field grade	☐ 3 officers, at least 1 field grade	☐ 3 field grade officers authorized access to all
	☐ Senior officer is President	☐ Senior officer is President ☐Non-voting recorder	relevant information Senior officer is
	□Non-voting recorder (preferably JAG)		President □Non-voting recorder
Legal Advisor	No	No	Yes
Personal Rep.	No	No	Yes; authorized access to all relevant information
Open/ Closed	Open except for deliberation and voting, security; person whose status is to be determined allowed to attend open sessions	Closed; detainee allowed to appear at initial board	Open except for deliberation and voting, security; detainee allowed to attend open sessions
Witnesses	Yes, if reasonably available	No	Yes, if reasonably available
Legal sufficiency review	Yes	No	Yes

UNCLASSIFIED