



# Questions and Answers

**USCIS International Operations (IO) Division  
Liaison Meeting with American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA)  
Agenda  
April 15, 2015**

## Overview

On April 15, 2015 USCIS International Operations (IO) Division hosted an engagement with AILA representatives. IO addressed questions related to IO operations, intercountry adoptions, parole, I-130 filings and biometrics among other topics. The information below provides a review of the questions posed by AILA and the responses provided by USCIS.

## Questions and Answers

### General Operations

#### 1. Question

USCIS International Operations (IO) has advised AILA on several occasions that workload and staffing developments are ongoing. During our meeting in December 2014, IO informed AILA that no overseas offices are expected to close in the next 12 months and that there are no sites for new offices being discussed.<sup>1</sup>

- a. Since that time, has anything changed regarding the opening or closing of IO offices abroad?

**Response:** USCIS continues to evaluate its international presence to ensure that workloads and resources are properly aligned. USCIS will provide public notice in advance of any significant changes to its international footprint.

During our meeting in December 2014, IO advised that in the previous twelve-months some Form I-130s were transferred from London and Frankfurt to the Rome Field Office. Additionally, AILA was advised that due to security issues, IO decreased U.S. citizen (USC) staff to one person who is the field office director.

---

<sup>1</sup> USCIS International Operations Liaison Meeting Q&As (4/9/14), Q27, AILA Doc. No. 14050642, <http://www.aila.org/content/default.aspx?docid=48477>

- b. Have there been any additional significant workload shifts, either between offices or from other USCIS offices, since December 2014?

**Response:** No.

- c. Is the FOD in Nairobi still the only USCIS USC employee in that office?

**Response:** Yes. At this time, IO sends staff to Nairobi on detail as needed.

## 2. Question

During our last meeting, we discussed the feasibility of conducting following-to-join circuit rides to countries without USCIS field offices. AILA understands that a pilot circuit ride took place in Nepal, exploratory site visits took place in Ethiopia and Malaysia, and that IO has tentative plans to conduct additional circuit rides to high volume posts in 2015. Can IO advise as to which high-volume posts may receive circuit rides during 2015?

**Response:** IO likely will not be conducting following-to-join circuit rides in 2015. We may continue to explore this option in 2016.

## Form I-601 Waiver Issues

### 3. Question

Recently, IO advised that only three Form I-601 cases were pending. How many Form I-601 waiver cases remain pending with IO at this time?

**Response:** As of 4/2/2015, there was only one Form I-601 case pending in the Athens Field Office.

## International Adoptions

### 4. Question

On Jan. 3, 2014, USCIS published [Policy Memorandum 602-0095](#), entitled “Criteria for Determining Habitual Residence in the United States for Children from Hague Convention Countries.”<sup>[1]</sup> The memorandum clarifies the criteria for determining whether the Hague Adoption Convention applies to the U.S.-based adoption of a child from a Hague Adoption Convention country other than the United States, as well as the subsequent Form I-130 filing. What is the anticipated release date for the Final Memorandum?

**Response:** Final revisions to the memo are currently underway. We do not have a target date for the Final Memorandum. As noted at the December 2014 meeting, practitioners may rely on the Interim Memo, which is currently in effect. We received AILA’s comments/questions and are considering them as part of the public comments on the Policy Memo. We thank USCIS for addressing a number of questions regarding the Interim Memorandum during our December 2014 meeting.<sup>[2]</sup>

### 5. Question

As a follow-up, if USCIS has confirmed that a country does not have a policy of issuing statements on habitual residency, such as Mexico, will the family be expected to obtain a “statement of no-issuance” from the country’s U.S.-based consulate and integrate that into the adoption and/or supplemental order, or will it be sufficient that USCIS is aware of that country’s policy of not issuing a statement?

**Response:** We are working with the Department of State to explore the feasibility of obtaining statements on habitual residence and statements of no-issuance from certain countries. We understand this could be very helpful, and will provide updates as they are available. Until USCIS is able to provide additional information on this, petitioners should continue to follow the guidance set forth in the Policy Memo with respect to obtaining statements of no-issuance.

**6. Question**

During our December meeting, USCIS indicated that it was discussing with the Department of State the best way to make public a list of countries which have a policy of not issuing statements of habitual residence. Does IO have any updates on efforts to publish this information?

**Response:** We are still working with the Department of State to determine the best way to make such information available to the public and will provide updates when they are available.

**7. Question**

A family habitually resident in the United States adopts a child who is a habitual resident of a Hague Convention partner country. The U.S. has determined that the child's country of origin is not substantially in compliance with the Convention and the U.S. is not processing adoptions from that country.

- a. Would 8 CFR §204.2(d)(2)(vii)(D) preclude approval of a Form I-130 in such a situation?

**Response:** The Hague Convention requirements and the related DHS regulations apply if the adoption takes place after the Hague Convention enters into force between the United States and the other Hague Convention country. The fact that the other country has not yet established its implementing procedures does not mean the Hague Convention is not in force. Generally, a Form I-130 would not be approvable in these circumstances for a U.S. citizen petitioner, habitually resident in the United States. However, after April 1, 2008, a Form I-130 may be approved for a child habitually resident in a Hague Convention country **IF** the U.S. citizen petitioner establishes that he or she was not habitually resident in the United States at the time of adoption.

- b. How would a Form I-130 be treated if there was no opportunity for the family to have complied with the Hague process at the time of the adoption? For example, the Hague Convention entered into force in Vietnam on February 1, 2012; however, the U.S. only began processing Convention adoptions from Vietnam for certain children in the Special

Adoption Program on Sept. 16, 2014.<sup>[3]</sup> Could a Form I-130 be approved if the child was adopted in the U.S. after February 1, 2012 and before Sept. 16, 2014?

**Response:** The petition may be approvable if all INA 101(b)(1)(E) and all Form I-130 requirements have been met, and the evidence supports a conclusion that the Hague Convention did not apply to the adoption. The guidance on this issue is described in [HQ DOMO 70/6.1.1-P](#) and in [Policy Memorandum 602-0095](#). USCIS takes no position on whether the Vietnam Central Authority would say that an adoption of a child from Vietnam is not subject to the Hague Convention. The Special Adoption Program applies only to Hague Convention adoptions processed with Form I-800A applications and Form I-800 petitions.

- c. What if the child was adopted domestically after Sept. 16, 2014, but did not qualify for the Special Adoption Program? (See the [list of 10 countries](#).)<sup>[4]</sup>

**Response:** See answer to 7b above.

## 8. Question

Please clarify the following related to Form I-130 petitions that are adjudicated under 8 CFR §204.2(d)(2)(vii)(E):

- a. Must the two years of joint physical residence and legal custody run concurrently or can the clocks run independently?

**Response:** The criteria for establishing the two year periods for joint physical residence and legal custody are reviewed independently. Therefore, the required periods of joint physical residence and legal custody may be accrued and calculated independently.

- b. If the clocks can run independently, must the family be physically present in the foreign country during the completion of the two years of legal custody?

**Response:** If, through an adoption order or pre-adoption order, the court has granted legal custody over the child, USCIS will recognize that that legal custody exists, no matter where the parent and child may be, unless some later order withdraws legal custody. The fact that the parent may be in one country, and the child in another, does not necessarily mean that there has been any interruption in legal custody. Keep in mind that, if the child is from a Hague Convention country, the two year joint residence requirement generally must occur outside of the United States before USCIS can find that the adoptive parent(s) were not habitually resident in the United States, so that USCIS could approve a Form I-130, rather than having the case proceed as a Convention adoption.

As a practical matter, even if the adoptive parent(s) may have met the joint residence requirement based on having had the same residence as the child for at least two years (in the aggregate), USCIS cannot approve a Form I-130 unless, at the time of filing, the 2 year legal custody requirement is also met. For this reason, it would not generally be possible to bring the child to the United States before each requirement has been met.

- c. Must the two years of joint physical residence and legal custody run continuously, with no breaks in time or may shorter time frames be combined for a total of 24 months? Many countries, such as the Philippines, place a temporal limit on the maximum amount of time a U.S. citizen may spend in-country without departing to obtain a new visa. In these cases, it is impossible under foreign law to accrue two years of continuous residency in the foreign country.

**Response:** The two years of joint residence is counted in the aggregate, so shorter time frames of joint residence can be combined to reach a total of 24 months. Keep in mind that a series of short visits will generally not meet the joint residence requirement. The requirement can be met only on the basis of time(s) during which the parent and child have the same principal, actual dwelling place, with the parent exercising primary parental authority with respect to the child.

## 9. Question

On July 30, 2014, USCIS released [PM-601-0103](#), “Guidance on Implementation of the Intercountry Adoption Universal Accreditation Act of 2012 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 in Intercountry Adoption Adjudications.”<sup>[5]</sup> At the December 2014 meeting, USCIS indicated that it wanted to monitor the UAA process for some time before [publishing the Final Memorandum](#).<sup>[6]</sup> Would IO share some of its observations with regard to the UAA process thus far? In addition, is there any update as to when the Final Memorandum will be published?

**Response:** We continue to monitor and assess how the Intercountry Adoption Universal Accreditation Act of 2012 (UAA) cases are progressing through the process before we publish a final memo or determine if additional guidance or revisions are needed. We do not yet have a target date for the Final Memorandum publication at this time.

## 10. Question

Many in-country adoption services in non-Hague countries are performed by central authorities, competent authorities, and/or public foreign authorities, and U.S. agencies are either not permitted to operate in the country or their role is severely limited. As such, it is difficult for families to find U.S. agencies to serve as primary providers in these countries. The “UAA Country Specific Guidance” regarding Jamaica and Ukraine, published by DOS in conjunction with USCIS has been extremely helpful in clarifying the responsibilities of the primary provider in these countries and in encouraging agencies to assume the role of primary provider.

During the meeting in December 2014, we discussed that similar information is needed for other non-Hague countries that prohibit or limit the role of U.S. agencies. In response to USCIS’s request that AILA provide a [list of such countries](#),<sup>[7]</sup> we propose that the countries with the greatest need for guidance include Pakistan, Bangladesh, Guyana, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Nigeria and Uganda. We hope that information on these countries will be made available as soon as possible either by USCIS or DOS in conjunction with USCIS. In the interim, please advise as to the progress that has made in preparing such information,

including which countries are under consideration and an estimate as to when the information will be available.

**Response:** Thank you for your suggestions and for submitting your list of additional countries that may benefit from country specific UAA guidance. We are aware that guidance has also been suggested for Ethiopia, Rwanda and the Bahamas. We will work in conjunction with the Department of State (State) to determine how best to clarify the responsibilities of the primary provider in these countries. At the last State/USCIS stakeholder meeting on March 17<sup>th</sup>, State announced that several UAA country specific materials would be issued in the near term.

#### **11. Question**

During our last meeting, AILA proposed that the requirement that PAPs engage a “primary provider” should not apply to adoptions where PAPs are acting on their own behalf. USCIS responded that this was not a policy position of USCIS but was required by the UAA.<sup>[8]</sup> Please confirm that under the UAA and unless prohibited by the home country, PAPs acting on their own behalf must only be required to engage an accredited service provider when preparing a home study report and adoption order.

**Response:** Form I-600A applicants and Form I-600 petitioners may still act on their own behalf in adoption cases if permitted under the laws of the state in which they reside and the laws of the country from which they seek to adopt.

Although Form I-600A applicants and Form I-600 petitioners do not need accreditation or approval to act on their own behalf, their actions need to comply with applicable law, and they will still need an accredited agency or approved person to act as the primary provider unless an exception applies. A primary provider helps to ensure that orphan adoption services are provided with the same standards of practice and ethical conduct as Hague Adoption Convention cases. Under 22 CFR Part 96, a primary provider is responsible for ensuring that all six adoption services defined at 22 CFR 96.2 are provided; supervising and being responsible for supervised providers where used; and developing and implementing a service plan in accordance with 22 CFR 96.44. The transition guidance available on the Department of State’s website (adoption.state.gov) also helps to explain that a primary provider is not responsible for adoption services that occurred prior to the UAA effective date, or for supervising the actions of public foreign authorities, competent authorities, or public domestic authorities after the effective date.

## Overseas Form I-130 Filings

#### **12. Question**

Please provide an update on the number of Form I-130 petitions filed with USCIS offices overseas, including per country or per office totals, since Dec. 1, 2014.

**Response:** See table

<b>USCIS Office</b>	<b>Number of I-130 Petitions Filed with USCIS International Offices Between 12/1/14 - 3/31/15</b>
Accra	11
Amman	114
Asia/Pacific (APAC) District Office	2
Athens	83
Bangkok	70
Beijing	94
Ciudad Juarez	33
Frankfurt	405
Guangzhou	108
Guatemala City	52
Havana	6
Johannesburg	51
Lima	26
London	561
Manila	159
Mexico City	131
Monterrey	25
Moscow	43
Nairobi	7
New Delhi	67
Port-Au-Prince	11
Rome	187
San Salvador	32
Santo Domingo	134
Seoul	412
Vienna	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,836</b>

**13.** During our meeting in December 2014, IO stated its intention to issue guidance regarding eligibility to file a Form I-130 with an international office. What is the timeframe for issuing such guidance?

**Response:** We anticipate issuance of that guidance and updates to our public website on this issue in the next two or three months.

## Humanitarian Parole

### 14. Question

Please confirm that queries on pending or denied humanitarian parole requests before the Humanitarian Affairs Branch (HAB) should be sent to the below address:

DHS/USCIS/IO  
ATTN: HAB  
Massachusetts Ave, NW, 3rd Floor  
Mail Stop 2100  
Washington, DC 20529-2100  
Fax: 202-272-8328

**Response:** The address below is correct:

DHS/USCIS/IO  
ATTN: HAB  
20 Massachusetts Ave, NW, 3rd Floor  
Mail Stop 2100  
Washington, DC 20529-2100  
Fax: 202-272-8328

### 15. Question

As most humanitarian parole cases do not receive a receipt number, calling the National Customer Service Center (NCSC) to inquire about a case can be quite difficult. At the AILA/IO meeting in September 2013, USCIS advised that staffing issues did not permit the HAB to offer assistance for public inquiries via an e-mail box, but that the HAB was exploring [other USCIS customer service options](#).<sup>2</sup> Please advise of any additional options (other than calling the NCSC 1-800 number) applicants or their representatives may use when inquiring on a filed humanitarian parole case.

**Response:** The Lockbox processes the case, inputs into CLAIMS the receipt of a parole case and sends a receipt letter with a receipt number to the petitioner. However, no additional information on parole cases, such as a case decision, is entered into CLAIMS so NCSC staff cannot find information using the receipt number. Once the application is received at HAB, the petitioner will receive a receipt letter. HAB is currently working to improve public access to information about the parole process and case status information. In the interim, we suggest that individual write to the address noted above with any inquiries regarding a case.

### 16. Question

AILA members report that the NCSC has stated that a reverse search using the applicant's name and date of birth can be run when inquiring with NCSC when no receipt number is available. However, often the NCSC states that the case is "not in the system."

- a. Please advise as to how quickly a receipt number is generally issued for a case filed with the HAB.

**Response:** See answer 15 above.

---

<sup>2</sup> AILA USCIS International Operations Liaison Q&As (9/2013), Q23b, AILA Doc. No. 14032446, <http://www.aila.org/infonet/uscsi-intl-ops-09-13>

- b. Is the applicant able to locate the receipt number on the back of the cancelled fee check?

**Response:** See answer 15 above.

17. For humanitarian parole applicants who are in removal proceedings, the USCIS website offers conflicting information on where to file the application. For instance, as of October 2014, Humanitarian Parole applicants are directed to file at:<sup>3</sup>

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement  
Homeland Security Investigations/Investigative Services Division  
Parole and Law Enforcement Program Unit (PLEPU)  
500 12<sup>th</sup> St SW, Mail Stop 5112  
Washington, DC 20536

However, in a previous Q&A, the following address is offered.<sup>4</sup>

Homeland Security Investigations  
Attn: Law Enforcement Parole Unit  
11320 Random Hills Road, Stop 5122  
Fairfax, VA 20598-5122

- a. Which address is correct?

**Response:** The correct address is:

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement  
Homeland Security Investigations/Investigative Services Division  
Parole and Law Enforcement Program Unit (PLEPU)  
500 12th St SW, Mail Stop 5112  
Washington, DC 20536-5112

- b. Could the website be updated to offer the same information on both pages?

**Response:** The correct information appears on the Form I-131 page and it now appears on the Humanitarian Parole Q&A website on [uscis.gov](http://uscis.gov). Thank you for letting us know of this error.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Humanitarian Parole*, <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/humanitarian-parole>

<sup>4</sup> *Questions & Answers: Humanitarian Parole*, <http://www.uscis.gov/archive/archive-news/questions-answers-humanitarian-parole>

- c. Would IO consider linking the [Humanitarian Parole Guidelines](#) page with the Humanitarian Parole page and the archived Q&As from 2012 so that viewing these various documents would be more streamlined?<sup>5</sup>

**Response:** As one step of our initiative to revamp our parole information on the uscis.gov website, these Q&As have been connected to the Humanitarian Parole page as well as to the Humanitarian Parole Guidelines page. We are also taking steps to post more information about parole on our public website, to include information about the process and the kind of evidence that should be submitted in support of a parole application.

- d. USCIS posted a PowerPoint on Humanitarian Parole, which offers helpful information and is a valuable resource.<sup>6</sup> However, there is no date on the PowerPoint. Is the information still accurate?

**Response:** Some of the information on this PowerPoint is no longer accurate. We have added a date to the PowerPoint, which is located on an Office of Legislative Affairs archive page, and will post more extensive and current information on parole on our website.

- e. Would IO consider updating the USCIS website to explain the differences between humanitarian parole through USCIS, CBP and ICE?

**Response:** We are in the process of updating our parole website. It currently includes a link to the Memorandum of Agreement between USCIS, CBP and ICE on parole authority.

## 18. Question

Please provide fiscal year-to-date information on the number of humanitarian parole applications filed, granted, and denied.

**Response:** From 10/1/2014 to 3/31/2015, the International Operations Division (IO) received 798 requests for parole. During the same timeframe, IO granted 273 requests and denied 348 requests for parole.

## 19. Question

Please advise on the current processing times for:

- a. Urgent humanitarian parole cases.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Humanitarian Parole Guidelines*, <http://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/humanitarian-parole/humanitarian-parole-guidelines>

<sup>6</sup> *USCIS PowerPoint on the Humanitarian Parole Program*, pg. 9, AILA Doc. No. 1012243, <http://www.aila.org/infonet/uscis-powerpoint-humanitarian-parole-program>, <http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Resources%20for%20Congress/Humanitarian%20Parole%20Program.pdf>

- b. Non-urgent humanitarian parole cases.

**Response:** We will be posting our parole processing times online in the next few months. Those processing times will be based on historical data.

## 20. Question

Please advise on the number of cases being adjudicated:

- a. Within the 90-day target processing time-frame.
- b. Outside of the 90-day target processing time-frame.

**Response:** We will be posting our parole processing times online in the next few months. All parole requests are reviewed upon arrival with IO to identify those that require expedited processing. Therefore, cases are not processed strictly on a “first come first serve” basis. Of the parole applications completed in the first two quarters of this fiscal year, 557 cases (84.8%) were completed within 90 adjusted processing days, and 403 cases (61.3%) were completed within 90 actual processing days. Adjusted processing time is the actual processing time (from the date the application arrives at IO after being forwarded by the Lockbox to the date IO issues the decision), minus any delays caused by third-party action.

## 21. Question

During the December 2014 meeting, IO confirmed that it is working to [publish processing times](#) on the USCIS website.<sup>7</sup> What is the status of this?

**Response:** IO has already developed the methodology that will be used for providing our customers with the Form I-130, Form I-730, and Form I-131 (parole) processing times on the [uscis.gov](http://uscis.gov) website. IO is in the final stages of implementation and is currently working with other USCIS counterparts (Customer Service Directorate and Office of Policy and Quality) to publish the processing times. IO is expecting to complete this project during Q3 of FY2015. After we publish the data, we will be soliciting input on how it is displayed and whether adjustments are required.

## 22. Question

Are IASB staff members continuing to assist with the adjudication of humanitarian parole cases?

**Response:** Yes, the IASB continues to assist as needed in the adjudication of parole requests for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit.

---

<sup>7</sup> USCIS International Operations Liaison Meeting Q&As (12/11/2014), Q24, AILA Doc. No. 15020563, <http://www.aila.org/infonet/uscis-intl-ops-liaison-minnutes-12-11-14>

### 23. Question

In an effort to educate AILA members and ensure that humanitarian parole cases offer the most helpful information possible, please advise on the most common reasons for issuing a request for evidence (RFE) and how submissions can be best prepared in order to prevent an RFE.

**Response:** Some of the most common items missing in parole applications are the identity documents for the petitioner, beneficiary and sponsor of the Form I-134, Affidavit of Support; the Form I-134 and supporting documents; and updated medical documentation from the physician in beneficiary's home country and in the US (for requests based on medical needs). We are working to provide more information on our website on the kind of evidence that best supports parole requests.

### 24. Question

During the December 2014 meeting, IO confirmed that the [Parole Procedures Manual](#), consisting of humanitarian parole protocols and standard operating procedures (SOPs), continued to be pending the clearance process.<sup>8</sup> Does IO have any updates on the timeline for publishing the manual?

**Response:** IO is still in the process of finalizing this guidance and there is no set timeline for publishing the procedures manual. Additionally, we believe that the internal guidance will not be as useful as information that is tailored to applicants and representatives. Therefore, rather than focusing on publishing our procedures manual at this time, we are focusing our efforts on updating the web content with more detailed information about the process and parole policy.

### 25. Question

AILA members report cases in which DNA testing is requested, only to have the case denied on a completely unrelated ground. As DNA testing is quite expensive, would HAB consider requiring DNA tests only if relationship is the only remaining issue on an otherwise approvable case?

**Response:** We recognize the burden DNA testing places on applicants. It is IO policy for IO officers only suggest DNA when the case appears approvable and only the relationship is in question. However, in some rare instances, upon further supervisory review and consultations, a determination is made that there are other reasons in the case that lead to a denial. IO staff will continue to do their best to avoid unnecessarily suggesting DNA testing in cases.

### 26. Question

Assuming that an applicant meets the humanitarian parole standard,

- a. Would USCIS grant humanitarian parole to a U visa applicant whose case has been recommended for approval but whose case is stuck in the quota?

---

<sup>8</sup> *Id* at Q25.

**Response:** All parole requests are reviewed and adjudicated on a case by case basis.

- b. Would USCIS grant humanitarian parole for derivatives of where the principal has deferred action

**Response:** All parole requests are reviewed and adjudicated on a case by case basis.

## Overseas Biometrics

### 27. Question

In April 2014, it was mentioned that IO “will consider developing guidance to allow individuals to have their biometrics collected at an international office for reentry permit applicants on an emergency basis if there are compelling circumstances, at the discretion of the field office director.”<sup>9</sup> During the AILA/IO meeting in December 2014, IO advised that they are [working on guidance](#).<sup>10</sup> What is the status of this guidance?

**Response:** IO has drafted new field guidance allowing additional discretion for international field offices to collect biometrics for applicants outside the United States who have a pending case stateside. The guidance is generally broad, but directs specific attention to the Form I-131 as it relates to reentry permits and the Form I-90. In most cases, applicants will be required to demonstrate compelling circumstances that led to them depart the United States prior to attending their Application Support Center (ASC) appointment or they will be required to show that returning to the United States for an ASC appointment would create an undue burden. The guidance is currently in the internal agency clearance process with the expectation that it can be implemented later this summer.

### 28. Question

During the April 2014 meeting, AILA understood that applicants may request a specific location and/or date for the biometrics appointments, particularly those who live abroad and may prefer to secure an appointment in locations such as Guam or Hawaii.<sup>11</sup> However, ASC appointments are scheduled automatically based on the home address listed for the applicant on the respective USCIS form, and attorney cover letters requesting a specific venue seem to be ineffective. What is the best way to request a biometrics appointment for a specific date and/or location in these circumstances?

**Response:** ASC appointment notices are generated automatically based on the applicant’s home address. However, applicants are able to reschedule their ASC appointments to any location they choose. Once they receive the initial ASC appointment notice, applicants

---

<sup>9</sup> *Id* at Q5.

<sup>10</sup> *USCIS International Operations Liaison Meeting Q&As (12/11/2014)*, Q27, AILA Doc. No. 15020563, <http://www.aila.org/infonet/uscis-intl-ops-liaison-minnutes-12-11-14>

<sup>11</sup> *USCIS International Operations Liaison Meeting Q&As (4/9/14)*, Q6, AILA Doc. No. 14050642, <http://www.aila.org/content/default.aspx?docid=48477>

should follow the rescheduling instructions that are included on the notice to request an alternate location for their ASC appointment.