









### National Security, Screening and Vetting Enhancements

- We created a new office to centralize and effectively manage our screening initiatives with partners inside and outside the agency and enhanced our rigorous existing screening for national security threats. We broadened the scope of our screening protocols and also increased their frequency to ensure that we address national security threats as soon as they are identified within the Department of Homeland Security or by other law enforcement and intelligence partners. We also developed a comprehensive recurrent vetting strategy to lead the Department's biographic and biometric screening initiatives and studies.
- We enhanced our collaboration with JTTFs and other intelligence and law enforcement partners. FDNS officers have established working relationships with 39 local JTTFs and all State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers. FDNS officers are detailed to the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement National Security Unit, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection National Targeting Center, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Intelligence and Analysis, the Department of Homeland Security's Threat Task Force, the National Joint Terrorism Task Force, the National Counter-Terrorism Center, the Department of State's Kentucky Consular Center and National Visa Center, the FBI's Operational Deconfliction and Analysis Team, the Terrorist Screening Center, the FBI's National Name Check Program, the Central Intelligence Agency, and INTERPOL's U.S. National Central Bureau.
- We strengthened the international exchange of threat information, including biometrics. Working with US-VISIT, we expanded our exchange of information related to asylum claimants under existing data-sharing agreements with foreign-government partners.
- We developed and implemented with the intelligence community new vetting protocols for refugee applicants. The new vetting protocols subject refugee applicants to more rigorous screening against a number of security databases to ensure that they are eligible for refugee status and that they do not pose a threat to national security or public safety.

### Anti-Fraud and National Security Improvements to Process Integrity

- We issued a newly designed, more secure naturalization certificate to reduce fraud. The redesigned certificate features the naturalization candidate's digitized photograph and signature embedded into the document. The background also features a color-shifting ink pattern that is difficult to reproduce. In addition, we began using a more secure printing process that renders the certificate more tamper-proof.
- We issued a newly designed, more secure Employment Authorization Document and a more secure permanent resident card, commonly known as the "Green

Card.” State-of-the-art technologies incorporated into the new cards, including more secure optical media, holographic images, laser engraved fingerprints, and high resolution micro-images, prevent counterfeiting, obstruct tampering, and facilitate quick and accurate authentication of card holders.

- We expanded the Secure Mail initiative. We partnered with the U.S. Postal Service to enable delivery confirmation for secure immigration documents (Permanent Resident Cards, employment-authorization documents, and travel documents). Secure Mail allows our agency to confirm mailing and delivery and enables the U.S. Postal Service to track delivery and respond to applicants’ status queries. The initiative enhances the integrity of the system and improves customer service.
- We further strengthened the E-Verify program’s anti-fraud capabilities. We introduced U.S. passport photo-matching as a new feature in the E-Verify program, enhancing the program’s integrity by enabling E-Verify to check the validity and authenticity of all U.S. passports and passport cards presented for employment verification. This tool enhances E-Verify’s previous, more limited, capacity to detect identify theft by enabling the employer to ensure that the identity document presented belongs to the applicant. We also began expanding E-Verify’s anti-fraud capabilities in partnership with state motor-vehicle bureaus. The new effort allows USCIS for the first time to verify driver’s licenses presented for employment authorization against state records. We began piloting the effort with one state, with opportunities for other states to participate as the program expands.
- We promoted E-Verify to attract wider use, developing a robust customer service and outreach staff to increase public awareness of E-Verify’s significant benefits and inform employers and employees of their rights and responsibilities. In fiscal year 2011 alone, we informed more than 37 million people about E-Verify through radio, print, and online ads in English and Spanish, and approximately a half million more through 130 live presentations, 111 conference exhibitions, 305 live webinars, and distribution of informational materials. We also handled more than 98,000 calls from employees through our employee hotline. As a result of these collective efforts, 17.4 million queries were run in fiscal year 2011, one million more than the previous year. More than 958,000 worksites were enrolled, with more than 1,000 employers enrolling per week.
- We worked with the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to launch the Unauthorized Practice of Immigration Law initiative. Together, we partnered with state and local governments to develop and implement a comprehensive initiative that combats the unauthorized practice of immigration law by building capacity to deliver legitimate assistance, educating the public about finding bona fide legal advice, and strengthening prevention and enforcement efforts.

I am proud of these initiatives and the steps that we have taken to combat fraud and advance our nation's security. Some members of the public have not been so pleased. In fact, some stakeholders have been critical of our prioritization of these efforts, believing that the balance is shifting away from efficiency in favor of security.

Despite these public criticisms, I have been unwavering in my steadfast commitment to the fraud detection and national security aspects of our work. I believe firmly that as a federal fee-for-service agency, it is our mandate and our responsibility to deliver both efficiency and security in our adjudications for the benefit of the customers we serve and for the country we protect. As I repeated to agency personnel last year, "USCIS has no mission more important than guarding against those who might seek access to the United States to do our nation harm." I have continued to set this tone for the agency, and our top strategic priority for the last two years emphasizes this effort: "Strengthen National Security Safeguards and Combat Fraud."

I appreciate that the DHS Inspector General, in his recent report, recognized and praised our anti-fraud efforts and noted the many recent advances our workforce achieved to further integrate our efforts:

Through process improvements and additional systems checks, USCIS has taken important steps to improve national security and fraud detection. USCIS has also increased fraud detection resources and training.

The Inspector General then made several recommendations as to how the agency could better achieve its goal of combating immigration fraud. We concurred with many of the recommendations and are already implementing them. For example, efforts to promote better collaboration between FDNS officers and our adjudications officers are underway, and training programs are being strengthened for all decision-makers, including improved guidance on the roles and responsibilities of officers and supervisors in the area.

The Inspector General's report, admittedly based on limited testimonial information and not empirical data, captures the reality that the tension, whether real or perceived, between quality and speed still exists. No one has sought to tackle the breadth of the age-old tension between quality and speed more vigilantly than I. I have not only articulated my expectations both inside and outside the agency, I also have made structural improvements to strengthen a culture of quality within the agency.

In addition to the creation of the FDNS directorate in January 2010, I also created an Office of Performance and Quality to ensure that our agency prioritized quality throughout its adjudication practices and mission-support processes. In addition, we have been working to reform the agency's performance management system, striving to implement metrics that reinforce a broader focus on quality rather than production alone. The Inspector General recognized the importance of this undertaking:

USCIS recently revised its policies and reorganized its organizational structure to address immigration security concerns and facilitate fraud

detection. One key change is a shift from employee performance measures that focus on the number of applications or petitions that an [Immigration Services Officer] processes.

It is of paramount importance to me that no USCIS employee, whether because of any perceived pressure to process an immigration benefit quickly or for any other reason, ever adjudicates a case other than in accordance with what the law and the facts warrant. This is an ethic I have articulated and reinforced since I first became the Director of USCIS. Indeed, in a public question-and-answer session in early 2010, an immigration attorney articulated her hope that USCIS adjudicators will exercise their discretion “to get to yes.” My response was clear and direct on this point: “[T]he discretion to get to yes can be as pernicious as the discretion to get to no. It’s supposed to be the discretion to get to ‘right’.” In a conversation with the USCIS workforce last year, I reiterated to an employee who expressed concern about the effect of time pressure on adjudicative quality:

And if in fact there is a supervisor that is instructing an individual to just be fast at the expense of quality, then that’s something that one should raise to the top leadership . . . who would not tolerate that instruction and who, I can assure you, would find that instruction to be not consistent with the teachings of the program nor the agency as a whole.

I appreciate that the Inspector General emphasized that this is the ethic that I and the leadership of the agency continue to demand and promote:

USCIS has taken action to diminish threats to the immigration benefits system. General employee concerns about the impact of production pressure on the quality of an ISO’s [Immigration Services Officer’s] decisions do not mean that systemic problems compromise the ability of USCIS to detect fraud and security threats. No ISOs presented us with cases where benefits were granted to those who pose terrorist or national security threats to the United States.

....

The Director of USCIS informed us that managers and supervisors must ensure the integrity of each benefit determination, based on the evidence presented in the case file. ISOs who are pressured to approve cases that do not warrant approval should report such incidents to OSI [the Office of Security and Integrity].

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lofgren, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you again for the opportunity to share with you the great work we in U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services have done and continue to do to safeguard our national security and combat fraud. This work allows us to remain the welcoming nation of immigrants we are so proud to be. Thank you again to the Inspector General for his independent work to further these efforts.



And, finally, I want to once again express my deep thanks and appreciation to the men and women of USCIS who dedicate each and every day to our noble mission, and whose hard work and commitment to our principles have made our achievements possible.