



U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services

Questions and Answers

USCIS Asylum Division Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting

Tuesday, March 19, 2013

20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, D.C. 20529

2:30pm to 4:00pm ET

1. Asylum Division Updates

- **New Asylum Chief.** John Lafferty, starts July 1st.
- **New Hires.**
 - Locky Nimick (Returned to HQ Asylum as TRAQ Chief)
 - Jessica Dumas (Acting Director, ZAR)
 - Brooke Kirkland (HQ Asylum TRAQ, 3-month detail to Arlington Asylum Office as Acting Deputy Director)
- **Refugee, Asylum and International Operations (RAIO) Combined Training.** 43 Asylum Officers, 1 Refugee Officer, and 2 international students from the Bahamas attended RAIO CT from January 22 through February 22. Asylum Officers continued with the Asylum Division Officer Training Course (ADOTC) from February 25 through March 14.
 - 43 Asylum Officers, 1 Refugee Officer, and 2 international students from the Bahamas attended RAIO CT. 44 Asylum Officers attended and graduated from ADOTC on March 14.
- 2. **Statistics.** Please provide statistics from October, November, December, January, and February 2013 on Affirmative Asylum workload; NACARA workload; Credible Fear and Reasonable Fear workload; Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya receipts; and Unaccompanied Alien Children (UACs).

Response: The requested statistics are attached.

3 through 7. Backlog and Staffing Questions

3. **Backlogs.** Could you please provide any updates or statistics regarding backlogs at the various asylum offices, for affirmative applications as well as RFI/CFI adjudications?
4. **ZNY Backlog.** Are there any plans to provide more support to relieve the backlog at the ZNY Office?
5. **Numbers.** Does USCIS have any updates on numbers of filings received and efforts made to reduce backlogs generally?
6. **Staffing Updates.** Could you please provide stakeholders with an update regarding the staffing requests that were made prior to the last meeting? Was the request fulfilled in whole or in part? Can you describe where new staff may be allocated (if any)?
7. **Staffing Concerns.** Generally, do you continue to have staffing concerns in light of the increase in receipts (affirmative, CFI and RFI)? Are the receipts for all three areas continuing to increase?

Response: The Asylum Division is currently facing increasing numbers of receipts in all programs, except for NACARA. As there is a risk of legitimate refugees being subjected to prolonged detention, our program has always practiced expedited case processing for individuals in credible fear. These days, because detained cases have significant impacts on detention space and funding, the unprecedented and continuing surge of credible fear cases and the less dramatic but still increasing numbers of reasonable fear cases have the attention of DHS and USCIS leadership as well. These detained cases are the asylum program's top priority.

Affirmative asylum applicants are not detained and are eligible to receive work authorization should their applications pend for 180 days.

The asylum program is set to receive 100 new Asylum Officer positions, a clear indicator that we are currently understaffed. The current fiscal climate is uncertain. The Asylum Division's large staffing request was approved internally by USCIS. Currently, the agency is waiting on reprogramming from Congress. While the hiring efforts have begun, it will be some time before everyone is hired, entered on duty, and trained.

When receipts exceed capacity as is currently the case in some offices, some cases do go into our backlog. Our case management system continues to schedule more recently received cases first, a process which discourages non-meritorious filings but does result in some affirmative cases having to wait for longer periods before being scheduled for an asylum interview. This has always been the case, however, our program has been current with incoming receipts in recent years and this system may not have been visible.

PowerPoint presentation reflects both national and local office statistics for affirmative, credible fear and reasonable fear. To date, the two offices most impacted by the increased affirmative asylum receipts are ZNY and ZLA, but stakeholders should be aware that other offices may be impacted soon. ZNY currently has a pending case load

of 5,000 affirmative asylum cases. While they do not conduct circuit rides and have no credible or reasonable fear caseload, ZNY does send detailees to ZHN.

Last year, there were roughly 45,000 affirmative applications, and this year USCIS expects the same number, if not more. Compare this number to previous and recent years where we received 28,000 to 30,000 affirmative asylum applications. The combination of increased receipts, prioritization of detained cases, and staff shortages result in an increasing number of affirmative cases going into the backlog.

Affirmative cases in circuit ride locations are very much affected by the increasing receipts and the prioritization of detained cases. (See PowerPoint) ZMI has lower receipts and less of a backlog, while ZNK is experiencing significant delays in Boston.

CF Summary: Receipts continue to be high, but generally these cases are processed timely because they have been prioritized. Last year, there were 14,000 CF cases, this year the number is expected to double. ZHN has highest level of receipts of ~1000 per month. ZAR has a smaller caseload with ~70 per month. However, this is a significant increase from the ~12 APSO cases per month that ZAR used to receive.

RF Summary: Last year, the Asylum Division received approximately 5,000 reasonable fear cases, and we expect the same number for FY13.

In general, receipts are high in affirmative, credible fear, and reasonable fear and we expect more case receipts by the end of FY13.

8. Asylum Interviews. What are the best practices in terms of the number of interviews that an Asylum Officer should do per day?

Response: The number of affirmative asylum cases assigned is not determined by best practices, but rather in accordance with the Asylum Officer Performance Plan and Appraisal. Under this plan, management will randomly assign an Asylum Officer 18 cases per pay period. An Asylum Officer cannot be required to conduct more than 18 interviews per pay period. Where management cannot provide officers with interviews equal to 18 per pay period, they will assign an equitable number of cases per pay period. This model is used for cases interviewed and written up at the local office. Circuit ride interviews may be assigned in different numbers. The management takes into account local office hours, work schedules, and the number of local cases to be interviewed. Using the 18 case per pay period calculation an officer is allocated four hours to complete the case including interview. This works out to a case assignment of ~2 asylum cases per day.

The credible fear interview setting is different from the affirmative process, and therefore the assignment of cases is different. In some offices, such as ZHN, officers may interview up to 6 cases per day. Currently and historically, ZHN receives the highest volume of CF cases. The asylum office has structured their internal processes to enable officers to interview and process cases with maximum efficiency.

- 9. TRIG Holds.** Could you please address where USCIS is regarding applications for permanent resident asylees who have TRIG holds because they were ostensibly associated with the Oromo Liberation Front?

Response: USCIS is considering various options for addressing cases in which the applicant has associations or activities with the OLF. These options are at the final level of review. After a decision is made, USCIS will implement whichever option is selected. We hope to have an update by the next NGO meeting. TRIG stakeholder meetings are held on a quarterly basis. The next meeting is on June 4th. Please email Public Engagement at Public.Engagement@uscis.dhs.gov to be placed on the TRIG distribution list.

- 10. ROPs Sent to Immigration Courts from Asylum Offices.** We understand that immigration judges from at least two immigration courts are frustrated with the fact that the asylum offices are not in compliance with the Immigration Court Practice Manual when filing referred cases. In some cases, this has led to immigration judges either (1) sending the filing back to the asylum office with a request that it be re-filed in accordance with the Manual (thus requiring hearings to be re-scheduled, sometimes at the last minute), or (2) putting the burden on the Respondent by requiring the Respondent to re-file all of his/her application materials in accordance with the Manual. Can you tell us what instructions have been given to asylum offices about this issue? Is USCIS able to provide additional training and/or guidance to its asylum offices in regard to the filing of materials with the Immigration Courts in accordance with the Manual?

Response: The Asylum Division is aware of this problem occurring in limited situations (Baltimore, Houston, Bloomington, and Arlington) and is reaching out to EOIR. USCIS is not a party to the proceedings and is thus not strictly bound by the Practice Manual. The Affirmative Asylum Procedures Manual describes the requirements of the court packet (application, NTA and ANSIR sheet) and these procedures have been the same for over 10 years.

Stakeholder Follow-up: What if a local asylum office makes an error in submitting a case to EOIR?

Response: Please contact your local asylum office. The contact information for USCIS asylum offices was recently updated to include, email, phone, walk-in hours, etc. Please check the USCIS Office Locator to find this information.

- 11. Asylee Benefits Orientations.** We are aware that certain asylum offices (Arlington and Los Angeles) have partnered with local non-profit organizations to provide Asylee Benefits Orientations to all applicants who have been granted asylum. It is our understanding that these orientations have not been implemented in Newark, Chicago, Houston, or San Francisco, but that there is significant interest in implementing these orientations at all Asylum Offices. Is USCIS planning to expand these to its other asylum offices? If not, why not? If yes, how can we help? AILA would be pleased to assist

USCIS in partnering with local organizations and implementing these orientations at all asylum offices. We would also be pleased to provide any other assistance that USCIS might need in this regard.

Response: The IRC has been conducting orientations for our asylee populations in San Francisco since December 2008 and in Los Angeles since April 2011. In both locations, IRC coordinates participant presentations and our asylum offices invite USCIS granted asylees and provide meeting space in our office. These orientations have proved to be very successful and notices about the meetings are also posted in immigration courts.

Since June 29, 2012, asylee benefit orientations are being conducted every two months at the Arlington Asylum Office. The Asylum Office coordinates with different NGOs and state agencies involved in refugee resettlement (e.g. International Rescue Committee; Lutheran Social Services; Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc. (Clinic); Catholic Charities; Maryland Office for Refugees and Asylees (MORA); and Virginia Department of Social Services Office of Newcomer Services) to conduct the orientations.

HIAS and IRC have both expressed an interest in coordinating orientations at ZNY, but have not set up anything to date. The issue of jurisdictions and circuit ride locations may present challenges for arranging orientations at other offices (i.e. Chicago and Newark Asylum Office). One possible pitfall is asylum offices with large jurisdictions - each state has their own rules and regulations for Asylee/Refugee benefits. We are always pleased to coordinate with interested parties to implement asylee benefit orientations in the future. Please reach out to the local asylum office or HQ.

12. One Year Filing Deadline Review. The regulations and the asylum officers' training materials provide numerous examples of changed and extraordinary circumstances exempting an applicant from the one-year rule. In addition, the training materials contemplate that a reasonable period for filing an application can be, depending on the factual circumstances, more than the presumptive six-month period. AILA members report that, in at least one asylum office, the asylum officers are carefully and thoroughly considering evidence establishing an exception to the one-year rule. They are then applying the rule and exceptions reasonably. However, in most asylum office jurisdictions, practitioners report that officers are not meaningfully considering evidence of changed and extraordinary circumstances, but are instead referring applications filed outside the one-year period as a matter of course. This also seems to be true when the applicant is unrepresented. Practitioners report that in many of these cases, immigration judges ultimately find that changed or extraordinary circumstances have been demonstrated and grant asylum. We believe that more thorough review of potential exceptions to the one-year rule and, in some cases, requests by asylum officers for additional evidence relating to these exceptions, would ultimately preserve administrative resources by decreasing the immigration courts' caseload. Would USCIS consider providing additional training and/or guidance on one-year issues to (1) ensure that asylum officers are actually exercising their authority to grant cases that meet the exceptions to the one-year rule, and (2) ensure that the law and training is applied uniformly throughout the country?

Response: USCIS is committed to training Asylum Officers on the various immigration laws and regulations. The one-year deadline is a complicated assessment and includes the adjudication of exceptions and complex determinations of what constitutes a reasonable time in which to file.

Asylum HQ conducts Quality Assurance reviews to ensure that adjudications are completed properly. This annual review helps to identify areas of training needs and ensure policies, laws, and regulations are being applied consistently nationwide. Part of this review includes an inquiry into one-year filing deadline issues, including the adjudication of exceptions. The results of these reviews are communicated to the particular Asylum Offices with recommendations for follow up. Further, in the past year most local asylum offices have provided training on the one-year deadline during the weekly 4 hours of dedicated training time in asylum offices. One-year training guidelines are currently in the process of being updated and this will serve to assist asylum offices with local training.

Stakeholder Follow – Up: What should applicants do if the 1 year deadline is improperly adjudicated?

Response: There is 100% supervisory review for asylum cases. We recommend that you first raise your concerns with the Supervisory Asylum Officer.

Stakeholder Follow-Up: According to a study conducted by AILA, the San Francisco Asylum Office appears to be the only asylum office to consistently complete a thorough analysis of the one-year deadline.

Response: Asylum HQ will raise these concerns with the local asylum offices.

13. Asylum Officer Conduct. In reviewing surveys taken across the country by AILA, it appears that there is a uniform procedure in place whereby attorneys can report any unprofessional conduct of Asylum Officers. It also appears, however, that these complaints are not being handled in a consistent manner by the various local offices. For example, one office expressed to practitioners who had filed complaints that, while the office was aware of the problem, it lacked the ability to discipline or otherwise correct some of the problems that have been reported. Our committee would like to know what the national policy is on the handling of complaints filed in regard to asylum officer conduct. Is there a policy for addressing the issues raised in complaints? If so, what is that policy? If there has not been a policy implemented for handling these complaints, we would like to bring this issue to your attention and to respectfully request that a policy for addressing these complaints be instituted.

Response: Complaints relating to Asylum Officer conduct are handled by the local office on a case by case basis. Please be aware that you may not see or be aware of all the actions that local managers take. There are typically multiple conversations, counseling sessions, etc. Additionally, there are some cases that are elevated to HQ

Asylum leadership. Not all parts of the process are visible to stakeholders. Please know that USCIS takes complaints of Asylum Officer misconduct seriously and supervisors receive training on how to discipline their subordinates. Local USCIS Offices also post information on how to file complaints with the OIG. OIG and CIS Ombudsman's complaints are reviewed very carefully and are taken very seriously.

- 14. Mailed Decisions from Newark.** It has been brought to AILA's attention that there have been lengthy delays in mailing out decisions from the Newark Asylum Office and that the backlog is expected to extend through most of 2013. Does USCIS have plans for reducing this backlog in order to avoid delays in mailing decisions?

Response: ZNK is not aware that this is a problem. Director Sue Raufer recently travelled to Philadelphia, Boston, New York, and New Jersey speaking with stakeholders and no one raised the issue of lengthy delays in mailing out decisions. While ZNK is currently experiencing a backlog of circuit ride cases in Boston, MA, ZNK is unaware of any delays regarding mailing out decisions. Stakeholders are welcome to provide case specific examples and/or raise this issue with the ZNK Director.

- 15. Sequester.** Do you know what effect, if any, the sequester may have on the processing of affirmative asylum applications?

Response: The sequester will not affect the processing of affirmative asylum applications. Asylum Division staffing enhancement requests are on hold due to the uncertainty of the fiscal climate. Our current staffing levels and travel funding for circuit rides have not been affected because this work is considered mission critical for USCIS.

- 16. New I-589 form.** Could you please provide an update regarding the new version of the I-589 form that was posted online in November 2012? Have you continued to receive reports from customers and users that the form will not accept data entry of certain information (punctuation, dates, etc.), and was there any "fix" done on the part of the operations/information team?

Response: Thank you for bringing this issue to the attention of USCIS. The agency addressed these concerns (the form-fillable coding was changed) and a revised version of Form I-589 was released in mid-January 2013. We have not received additional reports of problems since the form was fixed and re-posted.

- 17. National Customer Service Center.** Stakeholders continue to experience misinformation from the National Customer Service Center when calling for case information that stems from an asylum claim. For example, when calling about an I-765 for a pending asylum seeker or an I-730 petition, the caller is instructed that "the service center cannot divulge information of any kind regarding an asylum claim (even for the attorney of record)" and that for any further assistance, the caller must approach the local asylum office with jurisdiction over the underlying claim. Alternatively, callers are instructed that because there is an asylum claim related to the pending petition, no information can be provided over the telephone and that the attorney of record must make

an Infopass appointment in order to make an inquiry. While we understand the NCSC is outside of your purview, do you know if there has been a policy change regarding the release of this kind of information, or if this is still likely a scripting error (as was suggested at the last quarterly meeting)?

Response: We are reviewing the scripts for the National Customer Service Center and we are preparing refresher training for the call center staff in the near future. Please provide specific scenarios to better inform the guidance we provide to the NCSC.

Stakeholder Follow-up: What is most frustrating about the NCSC is that they won't discuss asylum cases, even if the question is unrelated to a pending I-589 application. For example, the issue could be related to an EAD, I-730, I-131, etc and NCSC still cites confidentiality as a reason for being unable to provide assistance.

Response: Asylum agreed that this is problematic and requires additional training for NCSC employees and will address these issues soon.

18. Denial of Credible Fear Interviews. Many practitioners are starting to see clients who have entered without inspection along the U.S./Mexico border, and were stopped by ICE and questioned without being asked about fear of return. They have then been issued removal orders under 235(b) and released. However, they are never given the opportunity for a credible fear interview, when they actually have valid asylum claims. This problem has later surfaced when these individuals have hired attorneys to prepare affirmative asylum cases, only to then discover that they have prior removal orders. Is USCIS aware of this problem? If so, is USCIS working with CBP and ICE to make sure that their officers are properly trained to provide reasonable opportunity for credible fear interviews?

Response: We have heard of this issue on a limited basis – and can check with our field offices on trends during our next monthly conference call. After receiving this question, we met with ICE/ERO and asked them about any sort of policy or procedures shift. They indicated that they typically do not release individuals who are placed into expedited removal. While this is their general policy, they did mention some exceptions: 1) the situation that we discussed at our last meeting where ICE erroneously released individuals who had claimed credible fear prior to a CF interview with an asylum officer instead of issuing an NTA, and 2) sometimes the health or personal circumstances of the individual may warrant a release.

Asylum Offices provide training to CBP and ICE when requested, in addition to their regular communication and coordination. When we do see anomalies like the ones you referenced, we work through them on a case by case basis. Currently our program has prioritized the detained cases over the non-detained cases.

19. Release on orders of supervision without CFI. Stakeholders continue to hear reports that individuals have been released into the interior on orders of supervision, but without having had a CFI. These individuals were instructed to contact the local asylum office at

their final destination in order to schedule a CFI. At the last meeting, stakeholders were told that previous releases of this kind were not a policy shift and may have been done in error. Do you have any additional information or statistics regarding release without CFI? Are they continuing? Have those who were released successfully reported for their CFIs?

Response: See response to #18.

20. Expedited removal without CFI. While this is more a CBP issue than an asylum division issue, stakeholders have heard some disturbing reports regarding expedited removal in the border region. The scenario goes something like this: an individual is subject to expedited removal. During the expedited removal process, the individual expresses a fear of return but is not referred for a CFI and sometimes is not even asked the threshold protection questions by CBP. The individual is ordered removed, but is placed on an order of supervision by ICE and is permitted to enter the interior for an indefinite period. Our understanding is that this is because there is a lack of detention beds available, or perhaps because of humanitarian concerns (pregnancy, minority). In the normal course of events, stakeholders would not encounter such individuals because they would be removed before being able to report their lack of referral for credible fear. However, because of the OSUPs, legal service providers have been encountering a growing number of people who report these events. Has the asylum division seen any kind of increase in asylum applications from individuals in this procedural posture, or heard anything about this trend? If so has there been any outreach to CBP or ICE about it?

Response: See response to #18.

Stakeholder Follow-up: Can training also be done for CBP officers?

Response: While training may be conducted for CBP officers, it may not resolve the entire problem because people may not claim fear initially. Our asylum office staff may conduct training for ICE officers as well.

21. Credible Fear Statistics. Please provide complete credible fear and reasonable fear statistics for all years since 1998, or at least FY05 until the present. I am referring to the "Credible Fear Workload Report Summary."

Response: See statistics provided.

22. Name Changes. If an asylee changes their name post-grant, what procedure would the asylum division like the asylee to follow in communicating the change to USCIS? This most often arises in our cases where a woman has changed her name from her married name to her maiden name in a case involving domestic violence.

Response: Asylees do not need to inform the Asylum Division of post-grant name changes as a general rule. If an asylee wants a new I-94 in his or her new name, he or she

should follow the guidelines in the September 2012 memo on national customer access standards to appear in person at an asylum office, write a letter to the office, or e-mail the office. Whether appearing in person in an asylum office or contacting the office via letter or e-mail, the asylee should present a copy of his or her current I-94 as well as proof of his or her name change. The asylee will need to turn in his or her original I-94 before receiving a new I-94 in the new name.

Making a change to your I-94 card post grant, will not result in the issuance of a new EAD card. You will need to file Form I-765 for a replacement EAD.

23. Pending Asylum Application and Travel Outside the US. If an asylum applicant has a valid visa to re-enter the United States, is it possible for that individual to travel outside the US while their asylum application is pending or would the asylum application be deemed abandoned?

Response: If an asylum applicant and/or his or her dependent family members plan to travel outside the United States and intend to return, before they leave the United States they must each obtain advance parole for permission to return to the United States. If an individual travels outside the United States while his or her asylum application is pending without advance parole, it shall be presumed that the individual abandoned his or her application for asylum. Advance parole does not guarantee that an individual will be paroled into the United States. Rather, individuals must still undergo inspection by an immigration inspector from United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP). If an individual returns to the country of claimed persecution, his or her eligibility for asylum may be affected and he or she may be required to explain the reasons for return. Please note that re-entry to the US is at the discretion of CBP and USCIS does not have influence over CBP. Applicants travel at their own risk.

24. Asylum Filings. This question was raised at the 1.30.2013 AILA/CAIR Coalition Liaison meeting with ZAR and the office instructed us to raise this with the Asylum Division. How many copies of an asylum filing (meaning the I-589, any legal arguments, declaration, supporting evidence, including country conditions documents) should be filed? The regulations specify three but this may be outdated if the applications are no longer routinely sent to the State Department. In the interest of cost-savings for non-profits and pro bono lawyers as well as storage space in our offices and yours, is it perhaps time to re-visit the requirement that three copies be submitted?

Response: The requirement to file three copies of the I-589 with USCIS is based on the form instructions and not the regulations (8 CFR 208.3 or 208.4). At the time that 8 CFR 208.11 was changed to not require submission of the I-589 to Department of State in April 2009, the Asylum Division considered whether or not to reduce the number of copies asylum applicants are required to submit to USCIS. In consultation with our offices, we decided there were continued operational benefits to receiving three copies of the I-589. The Asylum Division will raise this issue with the field asylum offices.

25. Asylum Office Information. Is it possible to make information about the eight asylum offices available online? This would include:

- i. Opening hours – including hours for filing at the window
- ii. Mailing address
- iii. Contact information
- iv. Information on any preferences or local rules regarding supplemental filings – i.e. the Arlington asylum office asks for documents one week ahead of the interview but reserves the right to cancel the interview/reschedule if the materials submitted prior to the interview require further review.

Response: Contact information for the asylum offices is available on www.uscis.gov and can be accessed through the Office Locator. The walk-in hours, public email address, and public phone number are now listed under a new section titled “Customer Access Information.” The mailing address is listed under its own section. Concerning the fourth item, we will consider providing information about local asylum office preferences. Thank you for the input.

26. Representation. EOIR makes information about pro bono or low cost asylum attorneys and non-profit organizations and law school clinics available at the immigration courts and when an individual applies for asylum in court. This is also often given at the credible fear interview stage. Can the asylum division please make that information available by jurisdiction locally both on the uscis.gov website and also with posted information/handouts at the asylum office itself. We also request that USCIS consider posting advisories regarding the importance of counsel and representation – with links to organizations providing representation – on the website where the I-589 form is provided and in other places on the website where information on asylum is given.

Response: Information to assist the public in locating legal representatives is currently posted through the USCIS/AvoidScams webpage under the “Find Legal Services” left tab (Follow this link USCIS/AvoidScams/FindLegalServices). This is linked directly to the BIA list of attorneys organized by state.

The Asylum Division will take forward to USCIS Office of Communications the suggestion to include a link to the BIA legal services on all the USCIS forms pages under the “Non-USCIS links”.

Field Offices do distribute lists of local pro bono attorneys at credible and reasonable fear screenings and affirmative asylum referrals.

We will ask the field offices to post a sign saying if they would like a list of legal service providers, to please ask at the window.

27. Statistics. For all questions below, we request statistics for the last Fiscal Year for which data is available (FY11?) as well as for FY08-10:

- i. How many principal child asylum applicants seek asylum each year? How many are granted?

- ii. How many principal asylum applicants seek asylum based in whole or part on the “particular social group” ground? How many are granted? How many of these asylum-seekers are women vs. men? And how many of those granted asylum are women vs. men?
- iii. (Please see attached chart below which represents the last data-pull on these questions provided to us by USCIS – we are effectively asking for this chart to be update – see below)

Response: Updated statistics provided in packet.

The Asylum Division asked if stakeholders see UACs pursuing asylum – so far this has not happened in great numbers.

Stakeholder Follow-up: Perhaps USCIS could reach out to the CBO KIND for more information. Perhaps UACs are more qualified for Special Immigration Juvenile (SIJ) Petitions and they are not filing for asylum because that is more difficult and they are not qualified for asylum. Perhaps USCIS should compare UAC and SIJ stats?

The Asylum Division offered to provide a trend report. Fiscal year statistics for Unaccompanied Alien Children are currently included in the “Regularly Provided Statistics” packets at every Asylum Division Quarterly Stakeholder meeting.

- iv. Is there any way to break the data down further to determine how many of the PSG claims involved gender-based harms (e.g., past/future female genital mutilation; forced marriage; honor crimes; domestic and sexual violence)?

Response: Our case management system does not capture the specific social group.

- v. Can the asylum division let us know to whom would we direct similar inquiries re: EOIR statistics?

Response: Please contact EOIR’s Office of Planning, Analysis, and Technology (OPAT) through the Office of Legislative and Public Affairs at (703) 305 – 0289. OPAT releases the yearly publicly available “Statistical Yearbook”.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 31, 2013