

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

United States Department of State
and the Broadcasting Board of Governors
Office of Inspector General

Report of Inspection

Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration

Report Number ISP-I-06-40, June 2006

~~IMPORTANT NOTICE~~

~~This report is intended solely for the official use of the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors, or any agency or organization receiving a copy directly from the Office of Inspector General. No secondary distribution may be made, in whole or in part, outside the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors, by them or by other agencies or organizations, without prior authorization by the Inspector General. Public availability of the document will be determined by the Inspector General under the U.S. Code, 5 U.S.C. 552. Improper disclosure of this report may result in criminal, civil, or administrative penalties.~~

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY JUDGMENTS.....	1
CONTEXT	3
BUREAU OVERVIEW	7
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION	9
Policy and Program Direction	9
Relationship Management	10
Morale	13
Strategic Planning	13
Succession Planning	15
Paper Flow and Recordkeeping	15
Rightsizing	17
CORE FUNCTIONS	19
Program Planning	19
Admissions	22
Migration	25
Public Diplomacy/Public Affairs.....	26
Congressional Relations	27
POLICY COORDINATION AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION	29
Policy and Program Review Committee Process	29
Management of Federal Financial Assistance.....	31
Monitoring and Evaluation	37
POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	43
Office of Policy and Resource Planning	43
Office of Multilateral Coordination and External Relations	45
Population Unit	47
Office of Assistance for Europe, Central Asia, and Americas	48

Office of Assistance for Asia and Near East 51
Office of Assistance for Africa 54
Office of Admissions 57
Office of the Comptroller 58
MANAGEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES 59
 Bureau Resources 59
 Executive Office 60
 Human Resources Services 61
 Space 63
 Information Technology 64
 Security - Physical Access Controls and Classified
 Information Handling 67
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS 69
FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS 71
INFORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS 77
PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS 83
ABBREVIATIONS 85

KEY JUDGMENTS

- The United States remains the world's leader in supporting international programs to assist refugees and other vulnerable populations, accounting for approximately one-quarter of contributions worldwide. The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) manages the Department of State's (Department's) second largest program budget, with approximately \$997 million expended in FY 2005.
- Following an interregnum of more than half a year, the bureau's new Assistant Secretary took up her duties in January 2006. She inherits a bureau with a well-deserved reputation for professionalism and competent and effective management.
- The leadership change comes at a time of dramatic change in the bureau's operational environment. A welcome decline in the number of refugees worldwide has been more than offset by increased numbers of internally displaced and other persons of concern. Meanwhile, the conceptual frameworks for both the international humanitarian system and U.S. foreign assistance programs are being substantially redefined, even as resources to support humanitarian activities are declining.
- These changes hold significant implications for the bureau's mission and ways of doing business. Addressing these challenges and opportunities successfully will require vision, proactive leadership, an enhanced capacity for strategic planning, and more active public diplomacy and public affairs efforts.
- Changes in the global context and in U.S. policies have also created unpredictability in the U.S. refugee admissions program. With strong Congressional and executive branch support, admissions numbers have rebounded significantly in the last three years, after reaching record lows in the two years following September 11, 2001; but the ability to sustain these levels is currently threatened by new restrictions.

- The bureau has a highly developed system for setting policy and funding priorities, allocating funds and approving program implementation proposals. But this system has grown increasingly cumbersome and excessively demanding on bureau staff, hampering the bureau's ability to give due attention to critical, core functions.
- The bureau receives high marks for both the effectiveness of its programs and the efficiency with which it manages its contributions, grants, and cooperative agreements. Nevertheless, the bureau has correctly identified a need to further strengthen its grants management, performance measurement, and monitoring and evaluation functions.
- To adjust to its changing roles and responsibilities, the bureau will need to make more efficient use of existing staff and consider some increases in administrative resources.

The inspection took place in Washington, DC, between January 3 and March 24, 2006. Ambassador George Moose (team leader), Deborah Klepp (deputy team leader), Merwin Blust, Maria Germano, Frances Jones, Thomas Martin, Keith McCormick, Iris Rosenfeld, Timothy Wildy, and Pamela Young conducted the inspection.

CONTEXT

Over the past decade, PRM has had to carry out its responsibilities in a highly volatile international environment. The end of the Cold War ushered in a period of intrastate tensions and conflicts and a sharp increase in the number of refugees and other victims of conflict. Globally, the number of refugees increased from roughly eight million in 1980, when the Bureau of Refugee Programs was established, to nearly 18 million in 1992. In the last decade, the number of refugees has declined dramatically to an estimated 13 million in 2005, largely the result of concerted efforts to enable substantial numbers of refugees to return voluntarily to their countries of origin. During the same period, however, there have been dramatic increases in the numbers of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and other victims of conflict. Current estimates place the number of IDPs at between 25 and 30 million, double the number of refugees, although there are hopeful signs that this may be leveling off. Despite decreasing refugee numbers, PRM's overseas assistance and protection work on behalf of refugees, and the resources required to support that work, have not declined. This is a reflection of the difficult environments in which refugees are located, and the rising costs of caring for them, including costs related to security. Meanwhile, the increasing attention to the needs of IDPs and the climbing costs of resettling refugees in the United States - which include new medical and security screening procedures - have placed additional demands on PRM's resources. These factors explain the continued growth in PRM's budgets.

Changes in the global context have also had a major impact on the resettlement of refugees in the United States. Refugee admissions reached a high of 140,000 in 1993. With the gradual reduction of large caseloads from Southeast Asia and the former Soviet Union, the number of admissions declined steadily to 83,000 in FY 2000 and 69,000 in FY 2001. Following September 11, 2001, it plummeted to 27,000 because of more rigorous screening requirements for all categories of immigrants seeking entry to the United States. With strong political support from the White House and the Congress, and concerted efforts on the part of PRM and other offices involved in the admissions process, that figure rebounded to more than 50,000 in FY 2004 and FY 2005. The focus of international and U.S. resettlement efforts has also shifted to new and more geographically scattered groups, most

notably in Burma and East Africa. Currently, expectations of sustaining the level of admissions are threatened by the material support provisions of the Real ID Act of 2005, which restrict the admission of persons who have been members or supporters of groups that have engaged in political violence.

Other important changes that will impact PRM's humanitarian responsibilities and operations include reforms in the international humanitarian system to address the needs of vulnerable populations other than refugees, initiatives taken by the Bush Administration to reform and restructure U.S. foreign assistance programs, and a more stringent U.S. budgetary climate.

International Humanitarian System Reform: The United States has been a strong promoter of efforts to address critical gaps in the way the international system addresses the needs of conflict victims and other vulnerable migrants. These efforts have culminated in a package of reforms, announced in December 2005, which focuses particularly on the needs of the growing number of IDPs. Among other things, the reforms envisage an enhanced role for the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the creation of a Central Emergency Response Fund. Both reforms have significant budgetary and staffing implications for UNHCR, which in turn will affect PRM's operations and funding requirements.

Foreign Assistance Reform: In January 2006, Secretary Rice announced initiatives to reform the way in which the United States structures and administers the full range of its foreign assistance activities. These initiatives are part of a broader reconceptualization of U.S. foreign policy to better support transformational diplomacy. For PRM, these reforms represent both a challenge and an opportunity. There is a risk that the bureau's protection and assistance activities will be seen as just another foreign assistance program, interchangeable with other forms of assistance, overlooking the fact that U.S. responsibilities in this area derive directly from treaty obligations and statute. There is also a risk that the proposed reforms could challenge established international mechanisms for channeling assistance to refugees and other affected populations served by PRM and its partnerships with international organizations (IO) such as UNHCR, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). These partnerships have served U.S. humanitarian and foreign policy interests by supporting a broad international capacity to respond to humanitarian situations, leveraging U.S. influence in shaping global policies and actions, and facilitating the sharing of responsibilities and financial obligations with other nations.

More positively, the Administration's foreign assistance reform initiatives provide an opportunity for PRM to demonstrate the relevance of its programs and activities in meeting the challenges faced by countries in transition, particularly in the context of post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization. Likewise, the reform initiatives open possibilities for closer engagement with other parts of the human rights, humanitarian assistance and development communities in addressing current gaps in the so-called relief to development continuum, as well as in conflict prevention and mitigation efforts.

Budgetary Climate: Complicating these challenges is an increasingly tight budgetary climate. Already, Congressional cuts in PRM's proposed budget for FY 2006 have resulted in difficult and painful reductions in the bureau's support for overseas protection and assistance activities, notably affecting its nongovernmental organization (NGO) partners. The tightening of the budgetary environment comes at a time when, as noted above, the international system has been charged to assume responsibility for the unmet needs of IDPs and other vulnerable populations, and when UNHCR and other key agencies are already facing serious funding shortfalls.

BUREAU OVERVIEW

PRM has primary responsibility within the U.S. government for formulating U.S. foreign policy on population, protection and assistance to refugees and conflict victims, and international migration, as well as for administering U.S. refugee assistance and admissions programs. In this capacity, it has the lead role within the Department in responding to complex humanitarian emergencies around the world, as well as working to resolve protracted refugee situations. It also serves as the focal point within the U.S. government for multilateral coordination of international migration programs. The bureau is headed by an Assistant Secretary of State, supported by three deputy assistant secretaries (DASs), and comes under the direction of the Under Secretary for Global Affairs. The bureau has 131 authorized positions, of which 120 are filled. The 131 authorized positions include 23 overseas positions, all of which are currently filled.

PRM's principal authorities derive from statutes, including the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 and the Refugee Act of 1980. Substantial provisions of these laws are based in international conventions to which the United States is a party, most notably the 1967 Protocol to the 1951 Geneva Refugee Convention. The bureau in its present form was created in 1993 by adding responsibility for population to the former Bureau of Refugee Programs, which already handled migration issues. Through its work on behalf of refugees, conflict victims, and other vulnerable populations, PRM plays a central role in advancing the President's foreign policy priority of enhancing human dignity. It also contributes to United Nations (UN) reform efforts by promoting effective multilateral responses to international humanitarian situations. Because of the magnitude and importance of its programs, the bureau's activities receive high public and Congressional visibility.

Obligated Funding For Major Activities by Account, FY 2005	Funding
Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA)	\$774,961,062
Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance (ERMA)	42,993,611
Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF)	64,575,496
Emergency Supplemental	104,599,743
President's Anti-Trafficking Initiative	3,850,000
Global HIV/AIDS Initiative (PEPFAR)	405,000
Andean Counter Drug Initiative (ACI)	5,000,000
Diplomatic & Consular Programs for Population Unit	579,000
Total	\$996,963,912

The bulk of PRM's programs are funded through two appropriations that are separate from the Department's operating budget: the Migration and Refugee Assistance account (MRA) and the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance account (ERMA). MRA funds are used primarily for overseas assistance. ERMA funds are used primarily for unexpected crises. In FY 2005, the bureau was appropriated \$825.7 million, but spent a total of \$997 million, including funding from FY 2004 carryovers and program initiatives. Seventy-six percent, or \$753 million, of this funding was dedicated to international protection and assistance activities and for humanitarian emergencies. The remaining 17 percent, or \$172 million, of this funding was spent on refugee admissions to the United States, five percent (\$49.6 million) on Humanitarian Migrants to Israel, and two percent (\$22 million) for bureau administrative expenses.

Of the \$997 million, 74 percent, or 739 million, was channeled through major IOs, most notably UNHCR, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), ICRC, and IOM. PRM provides nearly 25 percent (\$319 million in FY 2005) of UNHCR's funding for its general program; 22-25 percent (\$108 million) of UNRWA's annual budget; 22 percent of ICRC's program budget and 10 percent of its headquarters budget (\$156 million); and \$116 million of voluntary and assessed contributions to IOM.

The bureau channels the balance of its funding for overseas activities through nongovernmental and private voluntary organizations. The bureau has often been appropriated supplemental funding to cover unforeseen humanitarian emergencies. Since 1999, it has also received transfers of additional funds to support special programs in Bosnia, Colombia, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION

POLICY AND PROGRAM DIRECTION

PRM enjoys a well-deserved reputation for the competent and effective performance of its complex mission. The inspection confirmed that, overall, the bureau is performing well in managing current operations. This includes politically sensitive policy issues such as the plight of North Korean refugees and the response to legislative restrictions affecting the admission of refugees to the United States. It also includes large, high profile humanitarian programs in Iraq, Afghanistan, Sudan, and the Palestinian territories. The PRM front office understands well its responsibilities for policy development and coordination and is diligent in fulfilling them. In consequence, it enjoys high confidence among Department principals. It has put in place a variety of processes for structuring the participation of other key actors, some of which, like the White House and the Congress, exercise considerable influence in the policy-making process.

The bureau experienced a seven-month hiatus between the departure of the previous Assistant Secretary in June 2005 and the appointment of the new Assistant Secretary in January 2006. In the interim, the bureau's three DASs, with the principal deputy assistant secretary (PDAS) serving as acting Assistant Secretary, continued to provide able leadership. They are credited with providing competent direction and oversight for the bureau's extensive programs and maintaining PRM's influence in both intraagency and interagency policy discussions.

Responding to a 1995 Office of Inspector General (OIG) recommendation, PRM has significantly enhanced bureau processes and procedures for ensuring accountability and consistency in policy, budgeting, and resource allocation decisions. The principal mechanism is the Policy and Program Review Committee (PPRC), which is managed by the office of Policy and Resource Planning (PRP) under the direction of the bureau's PDAS, who has drawn on his extensive experience in financial management to strengthen the process. Many aspects of the PPRC process impressed OIG. But OIG shares the widespread belief in the bureau

that the PPRC process has grown unnecessarily cumbersome and excessively demanding on staff time, hampering the bureau's ability to focus on critical functions. The inspection team made several recommendations aimed at streamlining the process.

The bureau has also done much to strengthen its ability to account for the way funds are used, another area considered weak at the time of the last inspection. As reflected in its most recent Bureau Performance Plan (BPP), PRM is developing more sophisticated standards to measure actual program impact on such things as health and nutrition, and it is pressing its IO and NGO partners to incorporate those standards. This, in turn, is obliging the bureau to strengthen its own monitoring and evaluation capacities. OIG was not in a position to measure these new requirements but did offer recommendations on how the bureau could assess its needs, together with the additional staff or administrative support resources that will likely be required.

RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT

Relationship management is arguably even more important for PRM than it is for most bureaus. To be successful in its mission, PRM must maintain close and effective relationships with an unusually wide range of interlocutors, partners and clients: intradepartmental, interagency, and Congressional, and with organizations both domestic and international.

Within the Department, PRM is challenged to maintain its influence with regional bureaus that tend to dominate the policy process, as well as with other functional bureaus - such as the Bureau of International Organizations and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) - with complementary or overlapping responsibilities. The bureau has been appropriately assertive in making its voice heard but rightly views this as an ongoing challenge. PRM is acknowledged for its support for the recently established office for the Coordination of Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS), which included the loan to S/CRS of a very experienced PRM officer. PRM's collaboration with S/CRS has produced tangible benefits, even though S/CRS's role has not yet been clearly defined.

In the interagency context, PRM's assistance efforts overseas require regular interaction with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). That relationship has been problematic, principally because the two entities have similar

mandates with regard to humanitarian emergencies but operate in very different ways. While PRM works principally through large institutional partners such as UNHCR and ICRC in order to leverage U.S. contributions and influence, USAID works bilaterally with countries and relies heavily on its partnerships with NGOs, which sometimes enables it to respond more quickly and flexibly. To their credit, PRM and USAID have worked out practical arrangements to clarify their respective roles and enhance coordination. The 2003 PRM-USAID/Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) coordination and funding guidelines for complex humanitarian emergencies define in two-and-a-half pages how PRM and USAID/DCHA will split their funding responsibilities and consult in situations when they both support UN agencies, IOs, and NGOs. PRM and USAID/DCHA have been discussing their new roles, funding responsibilities, and consultation mechanisms with regard to the UN reforms to improve the quality of services provided to IDPs. These changes will necessitate reconsideration and likely revision of key portions of their 2003 guidelines in order to avoid duplication of effort and unintended gaps in the delivery of time-sensitive assistance.

Recommendation 1: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should conclude a written agreement with the U.S. Agency for International Development's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance that clarifies their new roles and responsibilities for supporting reforms now being implemented within the international humanitarian system pertaining to internally displaced persons. (Action: PRM)

PRM's responsibilities with respect to the refugee resettlement program entail close collaboration with the Departments of Health and Human Services and Homeland Security (DHS), the Department of Justice and the National Security Council (NSC). The fact that responsibility within DHS is shared between two separate bureaus has created special challenges in obtaining timely and coherent policy input. PRM has been diligent in seeking interventions from both the White House and the NSC whenever necessary.

Because of the importance of its programs and the nature of the policy issues with which it deals, PRM attracts intense Congressional interest and oversight. It receives high marks from Congressional staff for its management of Congressional relations and its responsiveness to Congressional interests and concerns. Responsibility for legislative affairs is divided between two offices. While this has not created significant problems, combining the function in one office could yield synergies as OIG notes in its recommendation in the Core Functions section of this report.

International Organizations

The United States has long been the world's leader in supporting international programs to protect and assist refugees, conflict victims, and other vulnerable populations, accounting for approximately one-quarter of all contributions. PRM channels 74 percent of its program resources through IOs, such as UNHCR, ICRC, IOM, and UNRWA. These contributions support and maintain an international system that has been developed over the last 50 years to respond to humanitarian situations worldwide. PRM believes that the U.S. support for this international humanitarian response system serves well what the bureau has identified as its two principal clients: refugees and other populations of concern on the one hand and U.S. taxpayers on the other. Through its participation in this system, PRM has been effective in leveraging U.S. leadership and policy influence internationally and ensuring that the burdens of both leadership and financial responsibility are shared broadly with other nations. These multilateral organizations also provide a critical international umbrella for coordinating humanitarian response, as in Kosovo. In the last few years, PRM has used that influence to secure important improvements in the way the international humanitarian system addresses the needs of vulnerable populations. The reforms currently underway in the handling of IDPs are but one example.

The bureau can count among its major successes its work in securing a decision by the ICRC to adopt a new international emblem to be used along side those of the Red Cross and Red Crescent emblems. This outcome, a top U.S. foreign policy priority for the past six years, paves the way for Israel's national society, Magen David Adom, to become a fully participating member of the International Movement of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. For its intensive diplomatic efforts, PRM received commendations from the Secretary of State and the White House.

Nongovernmental Organizations

PRM's success also depends heavily on maintaining constructive relationships with large, diverse, and politically influential constituencies of nongovernmental and private voluntary organizations. The bureau was actively engaged with some 70 NGOs in 2005. Some of these organizations are also partners in implementing PRM's programs, both overseas and domestic. As part of its outreach, PRM conducts regular consultations with two large and prominent umbrella organizations, Interaction and the Refugee Council USA. In preparing this report, OIG spoke with representatives of more than 20 organizations. While it is impossible to satisfy the divergent expectations of these groups, PRM again receives high praise for its outreach, accessibility, attentiveness, and responsiveness.

MORALE

PRM's strength rests on two strong pillars: a shared and deeply felt commitment to the bureau's humanitarian mission; and the management and leadership skills of a very able group of office directors who generally receive very high marks for their attention to the professional development of their staffs. The new Assistant Secretary, who assumed office just as the inspection was beginning, has made a positive impression on the bureau and its staff. Her openness, accessibility, and lack of pretense have earned her praise and respect, as have her seriousness, energy, and evident understanding of the bureau's mission. She inherits, however, a front office characterized by interpersonal tensions that reflect differing personal styles as much as disagreements over policy. These tensions have left staff feeling awkwardly caught in the middle, complicating relationships and adversely affecting communication throughout the bureau. The situation has been complicated further by a less-than-clear delineation of responsibilities and reporting lines and management styles that are neither as inclusive nor as nurturing as might be wished. These issues have not seriously affected the bureau's overall performance or functioning, but they have exacted a price in heightened stress levels and lowered morale. On OIG's bureau management questionnaire (completed before the new Assistant Secretary assumed office), front office attentiveness to morale scored below average.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

As outlined in the Context section, PRM is operating in an environment that is undergoing rapid and dramatic change, which will impact the bureau's mission and ways of doing business. The bureau fully recognizes the challenges this poses and has coined the phrase "PRM at 25" - 2005 being the 25th anniversary of the bureau's establishment. The concerns of refugees that have been the traditional focus of the bureau's mission and work are being eclipsed by a sharp increase in other categories of persons of concern. The latter include IDPs and other victims of conflict or natural disaster, as well as both trafficked and stateless persons. The changing character of human migration is also forcing changes in the roles and responsibilities of the IOs. It has stimulated an expanding international policy dialogue on migration, which seems likely to lead toward the elaboration of new international norms to define the status and rights of various kinds of migrants and

the corresponding obligations of states with respect to their treatment. Meanwhile, key agencies of the international humanitarian system, such as UNHCR, are facing unprecedented budgetary difficulties, even as they are being asked to assume new responsibilities.

The United States has played a key role in efforts to adapt the international humanitarian system to these changes and will be looked to for continued leadership in the future. For PRM, this task will be complicated by the fact that U.S. mechanisms for delivering foreign assistance of all kinds are also undergoing major reform. The bureau has an important stake in the reform exercise, which by bringing greater coherence to U.S. assistance efforts could enable PRM to promote solutions to long-standing humanitarian issues, including:

- The long-term warehousing of refugee populations, which often poses both humanitarian and security concerns;
- Gaps in the so-called relief-to-development continuum, caused by disconnects in the international humanitarian and development assistance systems;
- Post-conflict situations, where breakdowns in the transition from relief and recovery to reconstruction, stabilization, and development have often resulted in renewed conflict; and
- Humanitarian disasters triggered by the absence of mechanisms for preventing and mitigating local conflict.

As one of the principal sources of knowledge and expertise on these issues, as well as the principal point of contact with the agencies and institutions that make up the international humanitarian system, PRM has much to contribute to the redesign of assistance mechanisms, both international and domestic. To do so, however, the bureau will need a much more robust capacity for strategic thinking and planning than currently exists. Many in PRM identified the bureau's inability to dedicate more time and resources to the strategic planning function as a major shortcoming. Moreover, the absence of such a capacity handicaps the bureau's ability to support other functions that are critical to its mission, among them:

- Forecasting and trends analysis to facilitate long-term resource planning;
- Emergency response in humanitarian crises, for which the bureau has lead responsibility within the Department;

- Further development of standards for performance measurement, monitoring, and evaluation; and
- Strategic outreach to key constituencies to ensure understanding of the evolving policy environment and support for the bureau's changing roles.

The logical place for these interrelated functions is PRP. However, as is described elsewhere in this report, that office is currently burdened with a host of other, noncore activities that severely limit the time and effort that it can devote to these activities. OIG recommended that PRP be relieved of a number of lower priority tasks to enable it to focus on the strategic planning function and other activities critical to PRM's mission.

Recommendation 2: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should take steps to strengthen the strategic planning function in its Office of Policy and Resource Planning. (Action: PRM)

SUCCESSION PLANNING

Since assuming office, the new Assistant Secretary has moved with deliberate speed to fill critical vacancies in PRM's management structure, including two office director positions and a successor for a recently reassigned DAS. Within the next three years, it would be reasonable to assume a complete turnover in the leadership positions in the front office. Given both the importance and the specialized nature of the bureau's work and the premium this places on continuity of stewardship and direction, OIG suggested that the bureau begin now to work with the Bureau of Human Resources to develop a succession plan that assures that continuity.

PAPER FLOW AND RECORDKEEPING

Staff Assistant Function

PRM has only one staff assistant position. As needed, the bureau calls upon program officers and other staff from its various offices to serve as the back up to the lone staff assistant. The arrangement is neither efficient nor reliable. Because bureau officers serve in the position only occasionally, they cannot be expected to

be current with routines and procedures for managing paper flow. The handling of communications with Department principals and with other agencies has become highly specialized and can be critical to ensuring timely and effective PRM participation in decisions. The current arrangement is also disruptive to the officers who must take time away from their normal duties. In addition, PRP, and to a lesser extent the Office of Multilateral Coordination and External Relations (MCE), have assumed a number of routine functions normally performed by a staff assistant, thereby diverting them from their own core activities. Other bureaus of PRM's size have two staff assistants. For these reasons, OIG recommended the creation of a second staff assistant position and identified a position that could be transferred to the front office for this purpose. The second staff assistant would ideally be a Foreign Service officer (FSO) to complement the current Civil Service officer staff assistant.

Recommendation 3: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should create a second staff assistant position and return those staff assistant functions currently being performed in other offices to the Front Office. (Action: PRM, in coordination with M/DGHR)

Records and Archiving

Many offices in PRM are keeping insufficient records of key policy and program actions. Much of the bureau's work is done by e-mail, adding to the problem of deciding what and how much to keep. Many files are kept informally, using ad hoc systems that make it difficult to share them bureau-wide. Official files are not being archived as required. The bureau does not need to keep internal and deliberative papers but must maintain records of key policy actions (either on paper or electronically) in order to guide its own actions and to meet legal and other records management requirements, including those of the Federal Records Act. The bureau may find it helpful to consult the Department's records management staff for guidance and best practices.

Recommendation 4: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should retire all outdated files and disseminate written guidance on maintaining office records. (Action: PRM)

RIGHTSIZING

PRM receives high marks for the efficiency with which it manages its programs and cooperative agreements. The bureau takes pride in the fact that it has kept its administrative costs at approximately two percent of its overall program funding. With this two percent, PRM funds virtually all of its salary, travel, equipment, training, and other administrative expenses. To remain within this self-imposed limit, it has made periodic rightsizing adjustments (most recently by eliminating a refugee coordinator position in Tbilisi, Georgia). Over the past decade, the number of filled positions has lagged well behind increases in both program funding and workload.

OIG identified several functions that are in need of additional focus and staffing. Among the most important are strategic planning, federal assistance management, performance measurement, emergency response, and monitoring and evaluation. OIG found that the bureau's refugee coordinators are critical to the bureau's diplomatic outreach, crisis monitoring, program implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. OIG did not inspect the refugee coordinators. However, in response to OIG's survey, a number of refugee coordinators indicated that they were not able to do justice to their multiple duties, especially given their broad policy, program, and geographic responsibilities.

OIG believes that many of these new requirements can be met by improving processes and procedures and by realigning existing staff resources. While OIG believes that the bureau is best placed to make decisions on how to realign responsibilities, specific portfolios, and positions, OIG nevertheless put forward several recommendations, formal and informal. They include:

- Moving one position from Office of Assistance for Asia and the Near East (ANE) to the front office to establish a second staff assistant position;
- Consolidating PRM's Congressional-liaison function, which is currently divided between PRP and MCE, into one office, thereby permitting greater synergies and improved coordination;
- Rebalancing the policy portfolios of PRP and MCE to enable the former to concentrate on critical, core functions; and

- Transferring the migration function, along with two of its three positions, from PRP to the Office of Population (POP), facilitating the more effective and efficient use of resources to support both population and migration activities. This would free up one current migration position in PRP that could be used to bolster PRP's strategic planning capacity.

In addition, the inspection team identified the following specific needs that will require additional resources:

- Contracting for or hiring a part-time support specialist for the Abacus project tracking system;
- Contracting for or hiring outside experts to perform technical monitoring and evaluation;
- Contracting for outside participation on selection panels for federal assistance; and
- Creating a full-time position to provide policy and operational support for the Migrant Operations Center at Guantanamo, replacing two when actually employed (WAE) retired annuitants.

CORE FUNCTIONS

PROGRAM PLANNING

Bureau Performance Plan

The bureau has made a concerted effort to strengthen strategic planning and improve performance measurement. This is in contrast to 1995 when OIG found that PRM management had not placed sufficient emphasis on program planning or performance measurement. The improvement has occurred not thanks to but despite the BPP process. The BPP format does not lend itself to the bureau's work, because 96 percent of PRM's funding resources falls under one performance goal, assistance for refugees and other victims. This goal paper, already unwieldy, was rendered almost unusable for strategic planning purposes in FY 2007 after five Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Performance Assessment Rating Tool (PART) assessments were grafted onto it. It is now a 38-page maze of assessments divided by funding streams rather than integrated by program area. Some performance indicators are only indirectly influenced by the bureau's activities, or they measure activities incidental to the bureau's main goals. Many performance goals are process-oriented, not impact related. A few performance indicators are dependent upon continued bureau funding. Bureau personnel invested significant time in the PART process and were disappointed not to see a closer link between performance and resource allocation. Although all five of the bureau's programs that were subject to PART received OMB's highest rating of effective, funding for three of the programs was reduced.

Given the current BPP's unsuitability as a strategic or program planning tool, it is no surprise that bureau personnel rarely refer to it. But they do extensively incorporate performance measurements into their work, as noted in the section on monitoring and evaluation. Even though the PART process is moving to a separate application, the bureau will not be able to draft a more coherent BPP for FY 2008 because it must retain the five PART programs. If PRM is required to maintain discrete PART programs in its BPP rather than integrating them into cohesive program areas, PRM's BPP will not serve as a vehicle for either strategic or program

planning. Although the bureau reaps little direct benefit from the significant amount of time and energy it devotes to preparing the BPP, the Bureau of Resource Management mines PRM's BPP to document achievements, support budgetary submissions, and for joint performance planning with USAID. However, it stands to reason that the BPP should be able to meet bureau needs as well. Following the on-site inspection, the Bureau of Resource Management informed OIG that it is already working with PRM to improve the BPP's usability. However, OMB requires that PART be meaningfully reflected within the BPP in accordance with the President's Management Agenda's Budget and Performance Integration Initiative. PRM in addition to a serviceable BPP needs to strengthen its capacity for strategic planning, as described in the Executive Direction section, to respond successfully to the challenges confronting it.

Recommendation 5: The Bureau of Resource Management should take steps to improve the usability of the Bureau Performance Plan for the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration's strategic and program planning. (Action: RM, in coordination with PRM)

Use of Intelligence

As part of the effort to strengthen its capacity for strategic planning, PRM could make more use of intelligence to project future needs, improve forecasting, and enhance emergency response planning. The Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) assigns a full-time analyst to support PRM and provides it with a daily intelligence briefing. However, except during actual crises PRM makes little use of this information. It could use intelligence information to inform its long-range planning in order to link its budget requests more tightly to anticipated future trends and problems. PRM officials also do not take sufficient advantage of the Humanitarian Information Unit. This \$1 million program, launched in 2004, was intended to speed responses to humanitarian crises by compiling in advance the kind of information that would be urgently needed by PRM and others in an emergency.

A key difficulty faced by the bureau in making better use of intelligence is the location of its action offices in SA-1. Busy officers find it impractical to visit INR to read available information, while INR cannot distribute information to the bureau electronically unless it is unbundled from other, more highly classified intelligence. OIG discussed with INR potential solutions to this problem.

Recommendation 6: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, should identify and implement ways to distribute needed intelligence information more effectively. (Action: PRM, in coordination with INR)

Emergency Response

The bureau has been designated the Department's focal point for responding to humanitarian emergencies. OIG observed that program officers appear to be effective in tracking situations that could deteriorate into crises. The bureau has also quickly deployed personnel to USAID-led disaster assistance relief teams in Iraq and Afghanistan. But the bureau may not be as ready to handle a humanitarian crisis as it should be. Program officers noted to OIG that during past crises there has been confusion as to the roles of PRM's regional offices and PRP. The bureau has since issued guidance to clarify that regional offices have the lead. The bureau has not fully implemented some of the mechanisms outlined in its March 2004 policy paper on emergency response. Specifically, the bureau's roster of staff available to serve on emergency teams is out of date. Few bureau employees have received the training needed, including field experience in noncrisis situations, to deploy effectively in an emergency. This could be critical given that several key experienced emergency response officers recently left the bureau. PRM's emergency response policy team is updating the policy paper on emergency response. OIG suggested that PRM develop and implement a training plan to ensure that sufficient bureau staff have the requisite training and experience to be effective when called upon to deploy during an emergency. Because of staffing ramifications, this training plan should be formulated in close coordination with the bureau's executive office (EX).

PRM also has had difficulty getting funding out quickly in the case of emergencies. PRM moves relatively quickly to request ERMA funds; but months can pass by the time the funds are approved, proposals solicited, and funding awarded. For example, after the October 8, 2005 earthquake in Pakistan that affected refugees, PRM was not able to provide funding to UNHCR until December, or fund NGO proposals until February. OIG informally recommended that PRM review its procedures to speed approval of ERMA requests and disbursements.

ADMISSIONS

The Office of Admissions is responsible for setting policies and priorities and proposing numerical allocations of refugees to be admitted to the United States. Each year the President determines the admissions numbers after PRM's consultations with UNHCR, Congress, NGOs, and state and local governments. PRM presents an annual refugee admissions report to Congress. The office manages the processing of refugees through Overseas Processing Entities, IOs, and embassies. It manages the reception and placement of refugees in the United States through NGOs.

In FY 2005, PRM admitted 53,813 refugees from 55 nations. Refugee admissions programs accounted for \$172 million of appropriated funds or 17 percent of PRM's budget. (There is a difference between those desiring to enter the United States as refugees and those already in the United States who seek asylum. Overall, DHS uses the same criteria to determine whether a person qualifies for permanent admission to the United States as a refugee or an asylee. DRL processes requests for information for use by DHS in adjudicating asylum claims. DRL's handling of these information requests was part of a separate OIG inspection in 2003.)

While the refugee advocacy community's view of PRM has improved considerably, many NGOs involved in refugee resettlement still believe PRM is not sufficiently aggressive in finding new refugee groups and helping to open doors for their admission. OIG did not find this to be true. The massive inflow of Indochinese and Soviet refugees began to abate in the 1990's resulting in a drop in numbers from 140,000 in FY 1993 to 69,000 in FY 2001. PRM redirected its efforts to many smaller groups of refugees located in remote and shifting locations. September 11, 2001, brought into effect stringent new security measures. This caused a sharp two-year drop in refugee admissions (27,000 in FY 2002 and 28,000 in FY 2003) as the U.S. government implemented and streamlined the new security systems. By 2004, through hard work and long hours, PRM had enabled the U.S. refugee admissions program to regain momentum and efficiently process and admit over 52,000 refugees.

PRM is successfully using its resources and those of its partners to develop new caseloads. PRM and NGOs meet frequently to discuss candidate groups for refugee admission. To strengthen UNHCR's capacity to identify and annually refer 25,000 refugees for resettlement, Department funding supports resettlement positions at UNHCR field offices. PRM organizes regional training workshops overseas for NGO humanitarian assistance workers on how to identify and refer

refugees in need of resettlement. PRM uses targeted response teams comprised of UNHCR, DHS, and NGO staff for field visits to locations overseas to investigate the characteristics of groups of refugees that might qualify for admission.

The refugee admissions program will be significantly improved this year by the formation of a Refugee Corps within the DHS - a cadre of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service officers dedicated to adjudicating applications for refugee status. They will be based in the United States but travel 50 percent of the year and will ensure the consistency and quality of refugee interviews.

There are constraints on PRM's ability to decide who and how many can be resettled. The decision on whether a particular population should be eligible to resettle in the United States often needs to be weighed against other solutions such as repatriation or local integration. There is usually a lack of alignment between the estimated number of refugees that can realistically be admitted and the amount of money appropriated by Congress. DHS, not PRM, makes the final decision on who meets the legal definition of a refugee. OIG commended the bureau for commissioning a report to provide it with an outside view of the admissions process and the bureau's management of it.

As noted in the Context section, the interpretation of the "material support to terrorists" provision of the Real ID Act of 2005 could make inadmissible many refugee groups that PRM has identified for resettlement in FY 2006 and who are already in the processing pipeline. PRM and DHS are working urgently to determine whether to use exception authority for a specific group. This requires that three separate components within DHS agree, which does not happen easily, as well as the concurrence of the Department of Justice. PRM has engaged Department of State principals and NSC staff to push for policy consensus. If none is reached soon, 46,000 refugees instead of the planned 54,000 will arrive in FY 2006.

The pace of refugee admissions varies significantly over the course of the year, with a large bulge occurring during the last quarter of the fiscal year. This so-called September bulge strains the capacities of organizations responsible for processing and resettling refugees in the United States and adds costs to the admissions program.

PRM is subject to pressures to meet what many see as an annual admissions goal. The pressures are in large measure a consequence of the annualization of the admissions program. For most NGOs in the refugee assistance community, as well as many in Congress, the number of admissions established by the annual Presiden-

tial Determination is regarded not as a ceiling but a goal. As the year evolves, pressure increases to meet this goal or, at minimum, exceed the previous year's admissions numbers. PRM has internalized these pressures and judges its success on the same basis. The long-standing tension over whether to regard the Presidential Determination as a ceiling or a goal is reflected in PRM's own discussions and documents. The bureau's BPP variously employs both terms.

Other factors contribute to the uneven flow of admissions. By law, no refugee may enter the United States until the President has signed the Presidential Determination for that fiscal year, but sometimes the signing is delayed. The problem can be compounded by the time it takes to complete subsequent actions, such as Congressional supplemental appropriations. This contributes to a slow start of the program at the beginning of the year. The combined effect is a messy rush at the end of the fiscal year to admit as many refugees as possible, and to make up for time lost in the first quarter. The uneven cycle also increases the cost of admissions processing. To ensure that refugees arrive before the September 30 deadline, PRM sometimes resorts to the use of charter flights. The DHS interview schedule is compressed which makes for an inefficient use of resources. The overseas and domestic NGOs are also obliged to compress their work to accommodate the uneven flow, and the refugees arrive in clumps making it difficult to resettle them efficiently.

The most critical factors contributing to this situation are beyond PRM's control. The President's budget request is made two years before the Presidential Determination. The annualization of the admissions process is enshrined in the Refugee Act of 1980, and there is no likelihood that this will change. Nor will there be a change in the pressures from well-intentioned NGO and political constituencies who drive the push to admit as many refugees as possible. An adjustment in the calendar of actions that would allow the Presidential Determination to be issued well before the start of the new fiscal year would help. But this would have to be negotiated with both the White House and the key Congressional committees involved. Nevertheless, PRM needs to explore ways in which the flow of admissions can be improved and money saved.

Recommendation 7: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should examine the actions that it can take to mitigate the significant fluctuation that presently occurs in the admissions cycle and should initiate a dialogue with the White House and the Congress on other actions that might be taken with their concurrence. (Action: PRM)

MIGRATION

As the focal point within the U.S. government for global migration issues and multilateral coordination of international migration programs, PRM is on the cutting edge in many critical areas of migration policy. The number of people residing outside of their country of birth has more than doubled since 1975, to over 175 million people, three percent of the world's population. The United Nations estimates that within 50 years, the populations of almost all European countries and Japan will be aging or actually declining, increasing pressures for replacement migration. Recent initiatives at the United Nations and other international fora demonstrate the heightened importance of migration issues. In 2003, the UN Secretary-General identified migration as a priority issue, proposing that the United Nations form a single agency to protect the rights of migrants and to promote shared interests in migration. Although that has not come to pass, various UN bodies have within the last few years adopted conventions relating to migration. Some of these, like the convention on migrant workers, advance rights-based approaches that the United States has traditionally opposed.

PRM is responsible for promoting U.S. policy to support legal migration, oppose uncontrolled migration, encourage the rapid integration of legal migrants, and understand the root causes of migration. The bureau's primary focus is on protection of migrants. It participates in the broader debate on migration through its primary migration partner, the International Organization for Migration as well as in international, regional, and country-specific fora. PRM also plays an important role in protecting and assisting victims of trafficking.

All indications are that UN activity on migration issues will continue to grow. Several outside experts told OIG that they believe the United States needs to be more actively engaged in efforts to shape international migration policy. The bureau's three-person migration team is lodged in PRP based on the expertise of PRP's previous office directors. There is, however, little overlap with other PRP staff on migration issues. The team reports not to the PDAS, as does the rest of PRP, but to a DAS. The team believes that the budget for migration issues has suffered because it does not have its own advocate. It is not clear to program offices what falls within the migration team's mandate and what falls within the mandates of the regional assistance offices.

OIG believes that the most logical place to move the migration team would be to POP. POP works extensively with many of the same UN contacts who are becoming increasingly active in migration issues. Much of the current migration debate focuses on development, demographic, and migrants' rights issues, some of

which are currently handled in POP. There is so much potential synergy that the bureau might be able to reduce one position from a combined population/migration office. Adding the migration team to POP may require Congressional consultations due to the concerns expressed when population issues were added to PRM's portfolio in 1993.

Recommendation 8: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and implement a plan to move the migration team from the Office of Policy and Resource Planning to the Population Policy Unit. (Action: PRM)

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY/PUBLIC AFFAIRS

There is a widespread perception, both within the bureau and throughout the humanitarian affairs community, that PRM has a good story to tell -- but has not been telling it. In short, the public communications capabilities of both PRM and the offices associated with the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs are not fully employed to back up and advance the bureau's humanitarian activities. PRM's separate funding stream (i.e., the MRA appropriation, rather than Commerce-State-Justice) means that funding for the bureau's public communications efforts is not provided by - and hence not fully coordinated with - the offices associated with the Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs. As could be expected, the bureau's public profile slipped while there was no Assistant Secretary in place; a vacancy in MCE's external affairs unit was a further complication; and the bureau's web site has received limited attention. As a result, international audiences have heard too little of the U.S. government's leading role in humanitarian work, and PRM's programs have not benefited from greater U.S. public understanding and support.

PRM has put together a one-page outline for a comprehensive public communication plan for FY 2006, to be reviewed by the new Assistant Secretary. The goals of the plan are to maximize the public impact of PRM-funded U.S. humanitarian assistance, to spotlight refugee-population-migration issues, and to build linkages with humanitarian organizations. On the public affairs side, the domestic audiences are Congress, NGOs and advocacy groups, and the interested public. On the public diplomacy side, they include IOs, the international public, and refugee and host country populations. Targets of opportunity include World Refugee Day (June 20) and the Department's annual admissions report; and there are numerous

potential spokespersons -- the bureau's Assistant Secretary and DASs, U.S. ambassadors and public affairs officers abroad, refugee coordinators, and program officers. Several observers pointed out to OIG that in certain conflictive areas, PRM's message and its delivery mechanisms would need to be carefully fashioned to take into account local sensitivities.

Recommendation 9: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, should establish a comprehensive multiyear public communications plan in consultation with the regional bureaus. (Action: PRM, in coordination with R)

CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

Like many other bureaus, PRM maintains an in-house legislative liaison capacity because the Bureau of Legislative Affairs cannot support its specialized legislative needs. The Bureau of Legislative Affairs does not devote a full-time legislative management officer to PRM. Congressional liaison work at bureau level grew when the Office of the Legal Adviser determined in 2004 that replies to Congressional inquiries on the status of refugee cases had to be conveyed primarily in writing to protect privacy. PRM answers over 1,000 such inquiries every year.

The bureau has experimented with a number of approaches to Congressional work. Its current arrangement places the responsibility for dealing with appropriations committees in PRP. Responsibility for all other Congressional work, including preparing testimony and coordinating required reports, remains with MCE. This approach allows the bureau to respond with special promptness to concerns expressed by members of committees that appropriate its funds. Congressional staffers gave the bureau higher marks for responsiveness than for coordination. Program officers must check with two separate offices to ensure that they have a full understanding of Congressional concerns. OIG found that the division of responsibility for Congressional work between two offices reduces both coordination and accountability.

Recommendation 10: The Bureau of Population, Refugee and Migration Affairs should combine its Congressional liaison functions in a single office. (Action: PRM)

POLICY COORDINATION AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

POLICY AND PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE PROCESS

OIG found much to praise in the bureau's PPRC process used to coordinate policy and funding decisions and document the bureau's decision-making process. It is comprehensive, seeks to take advantage of the extensive personal expertise in the bureau and secure buy-in for difficult funding decisions, and enhances policy and program consistency. But as currently employed, it is exceedingly time consuming.

PRP manages the PPRC process, which is centered around 19 sets of regional, organizational, and functional policy issues. A program officer is responsible for developing policy decision papers in coordination with the policy team that supports that set of policy issues. Each policy team includes representatives from almost every PRM office. Policy decision papers are reviewed at weekly PPRC meetings, in which any bureau employee may participate. After the Assistant Secretary approves the policy decision paper, program officers design programs to implement the strategy, solicit and review program proposals, and then write a project implementation paper describing the proposed programming. Once the Assistant Secretary endorses the project implementation paper, the bureau implements the approved programming.

PRM has taken the steps recommended in the 1995 inspection report to fine-tune the PPRC process. Within the past year, PRP refined the PPRC process still further by conducting a survey of bureau needs, holding a PPRC meeting on the PPRC process, and issuing revised PPRC guidance in March 2006. This guidance, also aimed at increasing monitoring and evaluation, includes dozens of detailed pages on the PPRC process, including templates for each step.

However, these recent refinements will ease the burden of the PPRC process only slightly, if at all. As in 1995, OIG found that at times, PPRC discussion focuses on minutiae that could be handled through the policy team clearance

process without requiring a meeting of all of the committee members. OIG identified a number of steps the bureau can take to reduce the time needed for the PPRC process by as much as half while preserving and perhaps even enhancing its benefits. These steps would essentially return the time of a number of full-time personnel to the bureau.

- Make drafting offices take responsibility for quality control by requiring that they, and not PRP, send the policy decision and project implementation papers to the front office, copying PRP so that PRP is able to remain the PPRC paper repository. Ideally, papers would be transmitted electronically.
- Streamline policy teams by allowing offices to determine on which policy teams they need to be actively involved and not participating in the rest. If an issue arises that the policy team recognizes will require the office's input, the policy team will flag the issue for the office's consideration.
- Empower policy teams members to represent the full views of their respective offices and ensure that each policy decision paper that is circulated represents a finished product for the Assistant Secretary. When office directors present critical views and line-in, line-out edits at the PPRC meeting, the policy teams and the papers are deprived of the office directors' valuable input when it is most needed, and PPRC meetings turn into high-level drafting sessions. This empowerment will have the side benefit of developing program officers.
- Impose more discipline on the clearance process. When policy team members convey comments from their respective offices, they need to specify which comments must be accepted or there will be a split paper, which comments should be accepted so that the paper is consistent with bureau policy, and which comments are merely suggestions. Policy team members must provide their office's feedback by the deadline so that the drafter can incorporate it into the paper.
- Reduce attendance at PPRCs to the drafting office and those offices with legitimate interests or concerns.
- When the policy team has consensus, consider having the Assistant Secretary approve the policy decision paper without convening a PPRC meeting.
- Flag to the front office when a policy team is deadlocked so that the front office has the opportunity to provide guidance.

- Reduce policy decision papers to a maximum of three pages and project implementation papers to a maximum of two pages. Even though bureau guidelines restrict policy decision papers to 10 pages plus annexes, OIG observed that most are a cumbersome 20 to 30 pages long, and one was a tortuous 100 pages. The front office should inform PRP what information it needs to approve a paper and what information merits inclusion in an annex.
- Encourage offices to consolidate project implementation papers whenever possible.
- Because OIG learned of no instances when a project implementation paper for a new partner or program was significantly changed during a PPRC meeting, approve all project implementation papers that have policy team consensus through the no-meeting process.

Recommendation 11: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and implement a plan to reduce significantly the amount of time bureau employees spend on the Policy and Program Review Committee process. (Action: PRM)

PRP maintains paper files with all of the PPRC documentation and has partial electronic files. OIG informally recommended that PRP make all of the PPRCs available electronically. PRP also produces a weekly e-mail summary for bureau personnel of PPRC actions taken by the front office. OIG also suggested that PRP consider instead compiling a spreadsheet of these actions to save PRP time and to provide bureau personnel with a more easy reference to what actions occurred on a given PPRC.

MANAGEMENT OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

PRM disbursed \$974 million of federal financial assistance in FY 2005. Approximately \$739 million of this assistance was in the form of assessed and voluntary contributions to IOs. Federal and Department regulations do not require that bureaus conclude agreements for contributions. However, to PRM's credit, it signs a framework agreement with two of its funded IOs to ensure program clarity. PRM's program officers and refugee coordinators are in continuous contact with IOs to ensure that the funds are being spent as the organization agreed and that

performance indicators are being met. PRM awarded the remaining \$235 million as grants and cooperative agreements (hereafter referred to as grants) to over 40 NGOs. The bureau manages the post-award portion of its federal financial assistance for NGOs well. However, its management of the pre-award process is inconsistent.

Program Design

After the PPRC establishes policy and overall funding guidelines, the program office develops a plan to execute the PPRC's decisions. MCE announces broad program guidance outlining general requirements for NGOs each year. Each program office is responsible for drafting NGO guidance for its programs. Not all program officers consult with refugee coordinators when developing performance measures. These two sets of guidance provide interested NGOs with most of the information the organizations need to prepare a proposal. However, neither set includes a description of the selection process or the award selection criteria that the bureau will use to evaluate their proposals, as required by Grants Policy Directive 5. PRM has not established a bureau-wide procedure for assessing NGO proposals. Instead, each program office develops its own selection criteria; sometimes after NGO proposals have been received. In at least one instance, a senior manager used a separate set of selection criteria and chose a different NGO than the one recommended by the selection panel. The bureau has not yet enforced the common evaluation criteria recommended in its NGO funding policy memorandum, dated February 13, 2006. The selection process is not transparent and, without common published criteria, there is no assurance that the bureau consistently selects the best NGO to carry out a given project.

Recommendation 12: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish common criteria to be used in evaluating proposals and procedures to ensure that each advertisement of federal assistance availability contains award selection criteria. (Action: PRM)

Advertising Assistance Availability

PRM has not consistently followed Department or U.S. government policies that require applications for federal assistance to be solicited in a manner that provides for competition. In Grants Policy Directive 5, the Office of the Procurement Executive (A/OPE) requires that the awarding bureau advertise the availability of federal assistance in the Federal Register, the Commerce Business Daily,

newspapers, trade journals, or similar means of publicity. PRM has not used any of these publications to advertise its funding announcements as it was relying on 22 Code of Federal Regulations Part 145, the Department's implementation of OMB circular A-110, that indicates these rules do not apply to overseas activities. As of 2003, the OMB has required that government agencies solicit competition by posting grant opportunities on a U.S. government web site called grants.gov. The bureau's FY 2005 and 2006 NGO funding policies for overseas assistance instructed program officers to post funding opportunities on grants.gov. But PRM has not yet fully complied, noting that it was unaware that the 2003 OMB policy directive on the use of grants.gov supercedes OMB circular A-110. The grants specialist responsible for overseeing implementation of the program estimates that only half of all grant opportunities were published on grants.gov in FY 2005. Of the 17 agreements that PRM has signed in FY 2006, only 10 were advertised on grants.gov. Most frequently, program offices post funding opportunities on the PRM's web site and notify associations of NGOs.

OIG learned that in several cases, the grant opportunity was not publicized, and the program office asked the organization holding the current cooperative agreement to submit a proposal. PRM did not justify in writing these noncompetitive assistance awards, as required by the Grants Policy Directive. OIG noted that the majority of the bureau's active cooperative agreements are awarded to the same organization that held the preceding agreement. In many cases, the same organization has performed the same work for 15 years.

Recommendation 13: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish policies and procedures to ensure that grants and cooperative agreements are advertised and that noncompetitive awards are justified in writing. (Action: PRM)

Convening Selection Panels

The bureau does not have standard procedures for convening panels to review NGO proposals. Each office has its own procedures. OIG reviewed program offices' notes of several past panels and found the documentation of the decision making process to be adequate. The panels reviewed included participants from other PRM offices and even from other agencies. The bureau has a well-established practice of funding the same partners. Bureau officers universally expressed to OIG that they trust PRM's implementers. To help the bureau make more objective

decisions on funding, OIG suggested that it implement its own proposal to establish a common procedure to use outside experts on selection panels.

Securing Project Implementation Approval

The program officer, often in conjunction with a selection panel, decides on a project or projects to implement part or all of the policy decision paper. The program officer then drafts a project implementation paper, as described in the section of the report on the Policy and Program Review Committee. Once the Assistant Secretary approves the project implementation paper, the project is ready to be awarded.

Grant Awards

OIG found that not all of PRM's program officers are performing their grant responsibilities as required by Departmental grants directives. The Department's grants policy guidance provides for a larger role for grants officers in the preaward process than the grants officers now play. Grants Policy Directive 16 specifies that grants officers are responsible for the administration of grants but may delegate some responsibilities to qualified personnel by designating them as grants officer representatives. PRM's grants officers have not appointed any grants officer representatives because they believe that program officers understand their grant responsibilities without the need for a written delegation of authority. A/OPE has approved this practice. Nonetheless, grants officers still must assist program officers in preparing grant advertisements, issuing requests for proposals, notifying unsuccessful applicants, and approving noncompetitive awards. PRM grants officers perform none of these functions. The oversights in the preaward process identified above can be partially attributed to the fact that the bureau divides management of its federal assistance program between program officers working in the regional assistance offices, MCE and PRP, and warranted grants officers in the Office of the Comptroller. Their respective responsibilities have not been specified in writing.

Recommendation 14: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish and publish written guidance on the role and responsibilities of grants officers during the preaward phase of the grants issuance process. (Action: PRM)

Federal Assistance Documentation

OIG found that the bureau's official federal assistance files are incomplete. As described in Grants Policy Directive 23, the federal assistance files should contain all required documentation supporting the issuance and administration of each assistance award. The bureau's official assistance files, which are kept by grants officers in the Office of the Comptroller, contain only information on the Office of the Comptroller's post-award activities. Program offices maintain files on preaward activities, but OIG could not determine if the bureau is retaining essential information because program files that OIG spot-checked were incomplete. PRM grants officers do not use the federal assistance file folder that became mandatory for all grants as of October 2003. The file folder, a checklist of information needed for each grant, would help grants officers administer the federal assistance program.

Recommendation 15: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should design and implement procedures to ensure that its federal financial assistance files contain all the required documentation to support the issuance and administration of each grant and cooperative agreement. (Action: PRM)

The bureau needs a grants management system to track federal financial assistance from award, obligation, and payment to closeout and recovery of funds. Grants officers now maintain individual spreadsheets to record vital grants data, an inefficient way of doing business. PRM program offices use Abacus, an off-the-shelf project tracking system developed by USAID, which contains some grants data. OIG found that it provided very little useful information on grants management. Abacus could not, for example, identify those grants that were awarded competitively. A/OPE is developing with USAID a joint assistance management system (JAMS) that PRM grants officers believe will meet their needs. PRM has participated extensively in the development of this system that will be tested in some bureaus during FY 2006, with full system deployment expected in FY 2007. The JAMS project manager has examined Abacus to determine if it duplicates any functions of JAMS. A report of his findings was expected to be published after the inspection.

Closing-out Federal Assistance Awards

Almost all of PRM's grants allow grantees to be reimbursed for indirect administrative costs based on provisional cost rates that are adjusted when a negotiated indirect cost rate is established. Grants Policy Directive 22 assigns responsibility

for negotiating and establishing indirect cost rates for most PRM grants to the International Program Division in the Bureau of Administration's Office of Acquisition Management (A/LM/AQM/IP). Over 300 grants, including almost 60 dating back to 2001, remain open beyond the term of performance because A/LM/AQM/IP or other federal agencies have not determined the final indirect cost rates. PRM leaves funds obligated to expired grants until the responsible U.S. government agency determines the final indirect cost rate to ensure that it can cover any increased costs if the final cost rates are adjusted upward. OIG estimates that approximately \$10 million dollars are committed to open grants from FYs 2001 through 2004. A/LM/AQM/P is responsible for finalizing the indirect cost rates of \$7 million, with USAID and the Department of Health and Human Services responsible for the remaining \$3 million. The bureau will be able to reprogram these funds once the final cost rates are established and total grants costs are known.

Recommendation 16: The Bureau of Administration should establish policies and procedures that will determine punctually indirect cost rates for grants and cooperative agreements awarded by the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration. (Action: A)

Pending the establishment of a final indirect cost rate, PRM should take steps to reduce the funds obligated to its open grants. Indirect cost proposals submitted by the grantee's independent audit firm are usually very close to the final rates negotiated by A/LM/AQM/IP. Using these cost proposals, grants officers should scrutinize the preliminary final financial report that grantee organizations submit after the expiration of an agreement and determine the appropriate level of funds that should remain obligated to the grant to cover residual costs. Unneeded funds should be deobligated and reprogrammed to other bureau projects. OIG estimates that PRM can recover close to \$10 million now committed to these open grants.

Recommendation 17: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in the absence of a final indirect cost rate, should establish procedures to review each expired grant or cooperative agreement upon receipt of the grantee's preliminary final financial report to determine the funding needed for the final closure agreement and to deobligate unneeded funds to make them available for bureau programs. (Action: PRM)

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Program Monitoring and Evaluation

PRM has made substantial progress in improving performance measurement and monitoring and evaluation. The 1995 inspection found that PRM lacked a uniform, written set of standards for program monitoring and evaluation. PRM now has a comprehensive guide to monitoring and evaluation, as well as extensive training materials, including guidance on performance measurement to ascertain the humanitarian impact of its programming. The bureau's progress is also reflected in the scores it has received on OMB's PART assessments. OMB has assessed five of the bureau's programs; all received high marks. PRM's Department, U.S. government, and international contacts told OIG that PRM's programs accomplish their goals. Program results that OIG reviewed corroborate this.

PRM sees a need to continue strengthening the tools it uses to measure humanitarian impact. It notes that it currently puts a disproportionate amount of monitoring and evaluation effort into the initial funding process, as opposed to ongoing program implementation and evaluation of results. PRM, like other assistance agencies, is also being pressed by Congressional oversight committees, OMB, and others to enhance its ability to measure actual program impact, such as improvements in health and nutritional standards for the groups it serves. OIG confirmed that PRM should further strengthen its monitoring and evaluation procedures. It also identified a need for PRM to develop a risk-assessment framework for determining which programs merit closer monitoring and evaluation and which do not. It is reasonable to assume that the actions proposed to enhance the bureau's performance measurement, monitoring, and evaluation capacities will require increases in both staffing and administrative expenses. Once the bureau has implemented the guidelines it is developing for monitoring and evaluating contributions to international organizations and established a framework to appraise how much monitoring and evaluation is called for, it will then be in a position to determine how to modify its monitoring and evaluation standards and adjust procedures. This will, in turn, enable the bureau to determine actual staffing, training, and administrative support requirements.

International Organizations

PRM disburses about 70 percent of its program funds as contributions to large IOs, such as UNHCR, ICRC, IOM and UNRWA. Contributions to UN organizations are not subject to federal monitoring and evaluation requirements, nor are

there specific Department requirements. In 22 CFR 145.2, the Department excludes international organizations such as UN agencies from the definition of a recipient of federal financial assistance subject to the requirements in OMB circular A-110. At OIG's request, the Office of Financial Policy, Reports, and Analysis in the Bureau of Resource Management agreed to change the text of 4 Foreign Affairs Handbook (FAH) 3 H-612.2 to clarify that neither assessed nor voluntary contributions to UN agencies are subject to the federal or Department monitoring and evaluation requirements. However, the Department still strongly recommends that bureaus follow 4 FAH procedures for contributions to international agencies.

Even though it is not required by regulation, PRM has developed various methods to enable it to exercise meaningful oversight of how IOs use U.S. contributions. PRM represents the United States in IO governing bodies and actively participates in their deliberations. It holds regular consultations with IO leadership, and both PRM staff in Washington and the U.S. Mission in Geneva engage daily with IO representatives. PRM has used these fora to advance U.S. humanitarian policies and to promote the strengthening of program management and internal controls. It has, for example, worked successfully to improve the quality of IO reporting systems. PRM has addressed issues identified in the 1995 report to improve monitoring and evaluation of contributions to international organizations. The United Nations now makes public biennial reports from the UN board of auditors. The United Nations also provides an annual report on the status of corrective actions it has taken on audit recommendations. PRM's BPP includes a performance indicator that by FY 2008, UNHCR will address 95 percent of audit report recommendations within one year. The bureau is also working closely with UNHCR to put forth needs-based appeals. UNHCR is no longer understating its carryover balances, thereby overstating its financial needs for the coming year.

The bureau has also signed framework agreements with two of its larger partners and has informal understandings with three others that serve to establish performance benchmarks and provide a foundation for evaluating performance. It can conduct in-depth monitoring and evaluation of field operations. PRM program officers and refugee coordinators visit IO work sites about once each year, often with other international donors, and conduct active desk monitoring. The bureau responds to performance problems as well as conduct issues. For example, when PRM learned of concerns about UNHCR's performance in managing repatriation operations in Burundi, it began pressing in both Geneva and Washington for reform. It also worked closely with UNHCR to investigate allegations of fraud in two field offices.

Because these contributions represent such a significant portion of PRM's program funding, the bureau believes there is a need to further strengthen its oversight of the activities of these organizations. OIG agrees. PRM's monitoring and evaluation policy team is developing guidelines for monitoring and evaluating IO programs, which the policy team leader hopes to complete by the summer of 2006. OIG encourages the bureau to support and implement this effort.

Monitoring and Evaluation Tools

New bureau employees praised the bureau's annual training session, which includes modules on monitoring and evaluation. However, OIG found that some program officers are not applying performance measures and lack the skills needed to evaluate programs effectively. Few program officers find time to attend the ongoing monitoring and evaluation training sessions PRP developed in response to its recent needs-survey of program officers. A common complaint among program officers is that because of other, more pressing demands, monitoring and evaluation tend to fall to the bottom of their list of priorities. OIG recommended that for all program officers and refugee coordinators with responsibility for program oversight, the bureau make applying monitoring and evaluation tools effectively a critical job element for Civil Service officers and a continuing responsibility for FSOs.

Recommendation 18: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should include the ability to apply monitoring and evaluation tools effectively in the annual personnel performance evaluations for all bureau personnel having responsibility for program oversight. (Action: PRM)

Both program officers and refugee coordinators observe that assessing more technical performance measures, such as nutritional and health standards, requires expert skills that they cannot reasonably be expected to acquire. In the past, the bureau has benefited greatly from in-house staff with health expertise. In addition, the bureau can obtain these skills from other sources. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has indicated its willingness to make its experts available to PRM to assist in project monitoring and evaluation; and USAID maintains a list of experts in a variety of areas who can be retained on contract. Accordingly, OIG also recommended that PRM take greater advantage of outside experts, particularly to support refugee coordinators in the field on whom the bureau's primary monitoring and evaluation responsibility rests.

Recommendation 19: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish and implement procedures to use outside expertise for technical monitoring and evaluation needs particularly to support refugee coordinators. (Action: PRM)

Written Evaluations

A FY 2007 BPP PART annual goal aims to increase the percentage of program funding monitored and evaluated by program officers and refugee coordinators from a baseline of 55 percent in FY 2004 to 75 percent in FY 2008. The bureau monitoring and evaluation guidelines set a minimum standard that a refugee coordinator or program officer visit each funded project at least annually and submit a monitoring and evaluation report. As described in the Federal Assistance Management section of the report, the bureau's grant files do not contain sufficient documentation to indicate whether the bureau is following its guidelines for program monitoring and evaluation. Little monitoring and evaluation documentation was found in the program files OIG spot-checked. As a result, OIG was not able to ascertain whether the bureau is meeting its minimum monitoring and evaluation standard.

In addition to site visits, by the end of each project, program officers are responsible for writing an evaluation of performance against the objectives and performance measurements specified in grant agreements. In actuality, most program officers complete program evaluations only if they plan to continue funding the activity into the next year. According to 4 FAH-3 H671, bureau monitoring should ensure that the recipient is meeting the goals included in the grant. Therefore, the bureau needs to ensure that program officers complete project evaluations on every grantee by the end of the grant. OIG encouraged the bureau to implement its plan to use the monitoring and evaluation portlet that it has established on its internal web site as both a repository for and easy reference of evaluation reports.

Recommendation 20: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish procedures to ensure that program officers complete evaluations on programs implemented pursuant to a cooperative agreement or grant. (Action: PRM)

Framework for Assessing Amount of Monitoring and Evaluation Needed

The bureau's monitoring and evaluation guidance manual applies the same standard for all programs as if all programs have the same monitoring and evaluation needs. This is not the case. Larger, more complex and more critical programs, especially those in demanding operating environments, call for more active monitoring than simpler programs in stable operating environments. In recognition of this, officers have created their own methodologies to determine where best to place their monitoring and evaluation efforts. OIG also found that there is considerable variation in the way refugee coordinators conduct program monitoring and evaluation.

- Security restrictions can make it impossible for refugee coordinators or program officers to visit each project annually.
- Even in permissive security environments, some refugee coordinators responsible for sizable programs or large geographic areas reported that they do not have enough time to conduct the annual program monitoring and evaluation the bureau requires. Some program officers believe that even annual visits by the refugee coordinator are not sufficient to permit reliable evaluations.
- A few refugee coordinators feel they do not have the required expertise to monitor the increasingly technical performance measurements PRM is introducing.
- Different program offices have different requirements for grantee program reporting. One office requires quarterly program reporting. The rest require semiannual reporting.
- In at least one case, PRM had such trust in an implementing partner that it was slow to react when it received outside information that performance goals were not being met.

To replace these ad hoc, informal methodologies, the bureau should develop a common framework for determining how much monitoring and evaluation is needed to evaluate a grantee's performance. This framework should incorporate a risk assessment for determining which programs merit the closest attention and when programs are worth executing even if other factors, such as urgency or the

security environment, will not permit close monitoring. Once the framework is established, PRM will be in a position to determine what additional resources may be required to support its monitoring and evaluation efforts.

Recommendation 21: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and begin using a framework to assess how much monitoring and evaluation each program or project needs to permit the bureau to evaluate the performance of recipients of federal assistance. (Action: PRM)

Financial Monitoring and Evaluation

Grants management specialists review the financial reports submitted by grantees for compliance with the assistance agreement and then adjust program and funding instruments as needed. Financial monitoring and evaluation also includes reviewing outside audits of grantees and UN audits of IOs and complying with audit recommendations to the bureau. The Office of the Comptroller recently developed a scorecard to evaluate each grantee's financial performance. Grants management specialists have begun to provide the results of this scorecard to program officers to include in program evaluations. With OIG's encouragement, the Office of the Comptroller refined its procedures to ensure that NGOs submit the required annual outside audits and that grants management specialists address any recommendations contained in these audits. Finally, OIG reviewed grants officers' responses to the recommendations OIG made in three recent audit reports. All recommendations are either closed or resolved.

POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

OFFICE OF POLICY AND RESOURCE PLANNING

As its name suggests, PRP performs the bureau's policy and resource planning. Its core functions currently include: budget planning, formulation, and justification for over \$800 million in appropriations, including liaison with OMB and Congressional appropriations committees; policy development and coordination of policy and programs within the executive branch; strategic planning and performance measurement; overall management of monitoring and evaluation of funded program activities to ensure humanitarian impact and policy consistency; management of the PPRC process; and migration issues. PRP's 12 positions are divided into three units: a budget team, a policy team, and a migration team. The budget and policy teams report to the PDAS while the migration team reports to a DAS.

Over the past two years, the work associated with PRP's core functions has increased considerably. Funding streams and resource justifications have grown in number and complexity. Department and White House planning and reporting requirements are also mounting, particularly the arduous PART process. PRP is also responsible for carrying out the bureau's expanding coordination with USAID. PRM supplements its coordination and funding guidelines with USAID with tri-weekly operational meetings of PRM and USAID program officers. PRP co-chairs these meetings, which OIG observed to be very productive. PRP also coordinates thematic quarterly meetings attended by the bureau's PDAS and USAID's equivalent. Finally, PRP was called upon to provide the programmatic support for the bureau's two-year introduction of the Abacus project tracking software and has been the driving force behind the bureau's progress on developing and implementing performance indicators for monitoring and evaluation.

But in addition to this expansion in PRP's core functions, the front office has relied increasingly on PRP to ensure quality control for bureau products, enforce policy consistency, and to make independent recommendations when there is not consensus on PPRC papers. PRP clears on most products the regional assistance offices send to the front office. As PRP's role has grown, so has the frustration and

resentment of the regional assistance offices over what they view as turf encroachment. As PRP's work has expanded, however, the office has been beset with staffing gaps and personnel changes. PRP's deputy office director has been also performing the functions of acting director for nine months. Five positions have turned over in that time, including the third program assistant in less than two years.

Despite these challenges, PRP's staff has performed very well. Department and interagency contacts gave PRP high marks for its responsiveness, accuracy, and thoroughness. Meeting the demands put upon them has come at a cost. Some personnel are on the verge of burnout. Many are frustrated that the day-to-day grind of taskings and clearances leaves little time for longer-term planning, policy development, and strategic outreach. The able and energetic acting office director manages the office effectively, but she and her staff have been forced to concentrate on getting through their often overwhelming workload.

The Assistant Secretary intends to select a candidate for office director within the next few weeks. Although this will significantly lighten PRP's load, the bureau should take a number of steps to clarify PRP's role to allow PRP to shed its nonessential duties and to concentrate on its core functions, including long-term planning, policy development, and strategic outreach:

- Issue written guidance on PRP's policy role with regard to the regional assistance offices, including on what products PRP needs to clear and what products it does not. The front office should hold program offices, not PRP, responsible for the quality of the documents they produce.
- Assign to the front office the staff assistant functions that PRP, and to a lesser extent MCE, have been performing, such as document quality control, maintaining the PRM central planning log, and the weekly report for the Under Secretary for Global Affairs.
- Clarify the respective policy responsibilities of PRP and MCE. Currently, PRP is responsible for bureau policy development on protection, UN humanitarian reform, IDPs, emergency response, security of humanitarian workers, civil-military relations, post-conflict stabilization, early warning, preventative diplomacy, refugee health, Good Humanitarian Donorship, protracted refugee situations, statelessness, internal migration, and trafficking in persons. OIG believes that the resulting span of responsibility is too great, and that a rebalancing of policy areas between PRP and MCE would permit more effective oversight of these issues. Specifically, security of

humanitarian workers, Good Humanitarian Donorship, and IDPs appear to belong more appropriately in MCE, because all three issues relate directly to MCE's work with the IOs that are principally concerned.

- Conversely, MCE's responsibilities for food, NGO outreach, and Congressional outreach might be more appropriately placed in PRP.
- As discussed in the Information Technology section, hire a part-time employee or contractor to take over Abacus training, ensure program officers know how to use and are taking advantage of its various reports, and verify that the correct information is being input into Abacus.
- As discussed in the Migration section, move the migration team to another office.

Recommendation 22: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should design and implement a plan to delineate clearly policy and coordination responsibilities of all of its policy and assistance offices and revise position descriptions and organizational statements accordingly. (Action: PRM)

With OIG's encouragement, PRP is already taking steps to free up its staff. This includes having only one PRP policy team member clear papers, rather than all four. PRP's acting office director has begun holding daily stand-up meetings with each of PRP's three units to clarify taskings and priorities.

OFFICE OF MULTILATERAL COORDINATION AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS

MCE oversees U.S. policy positions on refugee, migration, and other humanitarian issues in the UN system and in other multilateral organizations; coordinates with other donor governments on those issues; conducts much of the bureau's Congressional relations; and handles public affairs and public diplomacy functions for PRM. In a nutshell, MCE's task is to provide the bureau's big picture message within the Department and to PRM's external partners.

An experienced Senior Executive Service director effectively manages the office as a cohesive team. MCE, with a total staff of 12, comprises two entities. One is a unit for humanitarian institutional affairs, which handles budget and

governance relationships with the intergovernmental organizations (most notably UNHCR and IOM), as well as private international ones (such as ICRC) and key NGO's (including umbrella groups like Interaction). The other unit handles external affairs, addressing PRM's public affairs/diplomacy, and dealing with legislative affairs not related to the budget.

Within the official foreign affairs community, MCE works most closely with the Bureau of International Organizations and USAID. The clearance process flows smoothly, and the Bureau of International Organizations defers to PRM's expertise and judgment on the substance of humanitarian issues. By daily e-mail and phone contacts, MCE is the bureau's primary liaison with the U.S. missions in Geneva, New York, and Brussels.

External partners characterize their relationships with PRM as privileged, multi-tiered, and collaborative. Each views PRM as a key interlocutor on humanitarian issues and principal entry point for contact with the U.S. government. In that connection, MCE receives high marks for its consultation and coordination efforts. With UNHCR, there are monthly Washington meetings on common agenda items, as well as framework meetings prior to the mid-year and end-of-year sessions of UNHCR's governing body, the Standing Committee. Similarly, the bureau PDAS meets regularly with ICRC's representatives in Washington. The NGO members of Interaction gather with PRM monthly, as well as before - and also sometimes after - key UNHCR meetings.

OIG identified significant challenges in several areas that MCE is actively addressing:

- Overlap with PRP. There is a complementarity between MCE and PRP, based upon a natural division of labor. In places, though, PRP has responsibility for multilateral functions that might logically belong more with MCE, as described in the section on PRP. An underlying presumption has been that when matters first arise as broad policy issues they fall to PRP, and when they become more operational (i.e., with programs in the field) responsibilities will shift to MCE. However, in practice, hand-offs have been slow to occur, resulting in portfolio overlaps and duplication of efforts.
- UN reforms. In an effort to improve efficiency and fill gaps, the UN system has recently moved to reform humanitarian coordination. As a result, UNHCR - an agency for which PRM has policy and budget oversight within the U.S. government - has been given international responsibility for provid-

ing assistance to IDPs - the sort of aid that the United States has normally extended through USAID. Further, UNHCR cannot meet this task without additional resources. As described in the Executive Direction section, PRM's leadership is actively looking for ways to mobilize necessary funds.

- Congressional affairs. Responsibility for Congressional work is split between MCE and PRP, with a number of unintended consequences, as described in the section and recommendation on Congressional relations.
- Public affairs/public diplomacy. As described in the section on public affairs/public diplomacy, PRM needs to develop a multiyear public communications plan to ensure that the good story it has to tell gets out.

POPULATION UNIT

PRM has primary responsibility within the Department for population policy. It manages population issues through a separate unit, funded from the Department's diplomatic and consular budget rather than from refugee assistance funds. This approach reflects concerns expressed by Congress when responsibility for population was transferred to PRM in 1993. The bureau has been careful to honor commitments made then that its population work would not detract from its primary focus on assisting refugees.

POP does not manage programs or resources. It maintains relations with the UN Population Fund and takes part in international negotiations that sets norms or expectations in population-related areas. A key responsibility is disseminating policy guidance on these issues, including restrictions on the use of U.S. funds for family planning efforts overseas that involve abortion.

A reluctance on the part of career professionals to work on such politically neuralgic issues has made this office hard to staff. Until recently, positions had been left vacant or been filled by interns. This left the bureau unable to play an effective role in interagency deliberations. Domestic agencies were left without sufficient guidance on the international aspects of population issues, inadvertently damaging U.S. foreign policy interests that were collateral to the issues themselves.

PRM has made great progress in regaining its lead role on international population issues. An energetic new POP director has restored a level of trust between professionals and political appointees by insisting on the need for disciplined and

apolitical advice from civil servants to the government of the day, regardless of their private views. This approach has reduced suspicion and is beginning to improve morale. It enabled PRM to defend U.S. policies on population more effectively in international forums, and at a lower cost in other, trade-off issues.

Unlike other offices in PRM, POP lacks straightforward, written policy guidelines. The bureau did not prepare a PPRC policy decision paper on population or approve an annual plan of action. Even minor issues are referred to the front office for ad hoc decisions and too often receive a verbal or informal answer. This approach has left the office without an adequate record of its policy actions and accomplishments and made it difficult to empower staff. No official files have been retired in years.

While recently expanded to include a demographic research capability, POP remains too small to meet Department-wide requirements for a separate office. An FS-2 position in the office with no supervisory responsibilities is described in recruiting efforts as a deputy director with responsibility for supervision, a misleading description for potential bidders. OIG suggested that the bureau redesign or redesignate POP, bringing its composition, size, and titles into line with Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM) requirements as described in 1 FAM 014. Alternatively, this problem will be remedied when the bureau implements OIG's recommendation to move two members of the migration team from PRP to POP and convert one of the POP positions to migration.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANCE FOR EUROPE, CENTRAL ASIA, AND AMERICAS

A single office manages refugee assistance projects in Europe, Central Asia, and the Americas. Its size has varied greatly in the last few years to deal with changing workloads, in particular the easing of refugee flows in the Balkans, instability in Central Asia, and the assumption of new responsibilities in the Caribbean. An experienced FSO and his Civil Service deputy effectively manage the office. Both devote an important part of their management efforts to developing a staff that is talented but relatively new to their portfolios.

Balkan issues continue to require attention. The return of Serb and other displaced persons remains a sensitive issue as negotiations on the final status of Kosovo get underway. Reintegrating refugees is also important to the stability of several fragile new democracies in former Yugoslavia. Overall, however, the need

for refugee assistance in Europe has eased from its peak in 1999. PRM requested \$14 million for the Balkans in FY 2006, down from \$21 million in FY 2004. The bureau was able to eliminate a full-time refugee position in Kosovo, as well as one in the Caucasus.

PRM stopped funding NGO activities in Central Asia at the end of 2002. With only 37,000 refugees registered with UNHCR, the region is a low priority within the bureau for assistance programs. Since then, the office has focused on policy rather than program work in Central Asia. When violent protests broke out in Uzbekistan in 2005 that compelled some Uzbeks to flee the country, PRM concentrated on pressing governments not to force Uzbek protesters back across the border rather than on funding camps to house them. This is labor-intensive work, requiring close coordination with DRL and the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. OIG concurred with PRM's reluctance to reduce the staff resources it devotes to this task, in part because reports from UNHCR list Central Asia as the area most likely to produce a major new refugee crisis in the next few years.

Guantanamo Migrant Operations Center

In 2002, an executive order transferred responsibility to the Department for the Migrant Operations Center at Guantanamo Naval Base, Cuba. This center is not related to the military detention prison at Guantanamo. It houses migrants from Haiti, Cuba, and other countries who are rescued at sea by the U.S. Navy or Coast Guard while they are considered for resettlement.

PRM has outsourced day-to-day management of the center to IOM. A review of IOM's performance at the end of FY 2005 revealed no problems with this approach. However, the bureau has not assigned permanent personnel to handle the additional policy work created by the new responsibility - especially the important work of finding countries to accept the migrants for resettlement. Most of this work has fallen on two retired FSOs on WAE assignments. This has provided necessary expertise for the short run but is not a permanent solution, because restrictions on the number of hours WAEs may work create too many gaps in coverage. OIG suggested that the bureau create a full-time position to carry out this work. After the inspection, the bureau included funding for this position in its draft FY 2008 budget request.

The U.S. government is not sufficiently prepared to deal with a potential migrant crisis in the Caribbean arising from sudden political or security changes in Haiti or Cuba. PRM coordinates current migrant operations closely with the Department of Defense and DHS. However, planning for how these agencies

would cooperate if a crisis sent a sudden wave of Caribbean migrants toward the United States is stalled by interagency disagreements. As a result, the roles and funding responsibilities of agencies have not been defined and agreed on, and sufficient facilities at Guantanamo have not been prepared.

Recommendation 23: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs and the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, should prepare an action memo for the Secretary requesting guidance from the National Security Council on the role the Department of State should play in a potential migrant crisis in the Caribbean. (Action: PRM, in coordination with PM and WHA)

Colombia

PRM's largest program in the Western Hemisphere is in Colombia. It is focused not on refugees, but on people internally displaced by the country's civil war. Agency responsibilities are less clear in the case of IDPs than in the case of refugees who cross an international border. Despite this, PRM and USAID have cooperated closely on the program. PRM efforts focus on immediate needs and USAID programs on the longer term.

Funding has been more problematical. PRM partly funds the program using counternarcotics money transferred to it by the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL) in accordance with Congressional earmarks. These transfers have experienced some confusion. PRM did not request a transfer of funds from INL for FY 2007 in the belief that OMB and Congress would agree to finance the entire program out of refugee appropriations. When that did not happen, the bureau was left without sufficient funding to allow it to both contribute its traditional 25 percent to UNHCR and to continue NGO programs at their current level. As a result, the bureau is faced with difficult funding decisions, including the possibility of terminating its NGO programs in Colombia at the end of FY 2006. Reporting from Embassy Bogotá suggests that the problem of IDPs in Colombia may continue for some time. New displacements continue at the rate of 300,000 a year. Cutting PRM's program back significantly will create important new burdens for USAID and complicate INL's drug eradication efforts.

Recommendation 24: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, should develop a written plan with the U.S. Agency for International Development to identify alternative funding sources for programs that assist internally displaced persons in Colombia. (Action: PRM, in coordination with INL)

Program Management

Most officers devote the bulk of their time to policy and diplomatic work rather than to managing programs. The policy work involves designing programs to address refugee disasters, while the diplomatic work is aimed at underlying causes of such problems. Both are rightly treated as more urgent (though not necessarily more important) than the need to monitor and evaluate existing programs.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANCE FOR ASIA AND NEAR EAST

ANE handles policy and assistance programs for nine million refugees and persons of concern in the Middle East, South Asia, and East Asia. It managed \$315 million in programs in FY 2005. The office is involved in several high profile and politically sensitive issues affecting Iraqi, Afghani, Palestinian, and North Korean populations of PRM concern.

A Foreign Service director with Near East expertise and his Civil Service deputy effectively manage a team of dedicated Civil Service and Foreign Service personnel. The office understands its role within the bureau and works constructively with Department and external partners on policy and program-related issues affecting the office's region of responsibility. Department partners compliment the office on its cooperation and coordination activities as well as the knowledge and expertise of its staff members. External partners emphasize ANE's responsiveness and open communication.

ANE officers spend most of their time on time-sensitive policy work. But they cannot manage their programs the way they would like due to the demands of the policy PPRC process. Program officers communicate regularly with their partners and with the five refugee coordinators in Amman, Baghdad, Bangkok, Islamabad, and Kabul. ANE works well with the Office of Admissions on overlapping

programs affecting populations of mutual concern. Ambiguities in the division between PRP's policy role and that of the assistance offices in region-specific matters creates occasional but unnecessary friction.

OIG identified a lack of clarity in internal clearance procedures in ANE. However, during the inspection, the office issued written guidance to staff to clarify the process.

OIG concluded that ANE has one too many officers for its current workload. One-and-a-half program officer positions cover Iraq, two officers handle Afghanistan, and one-and-a-half officer positions are responsible for Palestinian refugees. The office also has three full-time officers responsible for smaller refugee populations in South and East Asia (Burmese, Bhutanese, Tibetan, Lao, Vietnamese, and North Korean). These smaller groups represent a fraction of the refugee populations and program funding in ANE's total portfolio. As such, they do not require three full time positions.

Recommendation 25: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should transfer one full-time position from the Office of Assistance for Asia and Near East to a higher priority need elsewhere in the bureau. (Action: PRM)

Iraq

To support larger U.S. policy objectives, PRM programs in Iraq target refugees returning to Iraq, Iraqis in neighboring countries, foreign refugee populations inside Iraq, and capacity building for the Ministry of Displacement and Migration. PRM also administers the transfer of funds to IOM for the \$3.1 million Iraq Property Claims Commission program, which is managed by the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs (NEA) and overseen by the Iraq Reconstruction Management Office. PRM had \$58 million in FY 2005 of Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF) for these programs. After Congress cut-off further IRRF funding in FY 2006, the bureau scrambled to obtain some IRRF funding from NEA. It will have approximately \$32 million for Iraq programs in FY 2006. PRM contributes to mandatory Department reports to Congress on how IRRF funds are being spent.

ANE devotes considerable time to two sensitive programs in Iraq. In FY 2005, PRM fully funded a \$9.6 million UNHCR program to relocate about 3,000 Iranian Kurds within Iraq. This program was more expensive per person than similar PRM

non-Iraq projects because of security concerns and the need to provide housing consistent with what PRM is funding elsewhere in Iraq. PRM is also working with the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, NEA, and UNHCR to relocate or repatriate 9,000 Turkish Kurds whose existing camp in Iraq is no longer safe. Security considerations severely limit ANE's monitoring and evaluating efforts. The refugee coordinator in Baghdad cannot travel to sites because she lacks the required security detail. USAID funds its own security detail and is better able to visit its programs. OIG informally recommended that PRM seek to conclude an agreement with USAID to conduct joint monitoring of programs in certain areas.

Afghanistan

Like Iraq, Afghanistan, including assistance to Afghan refugees and IDPs, is considered a major U.S. priority. Despite this, PRM's funding for assistance to Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran, as well for returnees to Afghanistan, has decreased from \$47.1 million in FY 2005 to \$36.5 million in FY 2006. PRM will receive \$8 million of reprogrammed USAID funds in FY 2006 to provide shelter for IDPs. The 2007 budget request is for \$38 million. These reductions have occurred despite an increase in UNHCR's needs-based appeal for Afghanistan. To meet UNHCR's new requirements, PRM anticipates having to reduce its funding to NGOs to address the education needs of Afghans in Pakistan. USAID has indicated that its country program in Pakistan cannot easily fund services for non-Pakistanis. PRM is concerned that the funding situation will continue to worsen and that resentment arising from cuts in such services could render the refugees vulnerable to extremist influences. PRM is continuing to draw attention to the situation while exploring other potential sources of funding.

Palestinian Refugees

The recent Hamas election victory has led the United States to reevaluate funding to the Palestinians. UNRWA faces funding shortages that will reduce essential humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees. ANE is actively coordinating within the interagency process and with external players to address whether to release funds to UNRWA. Contingent on a U.S. policy decision, PRM is prepared to fund \$84 million to UNRWA in FY 2006.

North Korean Refugees

The North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 USC §7801 et seq.) has provisions relating to facilitating the submission of North Korean refugee applications to the United States and to providing humanitarian assistance. An estimated 20,000-50,000 North Koreans are in China. Their irregular status makes them vulnerable to exploitation or deportation to North Korea. Over 7,000 North Koreans have left their country or China and entered South Korea, where they are eligible for citizenship. Despite U.S. government pressure, the Chinese government restricts UNHCR to Beijing. Resettlement of North Koreans in the United States is complicated by the difficulty of gaining access to the refugees and conducting security checks. At this time, no North Korean refugees have been resettled in the United States. PRM is appropriately coordinating with other Department and U.S. government offices.

OFFICE OF ASSISTANCE FOR AFRICA

The Office of Assistance for Africa (AFR) oversees the bureau's humanitarian programs and activities on the entire African continent for an estimated three million refugees and perhaps nine million other displaced conflict victims. FY 2005 funding for Africa was \$332 million, once again making the region the largest geographic recipient of bureau resources. The bureau disburses roughly 80 percent through contributions to IOs such as UNHCR and ICRC and funnels the remainder through agreements with private NGOs.

A knowledgeable office director and her Civil Service deputy run the office effectively. Office workload is spread evenly among a six-person staff. Each program officer has a portfolio that includes as many as a dozen countries, programs with formidable total budgets (with an average over \$50 million), and several functional/cross-cutting issues. The office has traditionally received its primary guidance from a designated DAS but currently reports to the PDAS owing to front office turnover.

Close coordination with the Bureau of African Affairs (AF) and with DCHA is critical to successful implementation of PRM's humanitarian programs and achievement of its policy objectives in Africa. AFR's relations with AF are collegial and strong; although on Darfur, the two bureaus' views have differed on progress in meeting fundamental humanitarian needs. AFR regularly attends a range of AF-hosted staff meetings, and is a highly regarded contributor at NSC-chaired policy

level meetings. Cooperation with USAID is regular and very effective at the staff level. However, as might be expected, frictions occasionally can arise on major issues such as funding ICRC, food pipeline breaks, and UNHCR's role with IDPs, as described in the Executive Direction section. At times, too, AFR is caught by internal conflicts within USAID.

AFR's coordination with other offices in PRM is continuous and occurs at multiple levels. The cornerstone, though, is the PPRC's thorough review of an annual All Africa Policy and Program Implementation Paper, prepared by AFR. The cleared *All Africa Paper* -- over 100 pages long, often with split recommendations on specific funding strategies and adjustments in levels of support to PRM's partners -- then goes to the Assistant Secretary for decision. Review of the FY 2006 paper took place in two energetically debated sessions of the PPRC and separate discussions spanning a six-week period.

AFR faces a number of opportunities and challenges. There are promising new prospects for achieving durable solutions to four of the African continent's largest refugee/IDP situations - Liberia, Burundi, Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Sudan. However, if funding were increased dramatically under existing resource guidelines, programs that address identified needs in other countries would suffer major cuts. While there is wide support for bringing emergency relief in Africa up to international standards, there is insufficient current donor support to do so. Although Africa has promising pools of candidates for resettlement in the United States, the potential for fraud and camp tensions remains high. Meanwhile, the bureau did not incorporate UNHCR's new responsibility for protecting IDPs into its FY 2007 budget request because PRM did not know it in time.

Sudan

PRM funds assist half a million southern Sudanese who have been living for the past 25 years in six countries in the region. They are now able to go home, thanks to the January 2005 peace accord between the Sudanese government and the People's Liberation Army. UNHCR and a dozen NGOs are facilitating their voluntary repatriation, helping to create conditions conducive to their return and assisting to settle those who do return. The task is expected to take three to five years. In 2005, PRM provided \$29 million toward this effort. The AFR director traveled to southern Sudan in October to monitor programs there; the Addis Ababa refugee coordinator will make further visits.

PRM also funds approximately 200,000 people from Darfur who fled into Chad after fighting erupted in Sudan's western region in 2003. They are mostly in 12 camps in Chad along a 600-mile border with Sudan. In 2005, PRM provided \$39 million from MRA and supplemental funds for refugee assistance in eastern Chad. UNHCR provides basic services in health, nutrition, and food. AFR monitors and evaluates the programs in eastern Chad by sending someone from Washington every three to four months. A visit in early 2006 confirmed that these refugees are in an increasingly volatile area. Further attacks by Chadian rebels and incursions by Sudanese Janjaweed could result in new displacements. PRM has created contingency plans based on five scenarios; these include actions to take should there be a disruption of humanitarian access to the camps.

Another group of concern to PRM are the 1.8 million internally displaced Sudanese still in Darfur where security has deteriorated during the past months, compelling UNHCR to downsize its operations by half. ICRC also operates in Darfur. PRM cannot monitor UNHCR and ICRC programs in western Darfur because of insecurity. PRM also assists 113,000 Eritrean refugees located in eastern Sudan. Efforts to repatriate them ended in 2005, and UNHCR is working on integrating or resettling those that remain.

Other Situations of Concern

With sizeable populations of refugees from Sudan and, more recently, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda is one of the largest hosts in Africa. In addition, a brutal internal rebellion has generated some 1.6 million IDPs. AFR's success in focusing international attention on these neglected conflict victims will also create new requirements for PRM funding. In West Africa, the resolution of long-running civil conflicts in Sierra Leone and Liberia has enabled large numbers of refugees and IDPs to return home. But Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea threaten to spark new crises that could generate other dislocations and undercut the substantial investments that have been made to stabilize Liberia and Sierra Leone. These situations underscore both the difficulty PRM faces in predicting possible demands and funding requirements and the need for comprehensive strategies to address the special challenges presented by conflict and post-conflict situations.

OFFICE OF ADMISSIONS

The Office of Admissions has 16 positions but two continue to be unfilled, although one is encumbered by two job sharing WAE officers. The work of managing the complex refugee admissions program is divided into overseas and domestic components and a refugee case data processing operation. A deputy director is the point person for the admissions budget and supervises two branch chiefs. The overseas branch chief manages the flow of refugees into the United States and guides the five geographic program officers who develop caseloads and coordinate overseas processing. They track the activities of refugee coordinators based in Cairo, Nairobi, Accra, Bangkok, Ho Chi Minh City, and Moscow. The domestic branch chief guides three program officers as they manage the initial refugee reception and placement program and monitor the performance of NGOs. The director of the Refugee Processing Center (RPC), who reports directly to the office director, manages the clearinghouse for all refugee case data, keeps the Worldwide Refugee Admissions Processing System updated, and supervises 80 contractors. A Senior Executive Service office director has competently led the office for 14 years.

The 1995 OIG report encouraged PRM to plan the phase-out of the comprehensive plan of action, the orderly departure program, and admissions under the Lautenberg Amendment. PRM succeeded in closing the comprehensive plan of action (an international agreement designating UNHCR as the monitor of refugee screening of Vietnamese in countries of first asylum) and the orderly departure program (for processing Vietnamese who remained in Vietnam), except that the latter was recently resuscitated. For the next three years PRM will support a refugee coordinator and an overseas processing entity in Vietnam. PRM was not able to phase out the Lautenberg program (for certain religious minorities from the former Soviet Union) that is reauthorized each year by Congress. The work of the Washington Processing Center was transferred to the IOM-run overseas processing entity in Moscow as recommended. The Refugee Data Center in New York closed in July 2002, and its work is done by the RPC.

Some admissions staff and refugee coordinators observed that PRM's orientation course for new employees did not adequately cover admissions' issues. OIG suggested that the Office of Admissions consider devising its own more specific training program to be offered after the bureau's orientation.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

A dedicated and experienced acting comptroller ably manages the Office of the Comptroller. The office effectively executes the budget and controls appropriated program, administrative, and supplemental funding totaling about \$997 million. The office also provides effective financial oversight over contributions to IOs and the preparation and execution of grants and cooperative agreements, as discussed in the Federal Assistance Management section of this report.

PRM divides the budget function among three offices. PRP prepares the bureau's program budget and coordinates the bureau's funding requirements with OMB, the Congress, or within the Department. The EX handles the preparation of the administrative budget. PRM believes this division improves coordination and planning because budget preparation and funding requests reside in the office responsible for ensuring policy implementation and the office handling administrative support. PRM also believes that this arrangement enhances management controls by providing a valuable check and balance, ensuring that plans for policy implementation, approved program, and administrative financial plans are all in agreement with the bureau's spending. OIG concurs with this assessment.

The three warranted grants officers are knowledgeable and well trained. Bureau program officers praised the quality and promptness of the support they received from the grants officers. OIG interviewed several IOs and NGOs that PRM uses to carry out its assistance programs. These organizations commented favorably on the accessibility and responsiveness of the grants officers. OIG made an informal recommendation that the office update and document all of its office and program policies, procedures, and desk guides. The workload is apportioned equitably among the grants officers, but OIG found that 67 percent of all grants were executed in the last three months of the fiscal year. The acting comptroller said that little could be done to more evenly distribute grant processing throughout the year because the bureau's Congressionally appropriated funding is not known until several months after the fiscal year begins.

Staffing is a concern within the Office of the Comptroller. After an eight-month vacancy, the bureau has just selected a new comptroller. But the office will soon lose two long-term veteran employees: the deputy comptroller and the budget analyst. The deputy comptroller, a 24-year veteran, is planning to retire in May 2006. The budget analyst responsible for execution of the administrative budget will also leave shortly.

MANAGEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

BUREAU RESOURCES

PRM Staffing As of 2/1/06

<u>Staffing Complement</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Actual</u>
Civil Service	75	65
Foreign Service Domestic	25	24
Foreign Service Overseas	23	23
Subtotal	<u>123</u>	<u>112</u>
Contractors		2
When Actually Employed		4
Interns		2
Total	<u>123</u>	<u>120</u>

PRM Appropriated Funding Sources FY 1997-2006 As of 2/1/06

FY	MRA	MRA Administrative Earmark	ERMA	Supplemental Funding	Total
1997	638,000,000	12,000,000	50,000,000		700,000,000
1998	638,000,000	12,384,000	50,000,000		700,384,000
1999	627,000,000	12,970,000	30,000,000	431,000,000	1,100,970,000
2000	608,825,000	13,800,000	12,452,000		635,077,000
2001	683,450,000	15,010,000	19,967,000	14,900,000	733,327,000
2002	689,000,000	16,000,000	15,000,000	111,250,000	831,250,000
2003	765,427,000	16,457,000	25,831,000	119,557,931	927,272,931
2004	734,835,000	20,876,100	29,823,000	146,220,342	931,754,442
2005	742,016,000	21,824,000	20,000,000	126,432,413	910,272,413
2006	760,320,000	22,770,000	29,700,000	13,000,000	825,790,000

PRM receives its own appropriation, the MRA appropriation, as well as a Presidential fund known as ERMA. Funding for these two accounts is provided by the annual Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, which supports all PRM programming and operations. There is an exception for the POP operations, which are funded out of the Department's Diplomatic and Consular Programs account, about \$500,000 annually. PRM has a \$22 million administrative expense fund, which is an earmarked amount in the MRA appropriation. As shown in the funding chart above, PRM relies increasingly on supplemental funding requests to achieve its policy objectives. Because funding is not sufficient to fund all projects, the bureau must make hard decisions about where to apply its limited resources.

The MRA appropriation funds overseas assistance activities, refugee admissions to the United States, and support for refugee resettlement in Israel. ERMA is permanently authorized up to a level of \$100 million, with partial or full replenishments appropriated annually. The President may use ERMA funds to address urgent, unexpected refugee and migration needs. MRA and ERMA are no-year funds and do not expire at the end of the fiscal year. But the bureau makes every effort to obligate all funds in the year in which they are appropriated because budget requests are made annually.

The supplemental column includes funding for current and past high priority initiatives, including the IRRF, Afghan Supplemental, Kosovo Supplemental, and many other Presidential initiatives.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

A Foreign Service executive director and his Civil Service deputy effectively manage the EX in providing the administrative support platform that enables the bureau to carry out its mission, programs, and operations. Overall, the office received good scores for management and responsiveness on the inspectors' management operations questionnaires. The one exception was the human resources (HR) unit, described below. The information technology (IT) unit received praise for customer service, but it needs to do a better job of updating systems documentation. The general services unit was also described as highly effective. The budget section is performing well.

HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES

PRM employees characterized the HR unit as a weak link in what is otherwise a well functioning and responsive office. The unit is staffed by a lead HR specialist who has been with the bureau many years and by an HR specialist and HR assistant. Although a number of employees expressed satisfaction with personnel services, the unit was the object of widespread complaints from PRM employees. On the inspectors' questionnaires, the section received the lowest scores of any EX component.

Some complaints may be misplaced. The bureau does not have delegated personnel authority so it must rely on the Department's Bureau of Human Resources for processing most personnel actions. PRM employees are often not aware when a delay in personnel actions is due to slow handling by the central HR system, rather than by the PRM HR unit. Nevertheless, much of the criticism appears valid. Employees are not always provided with accurate or timely information. This may be due in part to a workload imbalance in the HR section, which PRM identified before the inspection. OIG observed that PRM is taking steps to redistribute the HR workload, with more responsibilities to be delegated to the other HR staff. The unit also needs to ensure that personnel folders contain up-to-date position descriptions and work requirements for all employees. This was identified as a deficiency during the section's 2005 self-assessment. The bureau committed to OIG to do this by the end of July 2006.

OIG's 1995 inspection of PRM also found general dissatisfaction with the quality of HR services and a perceived lack of responsiveness. The HR function was identified as a management weakness in that year's vulnerability review. The executive director is working to improve the unit's performance, which includes creating a log to track important HR actions. The section merits continued close monitoring.

Mentoring of Entry-Level Personnel

PRM has half a dozen entry-level personnel, evenly split among entry-level FSOs, presidential management fellows, and upward mobility staff, who are scattered through five offices around the bureau. OIG's discussions with this cohort indicated that their office directors are actively providing encouragement and constructive feedback, as well as ensuring ample training opportunities. Entry-level personnel seem to find their work both challenging and satisfying and typically describe their morale as good.

Civil Service Career Development and Mobility

PRM is a close-knit bureau. Employees are dedicated to their work and committed to the bureau's mission. Some have worked for PRM and with each other for many years. Some have come to the bureau from the NGO community. They bring unique skills and experience to the job combined with a strong sense of purpose. Despite frustrations, they find their work fulfilling and believe they are making a difference. Not surprisingly, many envision spending their careers in the bureau and are reluctant to seek opportunities for career advancement elsewhere. It is a particular challenge for the bureau to provide employees with a career track that offers opportunities for continued advancement over the course of a career while, at the same time, meeting the needs of the bureau and enhancing its effectiveness.

OIG found many entry- and mid-level Civil Service employees were dissatisfied with promotion and professional development opportunities available within the bureau. Especially frustrated was a cadre of GS-13s who had quickly reached the limits of their career ladders.

To its credit, PRM management has made efforts in the past few years to address these concerns by undertaking some staffing and organizational reviews. But these efforts were carried out in a way that heightened the level of dissatisfaction. Following consultation with the Bureau of Human Resources, the PRM front office decided that a piecemeal approach to staffing reviews would best succeed in reclassifying or upgrading positions. With no comprehensive, bureau-wide plan, individual office directors undertook to upgrade and reorganize some positions in their offices. Employees perceived a lack of fairness, consistency, and transparency in this process.

The bureau has taken a number of steps to promote career development. The new Assistant Secretary, PDAS, and executive director met on the issue. PRM created an HR initiatives working group that began meeting in September 2005 to address the mid-level (GS-13/14) concerns as well as upward mobility opportunities for GS-7 to GS-11 employees. Additionally, PRM will participate in the Department's pilot program (announced in January 2006 by the Director General) to provide rotational opportunities for GS-12 to GS-13 employees. The bureau is also exploring how to expand employees' professional development through more frequent overseas travel and details to, or exchanges with, IOs, USAID, or other federal agencies.

These efforts to address the career aspirations of employees are laudable and should be encouraged. At the same time, as the 1995 inspection report pointed out, bureau management also has a responsibility to establish realistic career goals. The Bureau of Human Resources determines which positions meet the requirements for upgrading. PRM needs to take steps to help employees understand the structure and limitations inherent in the Civil Service system.

Training

In contrast to the 1995 inspection findings, OIG found that PRM now does a good job of encouraging and supporting professional development and training for its staff. Employees praised the deputy executive director, the bureau-training officer, for flagging training opportunities and offering advice on personal and professional development. Several employees noted that office directors mentor them. Staff gave high marks to PRM's two-week orientation course on bureau operations that is presented in conjunction with the Foreign Service Institute. PRM also organizes lunchtime training sessions throughout the year.

Equal Employment Opportunity

The bureau has no pending Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) cases. The bureau's EEO counselor has the required training and manuals. The bureau intends to post EEO information on harassment, substance abuse, and standards for ethical conduct policies on the PRM web site.

SPACE

With the exception of its front office, all of PRM's staff is in State Annex 1. This physical separation harms PRM's operations. More than most bureaus, PRM needs to interact with other parts of the Department to participate effectively in the policy-making process. In 1997, an outside consultant's time-management study estimated that the separation from the Harry S Truman building cost the bureau the equivalent of two full-time positions per year in commuting time. The costs in missed opportunities for communication and influence are impossible to calculate. In recognition of this, a former PRM Assistant Secretary obtained a commitment in 1999 that the PRM staff would be relocated to the Harry S Truman

building once the Department's space-renovation plan had been completed. That commitment was rendered invalid by the dramatic changes in circumstances and space requirements that have occurred since.

OIG appreciates that the Department's decisions on space assignments and allocations are among its most difficult. Nevertheless, OIG believes that in its future determinations, the Department should give priority to specific and definable operational requirements. For its part, PRM will want to take every opportunity to ensure that its particular needs are clearly understood.

Recommendation 26: The Bureau of Administration should ensure that its guidelines for making decisions with respect to office space assignments give due consideration to the specific and definable operational requirements of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration. (Action: A)

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The bureau's information technology unit is well managed. PRM staff gave it very high scores on OIG questionnaires and described customer service as superb. Despite these accolades, there are no written procedures for incident reporting, systems backup, web site management, patch management, and configuration management. There is also no system development and maintenance support for the Abacus project tracking system. Coordination with the RPC needs improvement.

Systems Documentation

There are no mandatory written instructions documenting the bureau's procedures for incident reporting, systems backup, web site management, configuration management, and patch management. The systems manager is taxed by his multiple responsibilities as the IT team leader, system administrator, web master, and information systems security officer, and finds it difficult to devote time to documenting these procedures. But, pursuant to 12 FAM, the systems manager must document these procedures to ensure the continuity of operations, to protect information from unauthorized users, and to prevent the loss of stored data. In addition, 5 FAM 861.d specifies that the information systems security officer and systems administrator must develop and maintain a configuration management plan

to oversee and enforce configuration management principles on all hardware and software systems. The configuration management plan is critical to maintaining total system integrity.

Recommendation 27: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures for the backup of systems programs and information. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 28: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures for patch management, including specific responsibilities for ensuring that appropriate patches are installed in a timely manner. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 29: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures that ensure proper maintenance and monitoring of information on its web site. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 30: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures for reporting information security incidents to the information system security officer. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 31: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue a written bureau configuration management plan that incorporates OpenNet workstations and servers operating the Refugee Processing Center. (Action: PRM)

Configuration Management

The Bureau of Information Resource Management's security audit reported that PRM is not fully compliant with security requirements in the following areas: control panel anti-virus, disk administrator, event viewer local groups, local users, user rights policies, and OpenNet terminals operating at the RPC. Security scores

for workstations operating on Windows XP Professional platform and Windows 2003 server were 94 percent and 95 percent compliant, respectively. Security scores for workstations operating on Windows NT platform and Windows 2000 server were lower, 88 percent and 77 percent, respectively. Scores at the RPC for Windows XP Professional platform and Win2K Professional platform were 52 percent and 94 percent, respectively. The lower scores indicate that IT needs to improve its compliance with security configuration standards and strengthen coordination to prevent the Department's systems and networks from being vulnerable to exploitation and other technical and security threats.

Recommendation 32: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should designate an information system security officer at the Refugee Processing Center to coordinate with the primary information systems security officer to ensure that OpenNet workstations and servers are compliant with the Department's security standards including patch requirements. (Action: PRM)

Abacus Database

The Abacus project tracking system is not being fully utilized. PRM staff are not adequately trained, are unfamiliar with Abacus special features, and do not know how to manipulate the database to produce desired reports. The single IT employee responsible for training and troubleshooting has a full workload and little time to tend to Abacus duties. Most of the personnel who participated in the initial development of the Abacus system have rotated to other assignments, leaving most of the burden for supporting Abacus on one individual in PRP. The IT staff provides some technical training and support but is unable to handle all user requests for assistance. Additional assistance is needed to improve user proficiency given the time and money already invested in the system. As described in the section on the Office of Policy and Resource Planning, this includes ensuring that program officers know how to use and are taking advantage of its various reports, generating specialized reports, and verifying that the correct information is being input into Abacus.

Recommendation 33: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should identify resources, including hiring a part-time employee, to provide bureau-wide training, troubleshoot problems, and collaborate with information technology staff regarding the Abacus project tracking system. (Action: PRM)

SECURITY - PHYSICAL ACCESS CONTROLS AND CLASSIFIED INFORMATION HANDLING

PRM has a limited role in security matters. Physical and information security are the responsibility of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. PRM follows procedures for handling classified information and has had no reported security violations in the last three years. Only authorized personnel have access to the bureau's office suites. The bureau has an approved emergency action and evacuation plan that is readily accessible on the Intranet. OIG made informal recommendations to improve security controls.

MANAGEMENT CONTROLS

PRM has effective management controls in place. The Assistant Secretary's FY 2005 annual management control statement of assurance indicated no material weaknesses. Prior to the inspection, the bureau completed the risk assessment and evaluation administered by the Bureau of Resource Management. This self-assessment measures three elements: inherent risk, general control environment, and standards for management controls. PRM is categorized as a moderate to high-risk organization due to the complexity of its programs and the amount of funds involved. The bureau received high scores for all offices. No formal corrective action plans were required. The scores indicate that good internal controls in each office minimize vulnerabilities. Documents related to internal controls are posted on the PRM web site.

As discussed earlier in the report, PRM implements most of its policy and program objectives through contributions to IOs and grants and cooperative agreements awarded to NGOs. PRM and the organizations and agencies it uses to accomplish its mission are subject to many types of internal and external reviews. These regulatory measures aim to ensure that funds are spent wisely and in accordance with all legal requirements. PRM is receptive and responsive to these monitoring reviews and diligent in correcting any identified weaknesses. Recent reviews conducted by accounting firms on improper payments, management controls, and federal assistance programs reported only minor deficiencies. This review process has ensured that management controls are in place and functioning properly.

PRM has controls in place for EX functions and operations. These include time and attendance functions, procurement and purchase card use, representation funds, and nonexpendable property management. Current and prior inventory certifications reported no unresolved discrepancies.

OIG received a few allegations of travel irregularities. The scope of this inspection did not provide for an in-depth review of a significant number of travel vouchers. OIG's spot-check of travel authorizations and travel vouchers indicated that the bureau has appropriate controls in place, including for premium travel and disposing of unused plane tickets. Supervisors and the executive director approve

travel authorizations and vouchers for all employees, including front office principals. To avoid future misperceptions, OIG informally recommended that PRM establish procedures for prioritizing and approving all bureau travel. The bureau should also update and reissue its administrative notice outlining the bureau's procedures for reviewing, approving, and processing travel authorizations and vouchers.

The executive director is reviewing administrative directives and notices to identify those that need to be revised and reissued. As discussed in the Information Technology section of the report, IT documentation will also be reviewed and issued or revised as needed.

PRM has controls over IT and telecommunications equipment, including laptop computers, digital cameras, and personal digital assistants. But PRM needs to do a better job of monitoring monthly cell phone billings. PRM has not documented a policy for cellular telephone and personal digital assistant use. When assigned a cellular telephone, employees are verbally briefed regarding proper use. However, 5 FAM 526 requires each bureau to establish a policy on the personal use of government-issued cellular telephones; otherwise PRM is vulnerable to unauthorized use and incurring additional costs to the government. A review of recent bills revealed instances of excessive personal calls by some bureau employees. The executive director will seek reimbursement from employees as required. The executive director will also reissue the bureau's administrative directive on cell phone usage.

Recommendation 34: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should issue a written policy for cellular telephone use, implement a process for reviewing cell phone charges, and obtain reimbursement where appropriate. (Action: PRM)

PRM spends approximately \$12 million a year for a contractor to operate the RPC in Washington. The contract is part of a government-wide agency contract that is let and administered by the General Services Administration. While legally the contracting officer's representative is a General Services Administration employee, the RPC director has had contracting officer's representative training and in all respects performs the oversight duties of a contracting officer's representative. The RPC director approves invoices and evaluates contractor performance monthly. The contractor's on-site project manager monitors the work of two sub-contractors. The contract will be rebid this year.

FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should conclude a written agreement with the U.S. Agency for International Development's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance that clarifies their new roles and responsibilities for supporting reforms now being implemented within the international humanitarian system pertaining to internally displaced persons. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 2: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should take steps to strengthen the strategic planning function in its Office of Policy and Resource Planning. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 3: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should create a second staff assistant position and return those staff assistant functions currently being performed in other offices to the Front Office. (Action: PRM, in coordination with M/DGHR)

Recommendation 4: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should retire all outdated files and disseminate written guidance on maintaining office records. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 5: The Bureau of Resource Management should take steps to improve the usability of the Bureau Performance Plan for the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration's strategic and program planning. (Action: RM, in coordination with PRM)

Recommendation 6: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Bureau of Intelligence and Research, should identify and implement ways to distribute needed intelligence information more effectively. (Action: PRM, in coordination with INR)

Recommendation 7: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should examine the actions that it can take to mitigate the significant fluctuation that presently occurs in the admissions cycle and should initiate a dialogue with the White House and the Congress on other actions that might be taken with their concurrence. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 8: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and implement a plan to move the migration team from the Office of Policy and Resource Planning to the Population Policy Unit. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 9: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, should establish a comprehensive multiyear public communications plan in consultation with the regional bureaus. (Action: PRM, in coordination with R)

Recommendation 10: The Bureau of Population, Refugee and Migration Affairs should combine its Congressional liaison functions in a single office. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 11: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and implement a plan to reduce significantly the amount of time bureau employees spend on the Policy and Program Review Committee process. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 12: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish common criteria to be used in evaluating proposals and procedures to ensure that each advertisement of federal assistance availability contains award selection criteria. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 13: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish policies and procedures to ensure that grants and cooperative agreements are advertised and that noncompetitive awards are justified in writing. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 14: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish and publish written guidance on the role and responsibilities of grants officers during the preaward phase of the grants issuance process. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 15: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should design and implement procedures to ensure that its federal financial assistance files contain all the required documentation to support the issuance and administration of each grant and cooperative agreement. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 16: The Bureau of Administration should establish policies and procedures that will determine punctually indirect cost rates for grants and cooperative agreements awarded by the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration. (Action: A)

Recommendation 17: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in the absence of a final indirect cost rate, should establish procedures to review each expired grant or cooperative agreement upon receipt of the grantee's preliminary final financial report to determine the funding needed for the final closure agreement and to deobligate unneeded funds to make them available for bureau programs. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 18: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should include the ability to apply monitoring and evaluation tools effectively in the annual personnel performance evaluations for all bureau personnel having responsibility for program oversight. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 19: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish and implement procedures to use outside expertise for technical monitoring and evaluation needs particularly to support refugee coordinators. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 20: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish procedures to ensure that program officers complete evaluations on programs implemented pursuant to a cooperative agreement or grant. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 21: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and begin using a framework to assess how much monitoring and evaluation each program or project needs to permit the bureau to evaluate the performance of recipients of federal assistance. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 22: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should design and implement a plan to delineate clearly policy and coordination responsibilities of all of its policy and assistance offices and revise position descriptions and organizational statements accordingly. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 23: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs and the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, should prepare an action memo for the Secretary requesting guidance from the National Security Council on the role the Department of State should play in a potential migrant crisis in the Caribbean. (Action: PRM, in coordination with PM and WHA)

Recommendation 24: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, in coordination with the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, should develop a written plan with the U.S. Agency for International Development to identify alternative funding sources for programs that assist

internally displaced persons in Colombia. (Action: PRM, in coordination with INL)

Recommendation 25: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should transfer one full-time position from the Office of Assistance for Asia and Near East to a higher priority need elsewhere in the bureau. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 26: The Bureau of Administration should ensure that its guidelines for making decisions with respect to office space assignments give due consideration to the specific and definable operational requirements of the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration. (Action: A)

Recommendation 27: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures for the backup of systems programs and information. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 28: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures for patch management, including specific responsibilities for ensuring that appropriate patches are installed in a timely manner. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 29: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures that ensure proper maintenance and monitoring of information on its web site. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 30: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue written standard operating procedures for reporting information security incidents to the information system security officer. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 31: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and issue a written bureau configuration management plan that incorporates OpenNet workstations and servers operating the Refugee Processing Center. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 32: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should designate an information system security officer at the Refugee Processing Center to coordinate with the primary information systems security officer to ensure that OpenNet workstations and servers are compliant with the Department's security standards including patch requirements. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 33: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should identify resources, including hiring a part-time employee, to provide bureau-wide training, troubleshoot problems, and collaborate with information technology staff regarding the Abacus project tracking system. (Action: PRM)

Recommendation 34: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should issue a written policy for cellular telephone use, implement a process for reviewing cell phone charges, and obtain reimbursement where appropriate. (Action: PRM)

INFORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Informal recommendations cover operational matters not requiring action by organizations outside the inspected unit and/or the parent regional bureau. Informal recommendations will not be subject to the OIG compliance process. However, any subsequent OIG inspection or on-site compliance review will assess the mission's progress in implementing the informal recommendations.

Core Functions

Admissions

In its BPP and in briefings, the Office of Admissions uses the word ceiling in various, but imprecise ways. This confuses the idea of an admissions goal and an admissions ceiling.

Informal Recommendation 1: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should, in official documents and briefings, use the word ceiling only to signify a legally binding maximum limit.

Emergency Response

The bureau's roster of staff available to serve on emergency teams is out of date. Few bureau employees have received the training needed, including field experience in noncrisis situations, to be able to deploy effectively in an emergency.

Informal Recommendation 2: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should develop and implement a training plan to ensure that sufficient bureau staff have the requisite training and experience to be effective if called upon to deploy during an emergency.

In an emergency, PRM may make a timely request for ERMA funds, but months can pass before they are approved and awarded to IOs and NGOs to provide vital humanitarian relief.

Informal Recommendation 3: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should examine its procedures to speed approval of Emergency Refugee Migration Assistance requests and disbursements.

Policy Coordination and Resource Allocation

Policy and Program Review Committee Process

PRP maintains paper files with all of the PPRC documentation and has partial electronic files. If all the PPRC documentation were available electronically it would make it easier for bureau staff to access it and less demanding on the PRP to provide it.

Informal Recommendation 4: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should make all of the Policy and Program Review Committee documentation available electronically.

PRP produces a weekly e-mail summary for bureau personnel of PPRC actions taken by the front office. Compiling and maintaining an electronic spreadsheet of these actions would save the PRP time and provide bureau personnel with an easier reference to what actions occurred after a given meeting.

Informal Recommendation 5: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should compile and maintain an electronic spreadsheet that is available for reference to all bureau personnel of front office and other actions following Policy and Program Review Committee meetings.

Management of Federal Financial Assistance

PRM tends to award grants to the same NGO partners year after year. Proposal review panels are usually comprised only of bureau employees, which may not foster the most objective review.

Informal Recommendation 6: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should establish a procedure to expand outside experts' participation on selection panels for awarding federal financial assistance.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Even though contributions to UN agencies are not subject to specific federal or Department monitoring and evaluation requirements, these contributions represent 70 percent of PRM's program funding. The bureau is interested in strengthening its monitoring and evaluating of IO programs and should do so by completing and then implementing bureau guidelines currently under discussion.

Informal Recommendation 7: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration

tion should finish developing bureau guidelines for monitoring and evaluating programs funded through contributions to international organizations and implement them.

Policy and Program Implementation

Population Unit

In accordance with commitments made to Congress, PRM has carefully separated refugee and population work; but as currently constituted, POP is too small to meet Department-wide criteria for a separate office. While the office director position appears appropriately graded, the deputy director position, advertised as supervisory, involves no supervisory responsibilities and very little responsibility for policy management. Alternatively, this problem would be remedied once the bureau implements OIG's recommendation to move two members of the migration team from PRP to POP.

Informal Recommendation 8: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should redesign or redesignate its Population Unit, bringing its composition, size, and titles into line with regulations, including those for Foreign Service bidding and Civil Service competition.

Office of Assistance for Europe, Central Asia and Americas

PRM has not reallocated adequate resources to carry out new work created by the transfer of responsibility for the Guantanamo Migrant Operations Center to the Department. Although assigning this work to two retired FSOs on WAE appointments was a good short-term solution to provide the necessary expertise, it risks discontinuity in the long term because of limitations on their hours of employment.

Informal Recommendation 9: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should create a full-time position in the Office of Assistance for Europe, Central Asia, and Americas to manage additional work created by the assumption of responsibility for the Guantanamo Migrant Operations Center.

Office of Assistance for Asia and Near East

Security considerations in Iraq and the lack of a required security detail severely limit the bureau's refugee coordinator's ability to visit PRM-funded programs. USAID funds its own security detail and is better able to visit its programs. Joint travel would facilitate the refugee coordinator's ability to conduct on-site monitoring and evaluation.

Informal Recommendation 10: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should seek to conclude an agreement with the U.S. Agency for International Development to conduct joint monitoring of programs in certain areas of Iraq.

Office of Admissions

New Office of Admissions employees and the refugee coordinators would benefit from a bureau orientation course specifically tailored to the demands of the U.S. refugee admissions program.

Informal Recommendation 11: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should create and offer to new Office of Admissions staff and new refugee coordinators an orientation course specifically on their responsibilities for the U.S. refugee admissions program.

Office of the Comptroller

In some instances, the PRM's Office of the Comptroller has not updated or documented all of its office and program policies, procedures, and desk guides.

Informal Recommendation 12: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should ensure that the Office of the Comptroller has updated and documented all of its office and program policies, procedures, and desk guides.

Management of Administrative Resources

Executive Office

Some employees perceive that there is travel abuse by some PRM employees, although OIG did not find any instances of abuse. PRM should issue detailed travel policy and procedures that are rigorously applied to ensure that travel regulations are strictly adhered to and that employees' travel is aligned with bureau priorities.

Informal Recommendation 13: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should draft, disseminate, and implement a comprehensive travel policy and procedures.

Security

Bureau staff does not always sign the Standard Form-702 security container check sheet when opening and closing classified filing storage containers as required by 12 FAM 539.1.

Informal Recommendation 14: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should periodically reissue its security standard operating procedure to remind bureau staff of the importance of following security procedures for safeguarding classified material and for locking and alarming the office at the close of business.

PRM does not regularly check to ensure that bureau staff are using Standard Form-702 on security containers.

Informal Recommendation 15: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should conduct periodic checks to verify the use of the Standard Form-702 security container check sheet and the proper safeguarding of classified material.

PRM does not consistently incorporate compliance with security procedures into annual performance evaluations, as required by 3 FAM 2823.4-3.

Informal Recommendation 16: The Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration should rate employees on their annual evaluation on their compliance with security procedures, including completing the security container check sheet.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS

Assistant Secretary	Ellen R. Sauerbrey	01/06
Principal deputy assistant secretary	Richard L. Greene	02/02
Deputy assistant secretary	J. Kelly Ryan	04/02
Deputy assistant secretary	Vacant	

Office Directors

Office of the Comptroller	Emily Krantz, Acting	04/05
Executive Office	Brian W. Wilson	07/05
Multilateral Coordination and External Relations	Margaret Pollack	10/02
Population	Ann T. Kennelly	05/05
Policy and Resource Planning	Kelly T. Clements, Acting	08/05
Africa	Margaret McKelvey	08/83
Asia and Near East	Richard Albright	08/05
Europe, Central Asia and Americas	David Appleton	08/05
Admissions	Theresa Rusch	11/82

ABBREVIATIONS

A/LM/AQM/IP	International Program Division in the Office of Acquisition Management in the Bureau of Administration
A/OPE	Office of the Procurement Executive in the Bureau of Administration
AF	Bureau of African Affairs
AFR	Office of Assistance for Africa
ANE	Office of Assistance for Asia and Near East
BPP	Bureau Performance Plan
DAS	Deputy assistant secretary
DCHA	Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance of the U.S. Agency for International Development
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DRL	Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
ERMA	Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance
EX	Executive office
FSO	Foreign Service officer
HR	Human Resources
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
INL	Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs
INR	Bureau of Intelligence and Research
IO	International organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration

IRRF	Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund
IT	Information Technology
JAMS	Joint Assistance Management System
MCE	Office of Multilateral Coordination and External Relations
MRA	Migration and Refugee Assistance
NEA	Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NSC	National Security Council
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
PART	Program Assessment Rating Tool
PDAS	Principal deputy assistant secretary
POP	Office of Population
PPRC	Policy and Program Review Committee
PRM	Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration
PRP	Policy and Resource Planning
RPC	Refugee Processing Center
S/CRS	Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization in the Office of the Secretary
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WAE	When actually employed

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~