

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

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

Report of Inspection

Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs

Report Number ISP-I-05-40, September 2005

~~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
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION	5
POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	13
Oceans and Fisheries Directorate	13
Environment Directorate	17
Health, Space and Science Directorate	21
Office of Global Change	30
Office of Policy Coordination and Initiatives	32
Public Affairs and Public Diplomacy	38
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	41
Office of the Executive Director	42
Human Resources Division	47
Financial Management Division	52
Administrative Services Division	54
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	55
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION	
TECHNOLOGY SECURITY	59
FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS	65
INFORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS	69
PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS	79
ABBREVIATIONS	81

KEY JUDGMENTS

- The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES) must defend American interests and implement U.S. commitments in a multitude of international fora, while advancing U.S. policy through a new array of partnership initiatives. Within the bureau, many do not appreciate this changing dynamic from traditional negotiations to newer, more entrepreneurial implementation in American environmental and science engagement.
- OES coordinates and exerts foreign policy discipline on the activities of U.S. government science, technical, and environmental agencies as diverse as the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Smithsonian Institution. Generally, these agencies express respect and appreciation for the bureau's work and leadership.
- A lack of clarity about the respective roles of the bureau and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary results in confusion in Washington and abroad. The Department of State's (Department) leadership must define the roles, responsibilities, authority, and accountability of the bureau and the adviser.
- The bureau's personnel structure and resource allocation are still in a rebuilding phase after the decimation of its science capability in order to address increased environmental and HIV/AIDS priorities. The bureau reestablished the deputy assistant secretary for science and health position in 2000 but has not succeeded in keeping the position filled.
- Executive office support to the bureau must improve. Financial management operations are adequate, but overall management of the executive office, general responsiveness by its employees, human resource operations (especially filling vacancies expeditiously), and management controls all merit attention.

- A grants program enables the bureau to stimulate cooperation and promote its priorities. The bureau needs to clarify the program's goals and procedures, however, and make the process more transparent to its own staff and embassies interested in submitting grant proposals. The bureau should also take steps to deal with the significant new administrative burden the program entails, a burden that will increase if funding levels rise.

The inspection took place in Washington, DC, between May 15 and July 15, 2005. Ambassador Brian E. Carlson (team leader), William D. Cavness, Jr. (deputy team leader), Peter J. Antico, Joseph S. Catalano, Patrick M. McCracken, Kristene M. McMinn, and Rosalind Willis conducted the inspection.

CONTEXT

Through OES the Department attempts to manage U.S. interests in the environment, oceans, health, space, and science. These issues arise in both bilateral and multilateral contexts, and they frequently arrive at the Assistant Secretary's door with complex legal considerations, as well as the support or opposition of weighty domestic political and business constituencies.

It is up to OES to meld the competing agencies and agendas into coherent U.S. government policies and negotiating positions. The bureau frequently leads the interagency process, bringing the Defense, Interior, Health and Human Services, and Energy departments to the table, together with specialized entities such as the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, the Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Geological Service, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The disparate players unanimously recognize the Department's role as an honest and well-informed broker, the one party with no program resources or science expertise of its own to promote.

The mandate for dealing with nongovernmental organizations and business groups interested in the environment, oceans, health, space, and science resides in OES as well. When the Department is able to win their understanding and support for U.S. government policies in the international arena, there usually follows a payoff in terms of congressional and public support on controversial policy issues. This suggests the need for OES to increase public affairs and public diplomacy efforts to convey U.S. achievements and policy objectives to audiences at home and abroad. The bureau's subjects constitute what Joseph Nye, a former Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science, and Technology, called America's "soft power." Generally speaking, nations around the globe admire America's strength in science, health, and technology. Even those who are skeptical about America on other grounds are anxious to cooperate with us in these areas. OES is an underused public diplomacy resource.

The responsibility for many bilateral science and technology umbrella agreements also lies with this bureau. These agreements traditionally do not include dedicated project funding from the Department's budget, but they provide a framework of diplomatic privileges and immunities governing any science, technology, engineering, environmental, or health cooperation that may develop between two countries.

OES has seen a diminution of its science capability in the last 10 or 15 years, concomitant with an increase in resources dedicated to environmental issues. During the Clinton administration, the bureau moved employee positions from science offices to environmental work and shifted money and policy emphasis in accordance with new priorities attached to the environment. At the same time, the Department eliminated the science and technology cone as a specific specialty in the Foreign Service. Embassies abolished many science attaché jobs and melded their functions with economic officer responsibilities.

Against this backdrop, in 1999 the National Academy of Sciences recommended a major change in direction for the Department. The Department's leadership at the time agreed to integrate science, technology, and health competence into policy and program development. There was acceptance of the need among Foreign Service officers (FSOs) and Department principals for increased awareness of science and technology considerations in foreign policy. In May 2000, the Secretary announced a new science policy for the Department, directing that better science, technology, and health resources should be available throughout the Department and its missions abroad.¹ As part of the effort to enable the Department to reach out to the American science, technology, and health communities for expertise and support, the Secretary announced the creation of a new position, the science and technology adviser to the Secretary. However, the Department did not move ahead on other commitments made at that time to enhance the role of science in its operations.

¹Unclassified Telegram to all posts, "Science and Diplomacy: Secretary Announces Changes, New Policy,"(U) SECSTATE 91353, May 15, 2000

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION

A distinguished conservationist and experienced government leader presided over OES from 2001 until July 2005. During the inspection, his announcement that he intended to resign met with genuine regret from a staff that regarded him as warm and caring. His tenure was principally noted for a new approach to global sustainable development rooted in public/private partnerships. There has been a special emphasis on initiatives that harness science and technology in partnerships with nongovernmental organizations and the private sector in the search for solutions to environmental change, improved access to clean water and energy, combating infectious diseases, conserving ocean resources, and protecting migratory species. Additionally, he helped develop a U.S.-led approach, joined by other governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector, to conserve the world's remaining tropical forests.

In addition to the Assistant Secretary, the bureau leadership comprises a career senior Foreign Service officer as principal deputy assistant secretary (PDAS), and three deputy assistant secretaries (DAS) - one each for environment, oceans, and science. The PDAS is an officer from the now-defunct science and technology cone of the Foreign Service with several tours in OES. The environmental DAS came to the Department in 2003 from the Environmental Protection Agency, and she has broad experience in congressional affairs and environmental issues. The DAS for oceans is a member of the Senior Executive Service (SES) with an extensive marine conservation background who previously served in the Office of the Legal Adviser. In March 2005, President Bush accorded him the rank of ambassador during his tenure. The science DAS position has been filled for just one year of the last four and was again vacant during the inspection. Although not officially a deputy assistant secretary, a presidentially appointed Senior Climate Negotiator manages the climate change issue for the bureau. He is responsible on paper to the OES Assistant Secretary, but for all practical purposes he reports to the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and coordinates closely with the White House Council on Environmental Quality.

The specialized backgrounds and narrow issue focus of the three deputy assistant secretaries means that a large and broad burden falls on the PDAS. The Assistant Secretary looked to him not only to manage the bureau's personnel, resources, and day-to-day operations, but also saw him as a policy adviser, information resource, historian-in-residence, and personal confidant. The PDAS is up to his elbows in routine administration as he picks up the slack for a relatively weak executive office. As the senior executive in the bureau's front office, with years of experience overseas and in the Department, it falls to the PDAS to negotiate with other bureaus, solve knotty personnel problems with the central system, and lobby for bureau equities with Department management.

Not surprisingly, there is broad respect and deep admiration for the PDAS. He is seen to be central to virtually every bureau decision or action, and he truly knows much of what is going on throughout the bureau. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) found him well informed on most subjects and able to offer a cogent explanation of the background as well as to predict future developments. Subordinates and colleagues describe him as open, fair-minded, and a good communicator. Given the burden he shoulders and the centrality of his role, it is not surprising that he also is occasionally seen as a bottleneck. Some office directors complain of a tendency to keep asking for more information, as though to postpone an unpleasant or difficult decision. OIG also saw some evidence of the PDAS's reputed reluctance to confront tough personnel problems and manage performance weaknesses. Nevertheless, the PDAS clearly had the confidence of the Assistant Secretary, the Under Secretary for Global Affairs, and senior leadership of the Department as well as the national science and technology community.

The current DAS for oceans and fisheries previously directed the Office of Marine Conservation (OMC), which is responsible for living marine resources policy and U.S. participation in related international organizations. Even as DAS he retains his interest in fisheries and finds little time for non-oceans subjects. A skilled negotiator, the DAS is respected on the Hill and nationally as one of this country's experts on treaties and international agreements on fisheries, marine mammals, and other marine environment issues. He is a "great leader and a good manager" according to generally content, well-motivated staff members of the offices he supervises. According to employees, coordination within the directorate works "extremely well," the offices have good relations horizontally, and coordination with the front office, except the executive office (EX), is good.

The DAS for environment covers international environmental issues, including trade, as well as issues related to wildlife and natural resource conservation (but not climate change). The offices in this directorate tend to complain that the

discuss finances, grants, travel budgets, and new employee orientation. The OES web site offers basic information on bureau operations, and there is general appreciation for the special assistant's circulated notes from the Monday and Thursday staff meetings. The bureau makes a concerted effort to inform the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and other seventh floor principals of its achievements. Although intra-bureau communication could always be better, and environmental hubs and science and technology officers at field posts are often an afterthought, it is a commendable effort that should continue to get front office attention.

Indeed, OIG noted that this is a bureau with almost daily accomplishments and achievements in diverse subject areas. Many of them not only have meaning for specific constituencies but could easily be appreciated by the American public and, in turn, generate public support for U.S. objectives. Arguably, as earlier noted, science and technology represent elements of America's "soft power" - the product of our country's intellectual and economic freedoms that garner respect and admiration worldwide. Yet, OES has only one staff member devoted to domestic public affairs, no public diplomacy officers, and little front office attention to a well-organized plan for external communication.

A philosophical split exists in OES and perhaps beyond on the question of how the United States can best achieve its conservation and environmental goals. On the one hand are those traditionalists who trust in our ability to negotiate binding international agreements that have the force of law. On the other are those who put emphasis on practical action programs designed to achieve change on the ground through working partnerships with nongovernmental organizations, national governments, and private sector donors. In recent years, and in keeping with administration priorities, OES has placed increasing emphasis on the latter approach, although still carrying forward its negotiations mandate.

The OES front office leans heavily on the Policy Coordination and Initiatives Office (PCI) to take the lead in moving the bureau in this new direction. There are several good reasons for this. PCI is notably responsive and capable, having been developed precisely to serve as a staff office for the Assistant Secretary. Indeed, PCI is only the most current (and perhaps the most successful) embodiment of OES leadership's ongoing struggle to develop an office to coordinate policy positions on the many issues the bureau must address and also to provide the front office with an action element capable of planning and carrying out top-priority program initiatives. PCI also leads the bureau's sustainability activities, with the office director acting as the U.S. Special Representative to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. By virtue of its role in the bureau, the PCI staff is very much in tune with front office thinking. PCI also enjoys an intangible advantage of

geographical proximity, being collocated in the seventh floor front office suite. So, it is no surprise that the PDAS and others in the front office have fallen into the habit of going to PCI with an increasing variety of tasks - the location is convenient and they do everything well.

PCI has become more than a policy planning staff, however, by taking on program implementation. Others resent this. Referred to disdainfully (if enviously) as "the golden children" by other OES staff, PCI today is perceived as unfair competition by other offices in OES that see themselves marginalized as PCI moves into their areas of responsibility. OIG would not be concerned if morale were the only issue, but the heavy reliance on PCI means that other offices are not brought in on front office projects, are not changing gears to shift in sync with the bureau leadership on new ideas, and not using their best resources to support current policy and programs. Not surprisingly, other OES offices express reluctance to take on programs when PCI decides it is time to hand them off.

It is possible to gain speed quickly and look good for a while, but it is not a stable, sustainable position for the long ride. OIG believes the bureau must apply some self-discipline in deciding whether PCI is a true policy, strategy, and resource management shop, or a hothouse for programs that cannot or will not survive outside the front office. Indeed, the ability of OES leadership to advance its goals regarding implementation of practical action programs and building partnerships - as opposed to the bureau's traditional focus on negotiating binding agreements - may require much greater involvement in program development and implementation across the bureau. As long as the OES front office routinely turns to PCI for high-priority initiatives, the necessary cultural change in attitude will not take place bureau-wide.

Recommendation 1: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should prepare a mission statement for the Policy Coordination and Initiatives Office delineating the office's authority and accountability for strategic and resource planning, sustainable development, initiatives grants, and operational coordination with science and technology officers in overseas posts. (Action: OES)

The OES leadership has sought to use its Initiatives Grants Program (OESI) to seed projects in selected areas of OES interest and to stimulate international cooperation. OIG noted some problems of coordination on OESI and heard a considerable amount of resentment - if not confusion - expressed within the bureau about the program's management. OIG recommended that OES continue its effort

to improve understanding of OESI's current priorities, expected funding, and likely apportionment of funds by means of a dedicated session on OESI at the bureau's annual off-site for principal officers and through ongoing communication with all OES staff engaged in areas that could make effective use of grant funds. Because PCI manages the OESI for the bureau, that office has ongoing responsibility for improving its functioning. OIG addresses OESI in detail later in this report.

There is an unfortunate lack of clarity about the respective roles and responsibilities of the OES bureau, and, in particular, that of its Assistant Secretary, and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary (STAS). OES is charged with formulating and implementing U.S. policy regarding the environmental, marine, health, scientific, and technological aspects of U.S. foreign policy. When STAS engages foreign governments and Washington institutions independent of OES, the result is competition and confusion in the building, in Washington and abroad. The Department's leadership must define the roles, responsibilities, authority, and accountability of STAS so that the adviser takes policy guidance and receives operational support from OES. (OIG addressed this issue in the inspection of STAS, conducted concurrently with the OES inspection and repeated the recommendation below in the STAS inspection report.)

The Assistant Secretary made no secret of his belief that the Science and Technology Adviser position is superfluous and should be abolished. Yet, OIG found the bureau he headed has not wholeheartedly melded science and diplomacy nor fully implemented the commitments made by the Department five years ago. OIG sees continuing value in a science adviser with direct access to the Secretary, as well as her under and assistant secretaries, and a mandate to engage the American science community with the Department.

Recommendation 2: The Under Secretary for Global Affairs, in coordination with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary and Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should propose a revised position description for the adviser that specifies more distinctly the adviser's role, authority, and accountability. The position description should specify that the adviser receives policy direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs and the Under Secretary for Global Affairs, coordinates with the bureau on all areas of activity with foreign policy implications, and obtains administrative and programmatic support from the bureau. (Action: G, in coordination with STAS and OES)

There is a continuing debate within OES regarding the correct balance between Civil Service and Foreign Service positions and how best to use FSO talents in the bureau. OIG believes there is no magic number. This is a bureau that rightly prizes the unique if sometimes narrow subject expertise and hard earned stature its senior Civil Service employees have in international organizations and negotiations. Talented Civil Service employees must see promotion possibilities in front of them. Yet, the Department is a foreign affairs agency that depends on the Foreign Service generalists to forge links between American policy and foreign nations. Foreign Service officers now populate just 21 percent of OES jobs, down from 29 percent in 1996, one of the lowest figures among the functional bureaus. If the Department is to enjoy a reasonable number of science and technology-capable officers in the future, OES leadership needs to work carefully with the Bureau of Human Resources to ensure there is a career-enhancing ladder of challenging positions for FSOs to occupy and learn in during Washington assignments. OIG noted that the bureau's leadership is fully cognizant of this problem and sees it as an area for ongoing priority attention.

If there is no right number for the balance between Foreign and Civil Service employees in the bureau as a whole, it is nevertheless important to have an appropriate mix of the two in individual offices to enable them to carry out their work. OIG found considerable disparities in different OES offices in the proportions of Civil Service to Foreign Service professional staff. Several offices were having trouble achieving a workable balance between long-term Civil Service staff and shorter-term professionals (not only FSOs but also American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) fellows, detailees, and others). In such circumstances, OIG counseled bureau management on the need to continue to consider office requests to convert positions from one employment category to another on a case-by-case basis, supporting those that would strengthen the capacity of the office in question to manage its issues.

Throughout the inspection, OIG was struck by the enthusiasm that OES professional staff, both in the Civil and Foreign Services, brought to their work. A number of OES's Civil Service employees have well deserved reputations at home and abroad for expertise in their specialized subject areas. Some FSOs continue to pursue the OES agenda in domestic assignments in the bureau as well as overseas, despite the absence of senior Foreign Service positions (and therefore limited promotion opportunities) for officers following the bureau's issues. As one FSO said to OIG, "I know what this assignment means for my career, but I don't care. I love what I am doing." A number of Civil Service professional staff members echoed this sentiment. This level of personal commitment is a hallmark of the bureau.

POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

OCEANS AND FISHERIES DIRECTORATE

The Oceans and Fisheries Directorate (O) comprises the Office of Oceans Affairs (OA) and OMC. A deputy assistant secretary, formerly the office director for OMC, provides able leadership to the directorate. His long service in the bureau and familiarity with the directorate's many complicated issues equip him admirably for his position. His expertise is recognized throughout the bureau but particularly among the experienced and highly motivated people who work under his direction. He has a relaxed management style and is a good communicator, two attributes that help him greatly to motivate subordinates. He is an effective bureau representative in frequent dealings with the Congress, for example, in discussions of legislation that would affect the powerful U.S. fishing industry. His legal background is another asset in a job where any discussion of policy must necessarily be related to the complex network of laws and agreements governing the world's oceans and ocean resources.

Office of Oceans Affairs

The Office of Oceans Affairs (OA) is responsible for most issues related to the oceans except for fisheries conservation and management, which are handled by OMC. OA is also the lead office for Arctic and Antarctic activities for the bureau and the Department. Since September 11, 2001, the office has assumed important additional responsibilities for maritime security. OA has led the interagency community in carrying out international aspects of the U.S. Ocean Action Plan, based on guidelines laid down by the President's Commission on Ocean Policy. Underlying much of the office's work is the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, which is now before the Senate for advice and consent to ratification by the United States.

OA participates in numerous bilateral and multilateral negotiations and meetings and is heavily involved in interagency work relating to oceans policy. The office helps craft legislation to carry out U.S. obligations regarding the world's oceans. In many of its activities, OA seeks partnerships with other U.S. public sector organizations. It also funds projects in support of its objectives through the OESI program and participates in the U.S. government response to natural and man-made disasters affecting the oceans and facilitates marine scientific research.

OA has frequent interaction with the U.S. defense and homeland security establishments. The office has important strategic and security responsibilities, which, from all indications, it is carrying out admirably. Most important in this regard is OA's lead role in Arctic and Antarctic affairs, where the United States has crucial strategic interests. The assignment to OA of a military officer on detail from the U.S. Coast Guard, who is primarily responsible for coordination with the Department on maritime incidents, is an indication of the office's homeland security role. This officer is well integrated into OA's operations, indeed considers himself a full part of the bureau staff, and is contributing significantly to the accomplishment of common Department and U.S. Coast Guard goals. Another sign of OA's effectiveness in this role is its close coordination with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and U.S. Navy in interagency meetings and discussions on the Hill regarding the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In another noteworthy accomplishment, OA, acting on behalf of the Department, was charged with coordinating international elements of a U.S. Oceans Action Plan, implementing recommendations made in a presidential commission study published in September 2004. (The study was a response to legislation passed in 2000.) The action plan, which OA completed in three months, has a security component as well as important economic, commercial, and environmental goals. To address each goal, OA identified projects that could be quickly implemented, with planning for many of them already underway. The White House adopted the plan, and most of the initiatives have been launched, if not in every case fully completed.

The director and deputy director, who divide supervisory responsibilities between them, provide effective leadership to the office. Staff members, with few exceptions, report receiving clear guidance on their assignments and generally appear well motivated. OIG questioned the distribution of responsibilities, however, among employees. A few employees seemed to be carrying more than their

fair share of the office's considerable burden, although some others had what appeared to be a much lighter workload. OIG made an informal recommendation that OA review the distribution of work portfolios among the staff with a view toward achieving a more equitable balance.

Office of Marine Conservation

OMC promotes international efforts for the conservation and management of fisheries and other living marine resources as an integral part of U.S. foreign policy. Pursuant to the statutory obligations of the Department, OMC seeks to achieve U.S. marine policy goals in close coordination with other elements of the Department, the Congress, other U.S. government agencies, the U.S. fishing industry, and the environmental and academic communities.

The office seeks to ensure equitable access for U.S. fishermen to resources that are shared and managed under various international agreements and participates in the organizations overseeing these arrangements. OMC represents the Department in fisheries negotiations at the United Nations and its subsidiary bodies, as well as at meetings of the parties to other regional and global agreements aimed at conserving and managing the exploitation of marine resources. The office also represents the Department in negotiations under bilateral fisheries agreements with Canada, the Russian Federation, China, and Taiwan. It conducts outreach to ensure that domestic concerns are reflected in U.S. fisheries policy and domestic efforts to manage fisheries are consistent with U.S. international obligations. As part of this process, OMC staff members serve as nonvoting members of eight regional fishery management councils established under U.S. law. Together these activities constitute a complex process that requires OMC to coordinate efforts and balance interests of a diverse set of stakeholders in both the government and private sector.

OMC's issues arguably have as much visibility in Congress as those of any other OES office, with the possible exception of the office dealing with climate change, the Office of Global Change (EGC). The economic stakes involved are enormous, for the U.S. fishing industry, the U.S. economy generally, and the world as a whole. The UN Food and Agricultural Organization reports that trade in fish and fish products reached a record \$58.2 billion in 2002, up by nearly one half in a decade. This trade is particularly important to the developing world, which accounted for nearly 50 percent (by value) of fishery exports in 2002, exceeding the combined net value of exports of coffee, cocoa, bananas, rubber, sugar, tea, and rice. Together with the European Union countries and Japan, the United States

accounted for 74 percent of total world imports in the same year. Keeping U.S. markets open to fair trade in fish products from the developing world advances U.S. developmental goals at the same time it promotes the welfare of American consumers. Even more important, this trade is crucial to food security in both developing and developed countries, with fish products accounting for approximately 10 percent of the world's food supply and providing the main protein source for one billion people.

OMC is challenged to handle its large and diverse portfolio with a staff of nine full-time professional employees - including a Coast Guard officer on detail and a fellow from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration -- and three support staff. The burdens on the office, already stretched thin, were increased at the time of the inspection by three staff vacancies still unfilled after varying periods ranging up to several months. The OMC staff is the same size it was in 1974, the year the bureau was established, although the number and complexity of issues demanding the office's attention have increased significantly during this period. OMC must cover a wider range of organizations, negotiations, and meetings than ever before, at the same time it prepares to deal with emerging issues related to previously unregulated areas of the high seas and the protection of such vulnerable species as sea turtles, sharks, and seabirds. Despite these challenges, the inspectors heard from OMC contacts inside and outside the Department that the high level of expertise and enthusiasm of the staff leads to very strong performance.

OIG agrees with the office leadership that the bureau must do a better job of filling vacancies, in OMC and throughout OES, expeditiously. (See the general discussion of this issue in the section of this report that examines human resources.) The three current vacancies in OMC and other staffing gaps during the forthcoming summer will place an exceptional burden on the office; it is unfair for the bureau to expect it to perform at its best under these circumstances.

OMC's staffing problems have to some degree been complicated by a lack of clarity in the division of responsibilities between the office director and deputy and by some confusion about the duties of the secretarial support staff. Lines of authority for the director and deputy should be more carefully defined. Performance standards for the secretarial staff should be thoroughly discussed and agreed in order to ensure an equitable performance evaluation process with full accountability for subordinates and supervisors. OIG counseled the concerned individuals about these matters.

ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE

The Environment Directorate has an unorthodox structure. The DAS responsible for the directorate (E/DAS) oversees two offices: the Office of Environmental Policy (ENV) and the Office of Terrestrial Conservation (ETC). As a result of reorganization within the directorate, a third OES office with an important environmental portfolio, EGC, now reports to the bureau front office. This office is discussed separately later in this report. The Senior Climate Negotiator, appointed by the President and based in EGC, reports to the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and through her to the White House Council on Environmental Quality. Dictated by the high political visibility of the issue of climate change, this arrangement appears to work reasonably well, although it does leave the deputy assistant secretary for the environment in the anomalous position of being unable to speak authoritatively for the Department on the world's most urgent environmental issue.

Another unusual arrangement in the directorate has to do with the team that handles the negotiation and implementation of environmental plans linked to new free trade agreements. This small Trade and Environment (T&E) unit is administratively part of ENV, although its chief reports to the E/DAS on all substantive matters. The idea behind this arrangement is to give the important T&E portfolio a somewhat higher profile and, more importantly, to ensure it receives direct and continuing attention from the E/DAS. Again, as a practical matter, the setup seems to work as intended, although, as noted below, OIG believes the bureau can take several additional steps to strengthen the T&E team.

A member of the SES and a political appointee, the E/DAS came to the bureau from the Environmental Protection Agency administrator's office some 18 months before the inspection. In a short time, she has done a good job familiarizing herself with the wide range of international environmental issues her directorate manages. She has gained valuable experience and is becoming increasingly skilled in the mechanics of the Department, in building consensus and coalitions to achieve objectives. As a manager, she properly delegates authority to her two office directors, tending to become more involved if things appear not to be going smoothly. In ways that reinforce the office directors' authority, it can be expected the E/DAS will become more directly engaged in the future if issues arise that seem beyond the power of the office directors to resolve or opportunities occur that the directorate could more fully exploit under her leadership.

Office of Environmental Policy

ENV has three teams. One deals with chemicals and pollution issues, including various international agreements to protect the ozone layer, regulate trade in toxic chemicals, and monitor transboundary air pollution. A second team is responsible for U.S. participation in the UN Environmental Program and the environmental activities of the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and other international bodies. A third team, which reports on policy issues directly to the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environment (OES/E) but falls administratively under the ENV director, leads the negotiations for environmental cooperation agreements as well as the interagency process aimed at improving environmental enforcement capacities in the trading partner nations.

ENV is responsible for leading the interagency process to negotiate and implement environmental cooperation mechanisms that are tied to new free trade agreements between the United States and its trading partners. ENV also participates in the activities of certain international environmental organizations, negotiating policy changes and guiding program initiatives undertaken by these organizations. ENV and the bureau can point to major negotiating accomplishments. Most prominent among those was the negotiation in 2004 and 2005 of critical use exemptions from the Montreal Protocol for methyl bromide, a vitally important pesticide for fruit and vegetable growers across the United States. In addition, earlier this year, an ENV team successfully beat back a European proposal to create a global, legally binding treaty to control mercury emissions by proposing instead the creation of public-private partnerships that would more rapidly address this serious threat to human health.

The office has been afflicted with staff vacancies throughout most of the past year. Assistance to fill these vacancies, first from the bureau's human resources office (EX/HR) and more recently from the Bureau of Administration's HR office, has been halting at best and largely ineffective. Several key vacancies are in Foreign Service positions. Bureau management, understandably seeking to maintain a proper balance between Foreign Service and Civil Service positions throughout OES, tried hard for many long months to fill these positions with qualified Foreign Service candidates. But there were few bidders, and one FSO who was successfully recruited proved to be a poor fit for the job she was given. Her assignment was later cancelled.

This problem primarily affected ENV's T&E unit, which was sorely pressed as a result to comply with its two-part mandate. First, T&E is charged with negotiating environmental cooperation agreements and associated work plans to implement the environmental chapters of free-trade agreements. Second, T&E is tasked to lead the interagency process to identify funding and oversee projects to build environmental capacities under the work plans in trade partner countries.

ENV managers felt frustrated by the bureau's inability to resolve the stubborn personnel problems - although OIG noted that this has been a bureau-wide issue. Their frustration, in turn, fed a perception that senior management was not fully behind the T&E effort, perhaps because bureau priorities had changed.

OES senior managers told OIG that the bureau places a high priority on the T&E effort. They cite an almost perverse series of errors and missteps that have delayed filling the vacancies in the T&E unit and note the bureau is now moving to convert one of the vacant Foreign Service positions to a Civil Service slot and fill the second one with a detailee from another agency. There has also been inter-agency disagreement on the relative importance of labor/human rights issues and environmental concerns as the U.S. government conducts trade negotiations. Meanwhile, the T&E unit continues to operate under-complement and faces the prospect of an increasing burden of environmental agreements that have been negotiated and are gradually entering into force. Although the proposed personnel changes the bureau has outlined should indeed improve the situation, these changes, as noted, have not yet been implemented. OIG suggested that the bureau make resolution of these personnel issues a matter of high priority and keep its attention focused on the T&E portfolio until it is satisfied the unit has the staffing and other resources it needs fulfill its mandate. OIG noted that other offices in the Department that work closely with the T&E unit on environmental aspects of free trade agreements are concerned about the unit's staffing levels.

Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation

ETC coordinates U.S. foreign policy approaches to critical ecosystems, including forests, wetlands, dry lands, and coral reefs, and the diverse species that depend on them. The office leads in formulating policy and conducting negotiations to address international threats to biodiversity such as land degradation, invasive species, and illegal trade in wildlife. In addition, ETC handles issues associated with trade in genetically modified organisms and promotes equitable access to and sharing of biological resources. Bureau leadership and representatives of the interagency environmental community offer generous praise to ETC for its effectiveness and many achievements in these efforts.

In carrying out its mission, ETC participates in discussions and negotiations at a wide variety of international institutions, many of them based on treaties. Simply to list some of these is to suggest the range of the office's activities: the UN Forum on Forests, the UN Food and Agricultural Organization, the Convention to Combat Desertification, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, and the International Coral Reef Initiative. The office also plays a key role in overseeing bilateral agreements under the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, an innovative program of debt reduction.

ETC has been a key player in the development of two presidential initiatives in forestry: the Congo Basin Forest Partnership and the President's Initiative to Combat Illegal Logging. In the short time that these initiatives have been in place, ETC has worked to develop and oversee the implementation of forest and wildlife conservation projects totaling tens of millions of dollars in Central Africa, help post-war Liberia institute a forest management plan so that timber sanctions can ultimately be removed, and convince G-8 ministers and those of other countries around the world to make enforcement against illegal logging a priority.

On assuming her position two years ago, the office director reorganized ETC's staff into three teams focusing on forests, biodiversity, and trade and ecology. This structure allows for the delegation of responsibilities to the team leaders and appears to promote better coordination across different areas of specialization. Although each office in the Environment Directorate has a different organizational plan, this team structure appears generally effective for ETC. Each of the team leaders manages a small staff in pursuit of a set of well-defined, realistic goals. The deputy director is primarily responsible for office administrative matters (e.g., travel) and works with the director on policy issues that are part of his portfolio. He also serves as support to fill a vacancy on the office staff. Communication with the junior staff is only fair, although it is improving. Staff (including ETC's two AAAS fellows) and clerical employees sometimes feel out of touch with work in the office outside their own areas of responsibility. This has had some impact on their morale. OIG made an informal recommendation that ETC establish a regular meeting schedule and make every effort to adhere to it in order to increase the involvement and engagement of the entire staff, including the junior professional and clerical staffs, in the office's work.

ETC has a high proportion of rotational employees on its staff, which imposes special burdens because such employees lack time to develop the expertise required to manage many of ETC's complex issues. (This counts FSOs together with AAAS, Presidential Management Fellows and interns - all as rotational staff.)

Elsewhere in this report OIG considers what should be the right balance between Foreign Service and Civil Service employees across the bureau as well as the balance each office, including ETC, needs in order to fulfill its mission.

The director, an expert on forests, has continued since taking over the office to focus a great deal of her energy and attention on this and other ETC priority issues and negotiations. Her intense engagement in this substantive work, where from all reports she has been highly effective, has taken her away from the day-to-day management of the office, which has been largely left to the deputy. This arrangement has not been entirely satisfactory. The director needs to increase her direct involvement in running the office. OIG thinks the director could safely delegate an increasing share of the office's substantive work to ETC's able professional staff, thereby allowing herself more time to devote to office supervision. Conversely, OIG thinks further efforts could be made to draw the deputy director more fully into the substantive work of the office. The deputy, now in his third year at ETC, has presumably had time to develop enough expertise in the office's issues to play a more forward role in its activities. OIG counseled the office director on these matters.

HEALTH, SPACE AND SCIENCE DIRECTORATE

The Health, Space and Science Directorate includes the Office of International Health Affairs (IHA), the Office of Space and Advanced Technology (SAT), and the Office of Science and Technology Cooperation (STC). IHA works with U.S. government agencies to facilitate policymaking regarding international bioterrorism, infectious disease, surveillance and response, environmental health, and health in post-conflict situations. SAT handles issues arising from our exploration of space to assure global security regarding this new frontier as well as multilateral "big science" collaborations. STC promotes the interests of the U.S. science and technology communities in the international policy arena, negotiates framework and other S&T agreements, manages the Department's Embassy Science Fellows program, and takes a leading role in representing U.S. science and technology in multilateral international organizations, such as the UN Educational, Cultural and Scientific Commission and other UN organizations, Asia - Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and others.

The dismal surroundings of the science directorate's remote offices would suggest that the directorate does not rank high on the OES priority list, as would the long periods during which the DAS position for the directorate has remained vacant (as it was during the course of the inspection). Even when there was an incumbent DAS, the staff commented that he was on the road much of the time and did not engage in the substance of the work done by the three offices under his supervision. Indeed, these unpleasant realities of life in the directorate were among the main concerns of the directorate's staff, as reflected in OIG's meetings with the employees. In fact, OIG concluded that the three components of the science directorate make important contributions to Department and U.S. government policy objectives, although some aspects of the directorate's activities need careful attention. Moreover, the extended gaps in filling the vacant DAS position arise from the bureau's desire to recruit a suitable candidate rather than from disinterest in the function.

As far as OIG could determine, the GS-15 position of special adviser to the DAS for science and health (position S85517) (the incumbent declined to be interviewed), is not contributing to the achievement of bureau goals. The bureau leadership must either better define the role, responsibility, and accountability of the position or move the position to a more productive use. OIG notes that no other DAS in the bureau has a dedicated special adviser.

Office of International Health Affairs

IHA is the newest office in the bureau, devolving when the Global AIDS Coordinator position was created in the Secretary's office. Today IHA concentrates on identifying and managing the foreign policy implications of infectious diseases, bioterrorism, and environmental health. The mandate potentially could include everything except HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis. And, herein lies the rub. The Department has no clear claim to lead U.S. policy on some IHA issues, and indeed occasionally other major bureaucracies at the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Homeland Security overlook it.

Working in cramped conditions with a limited budget, the IHA staff accomplishments are noteworthy. Assiduous work by the Public Health Service doctor on detail from the Department of Health and Human Services and other IHA staff in the G-8 process has helped to raise \$200 million dollars for the World Health Organization's polio eradication initiative. The World Health Organization noted the pattern of IHA demarche instructions to American ambassadors in G-8 and Organization of Islamic Council countries, because they could see the spike in

donations after each telegram. IHA has been especially effective in developing an international strategy (currently awaiting final approval at the National Security Council) to deal with international aspects of avian influenza. Congress encouraged this initiative by funding \$25 million for U.S. agencies to transfer technology and expertise abroad to prevent the disease metamorphosing into a human pandemic that might reach U.S. shores. Yet another employee, a university Ph.D. on sabbatical, has successfully developed a partnership among the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Health and Human Services, the U.S. Agency for International Development, foreign countries, and private donors to reduce deaths due to unsafe water.

In a similar fashion, IHA leads for the Department on bioterrorism prevention and response, partnering with the Department of Homeland Security to stimulate joint planning and training in the G-8 Bioterrorism Experts Group. IHA has pushed the foreign policy agenda as well as war game exercises for the coalition of health ministers from Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and the United Kingdom, the so-called Global Health Security Action Group. As a result, the United States is the only country whose equivalents of the health ministry and the foreign ministry both participate.

Nevertheless, OIG heard concerns from other executive branch agencies about IHA's lead for the Department on bioterrorism. It is not apparent to other agencies that IHA does, in fact, have the mandate for the Department's lead in bioterrorism and may not be fully consulting with all Department offices that have equities in the bioterrorism portfolio. Several agencies reportedly perceive a lack of leadership on international bioterrorism in the U.S. government, a role that naturally falls to the Department. In the course of the inspection, OES provided the inspection team with documentation outlining the bureau's role, including interagency coordination, on bioterrorism, biodefense, and health security. OIG believes that this apparent lack of internal coordination may, in fact, arise from insufficient communication within the Department and with other agencies on that role. The bureau's leadership is well aware of the situation, and OIG is confident that the new OES Assistant Secretary and new DAS for science and health will give the matter priority attention.

Despite a less than ideal workspace, minimal funding, a conglomeration of staff (AAAS fellows, Council on Foreign Relations fellows, Presidential Management fellows, interns, Schedule B appointees, and detailees from other agencies), and undeniably a catchall mandate, the IHA office has high morale and numerous successes to its credit.

Office of Space and Advanced Technology

SAT is a small office with capable people and a surprising list of accomplishments. For several years SAT has been primarily focused on the negotiations between the United States and the European Union on Global Positioning System (GPS) cooperation. As many as four of the office's nine staff have been devoted to the GPS work, although this will probably decline in the future. The second and even longer running priority for the office has been taking the lead for the Department on all UN and international law issues related to space, especially the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. SAT represents the Department at most interagency meetings on space policy issues, and frequently the officers serve as a convener or initiator of projects which may include the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, academic institutions and the U.S. aerospace industry. Interestingly, this is the office that maintains the official U.S. registry of objects launched into outer space and coordinates for the Department the interagency process of granting space technology export licenses.

The highly technical GPS talks, which lasted several years and were often quite acrimonious, succeeded in preserving America's ability to use the U.S.-built GPS system in time of conflict as well as to protect American industry from unfair licensing requirements by the European Union. At the same time, SAT was able to advance long-term transatlantic cooperation and guarantee future interoperable civil services for GPS users. SAT was fortunate to have on board several well-qualified specialists to deal with this subject, including a fellow from the Institute of Navigation with decades of experience in the field.

SAT had an important but little recognized achievement in preserving the Department's lead role in international space issues when it successfully countered a power grab by another agency. The office also promotes the Department's interests in White House-directed national policy reviews, which recently established new guidelines in national space policy, space transportation, remote sensing, space law, space based navigation, and space exploration issues. In yet another accomplishment, SAT overcame fierce resistance from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense to forge an interagency consensus on a U.S. strategy for mitigating the effects of orbital debris. The office gets good marks from Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for streamlining the clearance process for their travelers and for expeditious work in obtaining Circular 175 negotiating authority.²

SAT has proven its agility as well in moving forward on civilian space cooperation with India, in fulfillment of one of the Secretary's objectives, and a presidential commitment. SAT started up a bilateral working group to address mutually agreed subjects such as geographic information for sustainable development, global spatial data infrastructure, earth observation, space science, and satellite navigation. This goes hand in hand with work elsewhere in the office to reinforce U.S. initiatives designed to meld maps, remote sensing data from satellites, and cutting edge software into the geographic information for sustainable development project. The bureau may have been overly modest in public affairs terms about the American contribution to the project.

An exemplary cooperation has existed between this office and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary with regard to the U.S. position on ITER, the much contested site decision for the ten billion dollar international fusion research facility. One SAT staff member quietly provided much of the staff support, including interagency coordination and negotiation with ITER partners such as Japan, the European Union, Russia, China, and Korea. During the inspection, a solution to the site question between France and Japan was reached with U.S. interests having been successfully protected. The Department's end of the interagency process worked well because the SAT office director chose to deliver the staff resources necessary although others got the visibility.

²The Circular 175 procedure, pursuant to "Department Circular No. 175, dated December 13, 1955 as amended," concerns the authority for negotiation and signature of treaties and other international agreements. See 11 FAM 720.1.

Employees say the SAT leadership "makes coming to work a pleasure" and that "everyone is assured of having something important to do." Clearly, the low-pressure management style and remote location contribute to protecting SAT from drive-by taskings and distractions. There is a general recognition that the office lost some valuable talent due to recent retirements, and there is a strong sense of needing more hands. Much of the work in this office would be good grist for a public affairs and public diplomacy mill, were there more time. In the current bureau resource climate, however, management may have to tighten the belt and redeploy existing staff to keep up with current assignments.

Office of Science and Technology Cooperation

Collocated with SAT in the K Street building, STC is primarily home to the Department's bilateral and multilateral science and technology agreements. Numbering more than 30, these agreements (signed with an odd mixture of countries around the globe over the years for a variety of reasons) promote sustainable development, enhancement of the role of women in science and society, science-based decision making, good governance, and global security. STC also has responsibility for oversight of over 700 bilateral memoranda of understanding, a requirement that consumes significant staff time and so hinders the office's expansion into areas that the bureau leadership might find more productive.

In many cases, the S&T agreements are simply frameworks. With no dedicated Department funding, they often symbolize our interest in cooperative relations with another country. Most of them establish a mechanism for cooperation in research, the exchange of scholars, sharing of information and data, visa and travel requirements, and the treatment of intellectual property. They may call for periodic consultations by the two governments. In many cases, such agreements may be more important to the other country as a legal basis for fiscal commitments and planning. U.S. science agencies are usually unable, as well as unwilling, to make specific program commitments in advance. Moreover, most U.S. agencies have sufficient domestic legal authority to engage in international cooperation regardless of the existence of a bilateral umbrella S&T agreement and prefer to use their own topic-specific bilateral channels. Nevertheless, a number of U.S. science and technology agencies value these agreements and strongly support the Department's involvement in promoting and facilitating international science cooperation.

The S&T agreement can be an important foreign policy tool (Korea, China, or India come to mind), a means of stepping up our practical cooperation and putting in place useful rules and guidelines. Indeed, OIG was surprised to find that OES does not wield this tool more effectively than it does within the bureau and in the Department. As one employee said, the agreements tend to "serve the interests of the interagency community, but not the interests of OES." Indeed, OIG heard praise for STC's work on S&T agreements during the interagency survey phase of the inspection. Officials in other agencies said that STC's active efforts to solicit input and to develop U.S. government positions via a fully consultative process were exemplary. They also commented on what they see as a new "strategic focus" for S&T agreements that has replaced the earlier "shopping around" for countries that might want to enter into an agreement with the United States.

With regard to interdepartmental discussions on S&T agreements, there is little evidence that - on the eve of a new negotiation or a review of an existing agreement - STC solicits input and suggestions for important bureau or Department priorities to be included in the work plan or the agreement itself. There is little effort to include, incorporate, or reference U.S. objectives on fisheries, space cooperation, endangered species, water purity measurement standards, illegal logging data, or invasive species controls in the S&T agreements with other countries. (There are exceptions. Notification of marine scientific research within national economic zones and genetic resource access and benefit sharing are two examples.) However, these agreements are typically broad umbrellas that include all civilian S&T topics in the OES issues portfolio. With STC on the verge of scheduling a backlog of pending bilateral consultations, there are opportunities to make S&T agreements more relevant and productive for the bureau and the Department. The associated joint commission meetings, or their equivalents, in which bilateral activity is periodically reviewed and new activity contemplated, represent a good opportunity to promote OES and Department priorities.

STC carries out a number of bilateral and multilateral initiatives such as the Iraq Virtual Science Library and representing the bureau on visa policy for scientists, to name but two. STC is the home of the highly regarded Embassy Science Fellows program whereby U.S. science agencies loan experts to embassies for 30 to 90 days on a shared cost basis. As the office at the nexus of the Washington science agencies and the Department's overseas posts, STC is best qualified to manage this program, especially because it serves to reinforce the use of science in diplomacy. In reviewing this aspect of STC's operations, OIG concluded that the office could make adjustments to its management and promotion and discussed several suggestions with office leadership.

During the inspection, STC director, together with his Department of Defense counterpart, convened a meeting of the international affairs directors of the major U.S. science agencies and departments. OIG was impressed by the useful information about previously unknown international science collaborations that surfaced in the course of this meeting, a reminder of how science is affecting U.S. foreign relations.

The STC staff has worked cooperatively with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary since the STAS position was created. One STC staff member has developed an outline for managing the enlarged AAAS science fellows programs more effectively. STC would clearly be a logical home for many of the initiatives begun by the STAS, such as the Global Dialogue on Emerging Science and Technology and U.S.-EU Perspectives conferences, as well as the Foreign Service Institute science curriculum project, if they are spun off to an operational office as recommended in a separate OIG report. OIG believes STC and STAS can maintain and expand this kind of cooperation.

The recommendation by OIG, in the course of the recent inspection of the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi, that the bureau and STC can make better use of several millions of dollars in the U.S. India Fund and related bilateral instruments represents an opportunity for the bureau to make a notable contribution to further the budding U.S.- India relationship. The inspection of Embassy New Delhi showed that 10 U.S. government agencies have "programs still active and outstanding funding obligations of approximately \$5.9 million. There is approximately \$3.4 million in the U.S. India Fund accounts from expired programs and \$11.2 million in the Interim Fund from expired programs and unobligated interest. These nearly \$15 million dollars represent a valuable resource for furthering U.S.-Indian relations and should not sit idle." STC is aware of this money and is working on a strategy for its use and the closure of dormant programs.

There seems to be overlap with the PCI office in several areas; for example, PCI's Science in the Muslim World initiative also could be said to have begun several years ago with STC's outreach agreements and programs in Egypt, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and North Africa that now fall under the Muslim World Outreach rubric. OIG found persuasive the logic that argues for completing the desegregation of PCI (and returning it to a purely policy staff function) by restoring STC as the bureau's contact point for embassy S&T officers around the globe. This might imply the transfer of some positions from PCI to STC along with their geographic responsibility.

Any discussion of allocating more responsibility to STC must, however, take place against the background of past actions and the office's current management challenges. Once the powerhouse in OES, the science and technology office was asset-stripped in the 1990s to finance the growth in the bureau's commitment to climate change and environmental issues prior to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol negotiations. Reversing course in 2000, the office was re-established (but with the chief a "special adviser" and not an office director), placed in a remote location, and staffed with a "hodgepodge of skill sets and personalities," according to one observer.

Today, two FSOs serve as director and deputy director. There is a GS-15 senior advisor on loan from the oceans office. The remaining office staff includes an assortment of Foreign Service and Civil Service employees and temporary appointments and fellows of varying skill levels, experience, and motivation. The transitory nature of STC staff and leadership often leads to loss of continuity and corporate memory, as well as fractured and unclear office policy and objectives. In OIG's view, the office director must first delineate, and then communicate, office and individual priorities more clearly than he has until now. He must set firm but fair criteria so that chronic under performers either improve or move on. He must establish both individual and group priorities, and then measure their accomplishment. To do these things, the office director will need to refine and improve his management and communication skills. He will need help from a newly arriving deputy and the backing of the front office. OIG counseled the office director and the PDAS on these matters.

The STC office is still clearly a "turn around" challenge in terms of personnel, resources, and mission. But, it would be to the bureau's benefit to use it to revitalize the way its issues are managed in the field and to give the use of science and technology as a means to advance U.S. foreign policy objectives stature in the Department. OIG believes that with management attention to provision of resources and leadership, STC will be able to take on a greater responsibility for the bureau's relations with posts abroad, specifically including coordinating environment, science, and technology hubs, guidance and support to science and technology officers, and the integration of science and technology agreements with bureau and other Department goals.

OFFICE OF GLOBAL CHANGE

EGC coordinates the U.S. government's international activities relating to global climate change, including the promotion of scientific and technological research and development aimed at assessing climate change and mitigating its effects. The office has three main functions. Through its participation in UN and other international organizations, EGC seeks to shape global policies on climate change and processes being established to address the issue. As part of this effort, the office negotiates bilateral partnerships to foster cooperation and coordination on climate change policy.³ The office also promotes U.S. initiatives for the development and increasing use of clean energy technologies. In discussions with other Department offices working with EGC, OIG heard appreciation for the expertise of EGC staff and its cooperation and creativity in resolving extremely complex issues.

Climate change is without question currently the most politically sensitive of all the bureau's issues. With the United States not a party to the Kyoto Protocol, the Department is responsible for defending U.S. policies on climate change from a distinctly minority position. In this context, EGC's mission is to promote ongoing dialogue on the issue in the international community that is consistent with broader U.S. climate change policies. In multilateral talks and through a series of bilateral agreements the office has negotiated, EGC seeks to encourage cooperation and demonstrate the seriousness of U.S. purpose in addressing this issue, in particular by promoting research on clean energy technologies and key scientific issues.

Because of the issue's political sensitivity, EGC has an unusual organizational structure. A presidentially appointed Senior Climate Negotiator is the office's de facto DAS. He is responsible for keeping the OES Assistant Secretary fully informed of his activities, but for all practical purposes he reports to the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and through her to the Secretary and the White House Council on Environmental Quality. Although EGC is organized largely around the work of the senior negotiator, he has no direct management role in the office. A director and deputy director manage the office and its small but able professional staff. In addition to supporting the senior negotiator, the office leads U.S.

³President Bush announced new "clear skies and global climate change initiatives" in a speech at NOAA on February 14, 2002 -- available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/02/print/20020214-5.html>.

participation in climate negotiations under the rubric of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (to which the United States is a party) and in other multilateral fora. The office director and deputy are in fact heavily involved in negotiations throughout much of the year, as are all the office's professional staff members.

In a bureau whose lifeblood is negotiations, EGC may take the laurels for being involved in more negotiations, in more fora, more often than any other office in OES - such is the prominence of climate change on the current international environmental agenda. In addition to a relatively intense UN portfolio, EGC has developed 15 climate change partnerships and worked with technical agencies to establish and implement five plurilateral initiatives on a range of science and technical activities. This has meant a steady increase in office workload. An increase in AAAS fellows and other nonpermanent staff has helped the office meet its requirements. This intense negotiating round, which necessitates frequent absences of the director and deputy, sometimes at the same time, complicates management and supervision in the office.

Owing to the sensitivity and complexity of the climate change portfolio, delegation of authority is an issue. There are many junior staff members, and senior staff travels frequently. Subordinate staff members occasionally feel that they are lacking instructions, and this has had some impact on morale. To rectify the situation, the office leadership last year created four coordinators to serve as subject specialists guiding the work of less experienced staff members. Employees generally consider this arrangement beneficial. The result has been substantial delegation of executive authority, especially during the month that the office leadership is away for negotiations at the United Nations. The coordinators do not supervise the more junior staff members, but instead serve as coaches and resources for junior staff and a centralized resource for the climate negotiator and other senior staff. In what the director and deputy describe as a "hub and spoke" model, all subordinate staff members including the coordinators report directly to the heads of the office for guidance, direction, and decision on significant matters. In the last year, directors have also made themselves available by cell phone at all times, and this has become the normal means for subordinates to get direction where needed.

When the office directors are traveling or otherwise too busy to meet with staff - something that appears to occur with some frequency - decisions may be delayed and cause frustration among some staff members. This was particularly true of the AAAS fellows in the office. Office directors acknowledge the need to keep staff members informed of the office's business, for example, by holding regular staff

meetings. They agree, too, that communications with the office when they are traveling and coordination with the acting director and other action officers on pending decisions could be improved and suggest one way to do that would be by scheduling a daily conference call "back home."

OFFICE OF POLICY COORDINATION AND INITIATIVES

OES created PCI in the late 1990s, when the bureau divided up the portfolio of the old Office of Regional Policy Initiatives and several other functions between the new PCI and a new Office of Science and Technology Cooperation. The incumbent director, an SES career Civil Service employee appointed to his position at the time of the creation of the office, supervises a staff of 14 Civil Service employees, interns, and fellows, and three FSOs. The director also serves as the U.S. government's Special Representative for Sustainable Development, an area specifically identified by the Department as a strategic priority.

PCI arose in part from the desire of the OES Assistant Secretary to develop an integrated approach to decision making in the bureau and replace an existing process that did not provide bureau leadership with the information it needed to make decisions and set priorities. PCI develops and articulates bureau policies in conjunction with the Bureau Performance Plan (BPP) process and manages a number of issues that cut across the subject areas of OES offices. PCI staff with regional assignments serve as the principal OES liaison to regional bureaus on policy development of OES issues and work to insure OES priorities get into regional bureaus' BPPs. PCI staff with regional portfolios also serve as points-of-contact for embassy officers in need of assistance from OES. In this regard, PCI coordinates the work of the regional hubs overseas. Finally, PCI manages OESI for the bureau, providing opportunities for domestic and overseas offices to obtain grant support for projects to advance OES objectives in certain priority fields.

PCI has emerged as an action office for the OES leadership for both crosscutting issues and issues of great interest to the front office that do not quite fit elsewhere in OES. In response to ongoing efforts in the Department to increase outreach to Muslims, for example, PCI created programs related to science education in the Muslim world. PCI's innovative Afghan Conservation Corps jobs program and its leadership of the interagency emergency action efforts on behalf of the December 26, 2004, tsunami victims further demonstrate the variety of responsibilities assigned to the office. PCI sees itself as an idea generator for OES - taking general direction from the bureau's leadership, framing initiatives, finding

resources, and then playing a lead role in the start-up of programs that it might then hand off to other OES (or other Department or U.S. government) offices for ongoing implementation.

The hand-off process works better with some parts of OES than it does with others. In discussions with OIG, the office director and his deputy agreed that time lines and exit strategies for PCI initiatives need to be factored into their planning early and that ongoing close consultation and coordination with the action elements are critical to smooth transitions. OIG notes that several OES offices complained about confusion in the planning, execution, and transition of various PCI initiatives, some of which overlapped with programs already underway elsewhere in the bureau. OIG examined some problems in this regard in the review of SAT above, and there are other examples. PCI concurred with OIG's assessment that it could improve communication and coordination with other elements and affirmed its intention to do so.

The PCI director serves as the U.S. government's Special Representative for Sustainable Development, and PCI is the U.S. government's lead office for sustainable development, notably at the UN Commission on Sustainable Development. This has been a key area of PCI and OES interest since the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg - an event that marked a turning point in OES's organizational philosophy as it began to focus on implementation of development programs with practical results rather than negotiate agreements that set goals. PCI has been in the forefront of the OES leadership's desire to change the culture of the bureau, to reorient OES from its traditional role in negotiating international agreements to emphasizing involvement in sustainable development programs that actually affect the way people live.

Unlike the role it plays in many of its initiatives, PCI retains operational responsibilities for programs under the sustainable development umbrella. These include, for example, projects in developing countries involving access to fresh water and to reliable energy supplies - both priorities for the UN's Commission on Sustainable Development. Central to PCI's work in sustainable development is the emphasis on building partnerships among official bodies along with public-private partnerships. This is now the core of the U.S. strategy to advance sustainable development goals, with the United States seeking to build coalitions of public and private bodies in a consultative and inclusive development process. OES recognizes the importance of building and maintaining a tight strategic relationship with the U.S. Agency for International Development in working toward sustainable development goals, and there is regular collaboration with the agency in Washington and in the field. To help inform the American public - and, indeed, the world -

about the extent of the U.S. public and private commitment to sustainable development, PCI created and now manages a web site (<http://www.sdp.gov>) devoted to the subject.

By virtue of its physical proximity to the OES front office, PCI has ready access to and frequent interaction with the OES leadership. Indeed, in many respects PCI functions as an extension of the front office. PCI often has lead responsibility for preparing talking points, briefing memoranda, and other papers required by the front office. Meeting the requirements usually involves PCI's tasking other OES offices to provide information and background. PCI handles this critical responsibility well. The same coordinating process applies to annual production of the BPP. Indeed, the proximity of PCI to the front office and its steady involvement across the bureau on behalf of the front office has led to a perception in parts of OES that PCI enjoys a privileged status relative to other offices. This, in turn, fuels another perception that PCI does not always consult fully with other offices or seek to build consensus when it develops courses of action in response to front office demands. In the course of the inspection, the PCI office director and deputy director, along with the OES Assistant Secretary and his principal deputy, offered OIG an excellent analysis of the various incarnations of the PCI function in OES, its current purpose, and their perceptions of the opportunities and problems inherent in its unique role in the bureau. It was clear to OIG, however, that several other parts of the bureau do not fully comprehend PCI's purpose. Accordingly, OIG made the recommendation for a PCI mission statement in the Executive Direction section of this report.

OIG is concerned that the front office reliance on PCI's readily apparent capabilities may, in effect, work against the cultural change that bureau leadership seeks throughout the bureau, as noted in the Executive Direction section of this report. Some offices have successfully reoriented - even reinvented - themselves in response to the bureau's evolving priorities. Others have been less willing to change their old ways of doing business and express frustration at what they see as their marginalization. For the most part, however, the current system appears to give bureau leadership what it wants. OIG therefore decided against recommending a restructuring of PCI that would remove it from direct involvement in program direction and recasting it as purely the OES in-house think tank.

As is the case with other offices in OES, PCI has on occasion suffered from a lack of clear direction from bureau leadership. PCI's status as an action element available for deployment - along with its reputation among the bureau leadership as a "can-do" office - has led to some problems for the office. By its own assessment, PCI can be highly effective when the front office is clear on its priorities and

provides the resources necessary to accomplish assigned tasks. On the other hand, PCI staff note that the front office will assign PCI to "issues of the moment," (e.g., doing something in regard to Afghanistan) thereby taking time and resources away from ongoing assignments. PCI's ability to get projects going quickly and then pass action responsibility on to another office is therefore essential if it is to meet its primary function as OES's strategic planning, policy coordination, and idea-generating element. In OIG's view, PCI has generally been successful in meeting the routine and urgent requirements of the OES front office although carrying out its ongoing duties.

PCI has responsibility for overall coordination of the OESI program. This grants program was funded in FY 2005 at approximately \$2.5 million in economic support funds transferred to OES by the U.S. Agency for International Development. PCI has also succeeded in raising additional funds from regional bureaus in the Department and from other partners to support a variety of projects PCI could not cover. The funds support project activities in areas identified by OES as bureau priorities. In the current planning cycle, these include promoting U.S. positions in oceans, marine and wildlife conservation, health, sustainable natural resource management, environmental good governance, and water. The PCI deputy director oversees the translation of these bureau priorities into an action agenda, preparation of the project solicitation announcement, collection of proposals, evaluation, and selection by OES leadership of approved proposals, and required congressional notifications. The OES/EX office, in turn, has responsibility for the actual management of the grants funds and documentation of the use of the funds. As is the case with other PCI initiatives, handing off projects to other OES offices, other bureaus, or other government agencies after the programs are successfully launched is a high priority - especially when the new action office can bring new money to sustain the project.

OESI provides a clear example of the bureau's gradual transformation from a culture of negotiation to a culture of action and implementation. The bureau is seeking substantial increases to the OESI budget in FY 2006 and FY 2007. The current pace of activity and the prospect of more money and more grants in the future inevitably raise questions about how PCI, OES/EX, and the bureau in general have structured themselves to assure that OESI meets priorities across the bureau and that the programs receive the necessary oversight. This was a particular focus of OIG attention in the inspection. It was clear to OIG that some aspects of OESI need attention from PCI, the OES front office, and the executive office.

With regard to oversight of the programmatic aspects of OESI, the recent decision to replace a hodge-podge of approximately 40 grant officer representatives scattered throughout the bureau with one designated OESI point-of-contact (POC) in each OES office is a positive move. In effect, the POCs will serve as grant officer representatives for the Bureau of Administration's grants officers (there are no grants officers in OES) and provide general oversight to individual program managers. They will also serve as each office's interface with PCI and the OES executive office.

This consolidation of responsibility in one employee in each OES office represents an effective operational change or, perhaps more accurately, has the potential for effective change. According to the plan proposed by the PCI and the OES executive director, the designated employee will receive special training in project management and design and assist individual project officers. The POCs could provide guidance to their offices throughout the OESI awards process, making sure that their colleagues have full information on the program at the start of the annual grant cycle; that grant proposals meet technical requirements; and, that their offices, PCI, and the executive section are coordinating as necessary. In OIG's view, the establishment of the POC function should help standardize grant operations across the bureau.

Some gaps in OESI execution remain, however. The POCs do not have position descriptions that reflect new duties related to grants management and design and are unsure as to the exact nature of their duties. There is no training plan in place for the POCs. Additionally, not all POCs have been officially designated by A/LM/AQM as grant officer representatives. Various elements in OES (and environment, science, technology, and health officers in the field) complain that they do not get timely instructions on OESI and that PCI and the front office in the end make awards decisions that do not accord with the priorities set at the start of the awards cycle. OIG noted that PCI conducts an annual OESI information seminar for OES staff prior to the awards cycle, requests OES offices (including environment, science, technology, and health officers overseas) to develop proposals early, and then works closely with the bureau's principal officers to set priorities for awards at the annual OES off-site meeting in late December. The program receives further attention, including status reports, at senior staff meetings.

Nevertheless, offices in OES and overseas stressed to OIG that they would like greater information on current priorities (because those can change as fresh requirements come to the bureau), expected funding, and the likely apportionment of funds against priorities. Finally, the lack of involvement of the Bureau of Administration's grants officers in the grant selection process leads to vulnerabili-

ties regarding grantee selection and general grants procedures. OIG found that A/LM/AQM grant officers are largely removed from OES's grant selection process. Grant officers do not attend grantee selection committee meetings and do not have regular meetings with OES program managers or grant officer representatives.

OES plans to rely on POCs (grant officer representatives) for technical guidance related to the grant award process. Grant officers in A/LM/AQM, however, hold such responsibility, including ensuring that grants are properly competed, as directed in Grant Policy Directive No. 5, and that grantees considered for award have a satisfactory record of performance. Although grant officers may rely on grant officer representatives for some of the above requirements, grant officers are the experts and are ultimately responsible. OES program officers and grant officer representatives (POCs) should work closely with A/LM/AQM grant officers throughout the award process to ensure that grants accomplish the intended programmatic mission while meeting technical requirements. The Bureau of Administration should also issue guidance on grantee selection to insure that grantees meet U.S. government requirements for awards.

Recommendation 3: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should draft position descriptions for the office points-of-contact acting as grant officer representatives that spell out the duties of this new function, and the bureau should develop a training plan on grants management for the points-of-contact. (Action: OES)

Recommendation 4: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should take steps to insure that bureau staff and science and technology officers in the field have regular updates and current information on the bureau's initiative grants program. (Action: OES)

Recommendation 5: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should request that the Bureau of Administration's grants officers meet at least quarterly with its grant officer representatives, program managers, and budget officers and at other times, including selection committee meetings, when their participation would facilitate the award and oversight of its grants. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/LM)

PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

An experienced GS-14 press and public affairs adviser has directed public affairs and public diplomacy for OES since 1997. The public affairs adviser is attached directly to the Assistant Secretary's office and does not head a separate section. The incumbent's previous service in the Bureau of Public Affairs facilitates OES interaction and coordination with the Bureau of Public Affairs on the full range of OES issues and especially in the handling of climate change - the element of OES responsibility that continues to receive the most public and media attention and demands most of the adviser's time. The public affairs adviser coordinates the interagency public affairs strategy on climate change and oversees press operations for the U.S. government at international meetings on climate change. This is an important responsibility, but it is just one area of an extensive OES portfolio packed with issues of considerable interest in the United States and abroad (e.g., protecting forests and whales) that offer numerous opportunities to highlight U.S. contributions and leadership.

Given the resonance and complexity of OES issues, it is noteworthy that staff and resources for the public affairs and public diplomacy functions remain severely limited. In the course of the Department/U.S. Information Agency consolidation in 1999, the Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs approved funding for three public diplomacy (PD) officer positions in OES. The Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs (R) also provided a small amount of program funding (\$18,000) for use by the PD officers for overseas activities. However, there has never been a full PD complement in OES, nor has OES provided the additional personnel or financial resources required to develop and sustain an effective public affairs/public diplomacy program. The public affairs adviser provides some day-to-day oversight of the Assistant Secretary's speechwriter and can rely on that member of the OES front office staff for assistance in part of the OES press portfolio.

At the time of the inspection, the PD positions were vacant, and the public affairs adviser had no other staff to assist her, apart from a recently hired temporary secretary and ad hoc help from the Assistant Secretary's speechwriter. Although the public affairs office is able to request and usually receives funding from R for special projects, it has no assured funding from any source for ongoing activities or initiatives other than the annual R supplement of \$18,000. The absence of resources and therefore lack of good program opportunities - which OES and the

Under Secretary for Global Affairs leadership recognize and acknowledge are problems - discourage PD officers from applying for the reserved PD positions. The same issues that OES faces in attracting Foreign Service bidders to its various offices affect the public diplomacy function as well.

OES has nevertheless succeeded in recruiting a PD officer to serve as the deputy to the public affairs adviser beginning this summer and has decided to convert one vacant PD FSO position to a Civil Service public affairs specialist position responsible for domestic outreach. The third PD officer position fell victim to the Department's need to find positions to transfer to Embassy Baghdad - the "Iraq tax" and so is off the OES personnel roster. The staff increase will significantly increase this section's capabilities and contribute to badly needed stability, but lack of financial resources will still inhibit effective programming. An examination of the OES FY 2007 BPP reveals a rhetorical commitment to public affairs and public diplomacy, but there are few specifics. The BPP makes the following statement on communicating the bureau's message at home and abroad:

The global issues we manage give OES the keys to engage wider and younger audiences than the Department's traditional constituencies. At home, we are seizing the opportunity to augment existing public outreach and recruitment activities through targeted OES speaker programs, digital videoconferences, and a focus on the academic community. Overseas, we are partnering with our missions to highlight the U.S. leadership role in improving the quality of life for all citizens, with a special focus on interacting with the Muslim world.

But, with the exception of program strategies in the three goal papers on *Promoting Democracy in the Muslim World Through Science and Technology*, *Public Participation and Access in Environmental Decision-Making*, and *Environmental Good Governance*, there are virtually no details on how the bureau proposes to engage public or other target audiences, nor are there any references - apart from some general language on outreach - to the need for using public diplomacy tools to build support for U.S. positions.

OIG fully recognizes the difficulty that the sole public affairs adviser faces in developing and then carrying out a broad series of activities across the OES issues spectrum. The principal officials in the bureau do recognize the importance of communicating OES's messages to audiences in the United States and overseas. They carry out extensive speaking schedules, participate in digital video conferences with embassy contacts, and meet with foreign journalists. They continuously stress the importance of outreach on the part of all OES senior staff. But there is no fully articulated communications strategy for overseas audiences or for domestic

audiences that are unaware of the important work performed by OES on behalf of the American people, nor does the BPP demonstrate this important component of the bureau's daily work.

The bureau should develop a bureau communications strategy. It should also use the BPP to assess the results of its efforts in this area and to make an effective case for greater public diplomacy resources by improving its presentation to the Department of communication goals and strategies. These efforts should involve all OES elements active in areas of interest to both domestic and foreign audiences. Although the public affairs adviser can play a coordinating role in an overall communications strategy, the responsibility for identifying public affairs and public diplomacy opportunities to support the bureau's objectives does not reside solely in her office.

Recommendation 6: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should assign to a deputy assistant secretary the responsibility for a "corporate communication plan" that reaches beyond the bureau's current circle of supportive private organizations and specialist publications and that incorporates specific public affairs and public diplomacy strategies and desired outcomes throughout its annual Bureau Performance Plan. (Action: OES)

The incumbent public affairs adviser deserves credit for maximizing the use of her limited resources. She works with all offices of the bureau and has a good overview of all major OES issues. By pulling together teams from across the bureau, the regional bureaus, and other Department elements (in particular, the Office of International Information Programs), she has succeeded in leveraging her meager assets and conducting a respectable, albeit small, program. Unfortunately, the Office of International Information Programs' own staffing and resource problems hinder its ability to support OES public diplomacy programs, particularly in developing publications and identifying speakers to meet specific OES policy goals.

The addition of new public affairs staff will offer a good opportunity to invigorate OES operations in this area by increasing the bureau's ability to work with program support elements in the Department, increase interaction with the regional bureaus, and eventually develop a comprehensive strategic plan for her office. By combining this strategic plan with a set of clearly drawn public diplomacy program proposals, the bureau will be able to make a compelling case for dedicated resources from R early in the budget cycle.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Bureau Resources

OES Funding (in thousands)	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Request FY 2006	Request FY 2007
Diplomatic & Consular Programs					
American Salaries	17,428	19,130	19,426	21,697	21,697
Operations*	5,969	5,577	5,302	5,412	7,590
Public Diplomacy	43	68	118	18	418
Total D&CP funding	23,440	24,775	24,846	27,127	29,705
International Fisheries Commissions	17,589	19,097	21,688	25,123	26,875
Oceans, Environment and Science Initiative (Economic Support Funds)	3,925	1,988	2,468	9,000	30,000
Grand Total	68,394	70,635	73,848	88,377	116,285

*Includes STAS funds totaling \$175,000, \$337,000, \$142,000, \$400,000, and \$432,000 for FY's 2003 – 2007 respectively.

To carry out its mission, OES received \$46 million in FY 2004 and is currently operating on a FY 2005 budget of \$49 million. OES has about 200 employees including 112 Civil Service and 38 FSOs. The remaining 54 employees are temporarily employed as fellows, detailees, when actually employed staff, and interns. In FY 2004, about \$1 million of OES's operational funds also paid for contract personnel. About 40 percent of OES's operational funds are spent on travel. Additionally, because the OES executive office services the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) and STAS, OES operational funds and staff also support EX costs to support DRL and STAS. The majority of the International Fisheries Commission funds represent assessments passed through the Department.

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The OES executive office is one of four executive offices in the Department supporting multiple bureaus. The 40-person OES executive office supports OES as well as DRL and the separate STAS. Support to these other entities consumes a large amount of the executive office's time and resources. Although DRL has about 50 fewer full-time equivalents (FTE) than OES, DRL funding exceeds \$110 million - about twice that of OES. STAS has only three FTE; however, the office brings unique complexities including an unusual reporting relationship directly to the Secretary. Ensuring that adequate support is provided to all three of these entities has been, and continues to be, a problem for the executive office.

Equitability of Support

Concurrent with its inspection of OES and STAS, OIG conducted a compliance follow-up review of OIG's 2003 DRL inspection. Follow-up reviews allow inspectors to conduct a more thorough review of the bureau's response to OIG recommendations. The concurrent review was particularly helpful with regard to the executive office because the executive office services both bureaus. In 2003, OIG found that executive office support to DRL was inadequate and recommended that an entirely separate executive office be created. To date, resource constraints (in terms of funding, space, and FTE) have prevented the establishment of a separate office. Although DRL would still prefer a separate executive office, OIG no longer believes a separate executive office is the answer. The dysfunctional human resources function, a driver in OIG's 2003 recommendation for a separate executive office, has been revamped. However, the executive office has not yet addressed DRL's perceptions of service inequality.

Unlike embassy administrative sections, domestic bureau executive offices are not required to establish administrative service performance standards. Establishment of such standards is required overseas in the context of the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services program. Performance standards are a useful tool for managing customer expectations and measuring the effectiveness of administrative sections. Standards, used with workload statistics, are also useful in supporting requests for additional staff. Development and measurement of such standards would allow the OES-DRL executive office to demonstrate service equity among the bureaus and offices serviced. As discussed later in the report, standards are needed at a minimum for travel voucher and human resources functions, to better manage customer expectations, and to evaluate executive office employees' performance. The Bureau of Administration's Center for Global

Support Services and Innovation, responsible for expanding Department best practices, spearheads new performance measurement techniques within the Department and should be consulted when developing domestic service standards.

Recommendation 7: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should establish performance standards for administrative services under its direct control and develop a methodology for measuring the standards. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and A/GSSI)

Although development of service standards will address perceived inequities of routine executive office functions, a less quantifiable challenge is ensuring that both bureaus' priorities are appropriately weighted. DRL representatives said that when the executive office faces competing OES and DRL priorities, OES priorities always prevail. OIG noted that accountability mechanisms favor attention to OES issues. There is an informal agreement between OES and DRL to rotate drafting responsibility for the executive director's annual performance evaluation. The current informal arrangement has not been effective, and the OES PDAS drafted the evaluation in the last two cycles, most recently without any input from the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary and with only an informal e-mail from DRL.

Recommendation 8: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should institutionalize the rotation of the executive director's evaluation between the two bureaus serviced and the collection of written input from both bureaus and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary for placement in the executive director's official performance file. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and STAS)

The executive office interfaces separately with each bureau. The DRL front office and all office directors meet every day for one hour. An executive office representative is required to attend. Additionally, the DRL PDAS and an executive office representative also meet separately when requested. A representative of the executive office attends the OES office directors meetings twice a week and meets separately with the OES PDAS about twice a month. Conversely, executive office staff do not meet regularly with STAS. STAS representatives generally contact the

appropriate EX division director when needed. Because of shortcomings of these meetings discussed later in this section and of the executive office management, entirely separate meetings do not lend themselves to ensuring equity across the bureaus or in effectively setting EX priorities if both bureaus needs cannot all be met.

Recommendation 9: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should initiate weekly meetings with the principal deputy assistant secretaries and the deputy to the science and technology adviser and the executive director to discuss bureau and office priorities. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and STAS)

Executive Office Support and Management

Executive office support provided to OES needs to improve. OES bureau employees rated executive office operations overall slightly above average on OIG questionnaires distributed to all OES bureau employees. The information technology and administrative services division operations, other than travel voucher processing, received the highest scores and the least complaints from bureau employees. Financial management operations are adequate, though the office director needs to exercise greater oversight of her section. Operations that pulled the scores down included general responsiveness of the executive office, overall management of the executive office, human resources operations, and usefulness of the orientation program. As discussed later in the report, human resources operations have improved significantly over the last two years; interviews disclosed that low scores primarily reflected experiences with prior human resources division employees. Customer responsiveness, overall management of the executive office, management controls, and the orientation program, however, need attention.

Responsiveness of the executive office scored low on OIG's management operations questionnaire. Throughout OES, office directors and employees alike criticized the performance of the EX office in harsh terms. The executive director himself complained that office directors tend to "blindside" him at staff meetings by raising their complaints in front of the bureau's leadership. OIG takes this as a sign that discontent is boiling over. Problems originate from a lack of leadership within the executive office. A senior Foreign Service executive director and an FS-02 Foreign Service deputy executive director manage OES EX. The deputy

executive director supervises and oversees all four EX division chiefs. She also informally serves as DRL's primary point of contact, while the executive director informally serves as the primary contact for OES and STAS. Despite the informal separation of responsibilities, OIG found that EX operations are shouldered by the EX division chiefs and to a lesser extent the deputy executive director.

Bureau customers and EX staff said that the executive director is "not engaged" and that he frequently must be reminded what he has committed to. Similarly, EX staff said that he cannot be relied on to relay pertinent information from meetings to the proper EX division, that he cannot be relied upon for operational guidance, and that he frequently focuses his efforts and attention on initiatives and individuals not related to the serviced bureaus. OIG found that the executive director spearheaded two important initiatives during his tenure including outsourcing the broken HR function and training grant officer representatives overseas; however, OIG also found that bureau customers and EX staff characterizations above have merit. The executive director frequently tasks lower level EX employees (some at the GS-13 level) to attend bureau-wide, director-level meetings. He devotes effort and EX resources to two technology conferences a year that do not fall within the goals or objectives of OES, DRL, or STAS.⁴ He does not appear to review information sent by EX staff through him; frequently the information is grossly inaccurate. In view of the numerous criticisms of EX performance, OIG was surprised to find little evidence of the director's efforts to establish goals, to measure productivity, and to manage directly the performance of the operations for which he is responsible. In one egregious example, office directors were misled into thinking that a renovation plan would guarantee their staff offices with windows. OIG could find no evidence that the director took steps to identify the EX employees whose performance caused the error or to explain the situation to those affected. Equally, he has not effectively communicated to the bureau's leaders or customers that improvements are being achieved in EX opera-

⁴The conferences, held in San Antonio, Calgary, or Monterey are "for the promotion and advancement of the technology industry among the three NAFTA partners," and, are "intended to broaden trilateral technology business opportunities, share business strategies, and learn what has worked for other companies already growing through north-south trade." OES funds travel to the conferences, and EX staff is used to develop and distribute conference invitations and plaques. Today OES leadership admits these events have little or no connection to bureau performance plans or goals.

tions. Bureau customers and EX staff discontent with EX leadership was reflected in the low "management of the executive office" score on OIG's management operations questionnaire.⁵

The result of the executive director's disengagement is an inequitable distribution of EX workload, a lack of strategic direction in the executive office, a lack of attention to some performance problems, and a lower staff morale and lack of professionalism in EX. EX division chiefs shoulder much of the high-level work at the expense of the management of their own sections. Although the deputy executive director has drafted and issued a number of needed standard operating procedures and addressed some of the performance problems, other individuals with performance problems have been ignored. The executive office's web site is not balanced. It has a well-developed information management division (IMD) containing useful information, but an empty human resources division (HRD). (During the inspection, information was posted to the financial management division's section of the web site.) Many executive office functions and decisions are pushed up to the PDAS. The executive director proposed establishing a second deputy executive director position to better service the bureaus. OIG strongly disagrees with the establishment of another deputy executive director position if that individual does not also have functional responsibilities within one of the EX divisions. Better use of the existing executive director position would alleviate overworked EX divisions and provide needed direction. (During the inspection, the executive director started implementing a number of OIG's suggestions.)

Recommendation 10: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Science and Technology Advisor to the Secretary, should highlight in the executive director's work requirements improvement in services, provision of accurate information, presence at meetings, and follow-up on requests. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and STAS)

⁵The OES/EX score of 2.92 was lower than all but one of OIG's last 10 domestic inspections in that category. The only bureau EX to receive a lower "management of the executive office score" had a vacant executive director position; the deputy executive director was acting in that position as well as serving as one of the EX division chiefs.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION

The HRD support to the bureaus has improved significantly over the last year. In a unique arrangement discussed below, the entire division was physically moved into A/EX/HRD in October 2004 after both OIG and DGHR found significant problems, and efforts to retrain the staff failed. Although HRD support received relatively low scores on OIG's management operations questionnaire - 2.72 out of five - comments on the questionnaires and inspection interviews revealed that most low ratings reflected experiences prior to the transition to A/EX/HRD. Overwhelmingly, bureau employees said that the section is turning around. OIG also found a section on its way to becoming fully functional and views the transfer to A/EX/HRD a best practice. However, the section still has a long way to go. Executive office leadership needs to more fully embrace and engage the office to ensure that it is fulfilling its responsibilities. Additional resources in terms of staff may be necessary. OIG does not believe that physical relocation of the division back into OES/DRL/EX in October 2005 as currently scheduled, however, will enhance the section's development.

Relocation to the Bureau of Administration

HR support is currently provided by five employees and two contractors physically located in A/EX including: a division chief, a team leader, one experienced HR specialist, two newly hired and recently trained HR specialists, and two contractors. The acting HRD chief and acting team leader encumber Bureau of Administration FTE and also have significant responsibilities for A/EX/HR operations. OES/EX/HRD functions and staff moved into A/EX after both OIG and the Bureau of Human Resources found the section was dysfunctional and not meeting minimum HR requirements. The Bureau of Human Resources indefinitely suspended HRD's delegated classification and staffing authorities in February 2004 and sent several specialists to OES/EX to retrain the staff. Progress, however, was slow due to a proliferation of employee performance problems. The OES executive director asked other Department executive directors for assistance. A/EX/HRD offered to help and with the Bureau of Human Resources' concurrence and assistance, the majority of the OES/EX/HRD employees moved into A/EX/HRD in Rosslyn for training. During this process, six of the seven original HRD staff left the organization. To fill the corresponding staffing gaps, the Bureau of Administration made some of its HR staff available and hired two new staff now in training. The one remaining original HRD representative has had refresher training and receives oversight from a qualified HR specialist.

OIG commends the Bureau of Administration for its enthusiasm and generosity. Bureau employees overwhelmingly praise the A/EX/HRD supervisor and say that the section is on the right track. OIG found a capable customer service oriented supervisor who is ably developing the section. A/EX staff indicated that they are gaining valuable experience with unique OES and DRL staffing issues. A/EX's goal is to be considered a "center of excellence" for HR services within the Department. The successful arrangement is unique in the Department and may have future implications in the Department's efforts to provide better services at a lower cost to the government.

Best Practice

Outsourced Human Resources Function

Problem. Neither OES executive office management nor the Bureau of Human Resources were able to rehabilitate an OES dysfunctional human resources section filled with staff that lacked minimum qualifications for performing human resource functions.* Although the Bureau of Human Resources had begun retraining the staff, the lack of adequate human resources support (compounded by a lack of FTE to fill in gaps during the training process) brought human resources functions to a standstill and crippled the bureaus serviced.

Response. OES, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, transferred OES human resources staff and responsibility for the human resources function to the Bureau of Administration.

Result. Human resources support to OES and DRL has turned around. A qualified human resources supervisor is training and overseeing human resources staff. Consolidation of human resources staff in the Bureau of Administration fosters expertise and likely Department efficiencies.

* Although OIG considers A/EX support to OES a best practice, OIG does not condone the OES executive office management's chronic failure to supervise the human resources function that allowed the dysfunctional environment and incompetent section to fester and develop.

When originally arranged, the HRD section was to complete training and return to OES/EX in October 2005. Given the current arrangement's success and the fact that a fully functional freestanding section has not developed, OIG does not support the planned relocation of the division back into OES/EX. Neither the executive director nor the deputy executive director has HR expertise or experience, while the A/EX/HR supervisor has. Additionally, OES/EX may have difficulty supporting a GS-14 slot given the size of the bureaus serviced. Maintaining the section in A/EX allows OES/EX to take advantage of the experience of a part-time GS-14 level supervisor rather than the GS-13 that OES had in the past. The weight of a higher-graded HR supervisor is particularly useful in terms of credibility. Finally, the physical distance between HRD (located in Rosslyn) and the rest of the bureau (in the Harry S Truman building) does not appear to have stymied support.

Human Resources Division Use and Engagement

Although HR support has improved, OES is not yet fully utilizing its new HRD section. For example, executive office staff who are not specialists in personnel issues should not attempt to respond to questions on human resources issues but should instead refer the questions to the new HRD section. Even the executive office director and deputy director do not yet make full use of the new section. During one meeting, executive office staff discussed the need to issue guidance on training and conferences. None of the staff requested that the HRD representative assist with or lead the task - though this function falls squarely within HRD's purview. Although OIG concedes that this type of transition takes time, the executive office can take a number of steps to accelerate the process.

Although the executive office invites HRD representatives to weekly executive office division chief meetings, attendance has been optional, and the HRD supervisor has attended when convenient. Presence at these meetings is essential for engaging in and supporting executive office and bureau needs.

Recommendation 11: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should require that human resources division staff attend all executive office division director meetings. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Many bureau and executive office employees do not know who their new HRD representatives are. For example, during an executive office meeting that OIG attended, the HRD team leader was introduced for the first time to the other executive office division chiefs. HRD staff names do not appear on the OES phone list or on the OES/EX/HRD web site. OIG appreciates that new HRD staff are not fully trained and that HR requests should go through the HRD supervisor; however, it is important for bureau and executive office staff to know their support staff. OIG informally recommended that the executive office update the OES phone list and add HRD staff names to the OES/EX/HRD web site. OIG also informally recommended that the executive office hold an EX-wide meeting (including the full complement of A/EX/HRD staff) to remind the Harry S Truman building-based EX staff of the functions HRD is responsible for. OIG also informally recommended that OES/EX request that an HRD employee physically sit within the OES executive office occasionally. However, OIG does not believe that a presence of more than a few hours is warranted.

Concurrent with the bureau's leisurely embrace of its HRD staff, the HRD staff have not yet achieved the necessary familiarity with the bureaus serviced. During the course of the inspection, OIG noted that the staffing pattern and phone list were not up to date. Additionally, HRD was not aware of a number of detailee assignments within the bureaus and offices serviced - for example, leaving one off who had been in an office for over a year. Although the HRD staff communicates regularly with OES office directors, the HRD staff have not recently reviewed the staffing pattern with directors or compared the staffing pattern to informal phone lists. HRD staff may have been hesitant to review staffing with office directors while the OES PDAS made FTE allocation decisions. Allocation decisions, however, do not need to hold up a review of current staffing and FTE within each office.

Recommendation 12: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should require office directors to meet with human resources staff and review current staffing to ensure that all permanent and temporary staffing arrangements are properly reflected on the staffing pattern, phone list, and records for temporary staff including detailees, fellows, and interns. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Vacancies, Position Descriptions, Orientation Program, Training Plans

A number of offices noted that vacancies are not filled in a timely manner. OIG found that HRD staff have completed and filled a number of vacancy announcements and selections since taking over. However, some vacancies have taken a long time to process. HRD concedes that the current number of staff and level of experience within the office is not yet adequate to complete all requests in a timely manner. HRD has spent a lot of time correcting mistakes made by prior HR staff. OIG recognizes that training the section will take time; however, qualified Bureau of Administration staff may need to assist the inexperienced section and add additional resources. When the HR section transferred to the Bureau of Administration, HRD had seven FTE. Three of the six vacant positions have been filled, but it is unclear what has happened to the other four FTE. The Bureau of Administration may also seek some form of reimbursement from OES for its resources consumed in this exercise.

In addition to a few outstanding vacancy announcements and out of date phone lists and staffing patterns, OIG found that some position descriptions were out of date, there was no effective orientation program for new employees, and supervisors who had not completed employee performance evaluations on time had not been notified of their deficiencies. OIG commends the section for the progress it has made. However, given the number of tasks that need to be completed, OIG believes that the HRD section needs to establish a timeline with priorities for completing the numerous outstanding tasks listed above.

Recommendation 13: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should develop a timeline for completion of a number of outstanding human resources tasks, including reviewing current staffing with all office directors, reviewing position descriptions, filling current outstanding vacancies, and completion of an orientation program. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Orientation Program

A number of employees noted that OES's check-in process is not effective or useful. Bureau employees rated the orientation program low on the OIG management operations questionnaires. An orientation program is necessary to help new

employees adjust to their new office and responsibilities and establish productive working relationships. The HRD section within the Bureau of Administration recognizes the need for a formal orientation program but has not had the time or resources to complete it. During the inspection, HRD piloted an orientation program checklist that includes assigning a sponsor, identifying training, discussing performance expectations, arranging for a security briefing, and introducing the new employee to colleagues. OIG commends the HRD for the progress it has made in this area. OIG noted that DRL, also serviced by EX/HRD, instituted a formal orientation program that includes policy briefings, tours of DRL offices, familiarization with principal seventh floor operations, and a luncheon with the Under Secretary or Acting Under Secretary. OIG informally recommended that HRD incorporate equivalent substantive aspects of DRL's orientation program into the OES program.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Financial management division operations are adequate, though more effective management is needed. OES bureau employees rated management of financial services slightly higher than average on OIG's management operations questionnaire. A GS-14 leads the section and is supported by a budget team leader, two budget officers, two program analysts, a conference coordinator, and two contractors. The two contractors and one of the budget analysts work exclusively on DRL operations, while the other five employees split time between OES, DRL, and STAS operations. Most bureau employees praised the financial management division chief as hard working and generally responsive. OIG found that the section chief shoulders many of the executive office's challenging tasks. She coordinates OES's BPP including FTE levels and drafts numerous policy memos and proposals for executive office management. The division's workload increased dramatically over the last few years from an influx of grant funding. The division chief responded to the influx by successfully securing funding for two additional staff to track some of the funds. The division chief, however, needs to refocus division efforts to ensure adequate supervision of the staff. Additionally, grant management responsibilities need clarification.

Supervision

OIG observed that some staff appeared to be underemployed, though at the same time they had requests that had not been addressed. Bureau customers noted that some section staff do not appear adequately trained, are not detail or customer

service oriented, and let requests linger. OIG also noted that the section did not always provide accurate information. There will always be mistakes, but the section chief needs to spot check employees' work to ensure they are meeting requirements. OIG informally recommended that the section develop target response times for bureau customer questions and tasks and ensure tracking and resolution of requests. The section recently cross-trained employees, and there is now support when employees take leave. OIG also made informal recommendations related to supervision of the section and more efficient methods of monitoring the status of obligations.

Clarification of Grant Management Responsibilities

A program management analyst within the financial management section tracks OES grantee compliance with the grant's period of performance and with the grant's reporting requirements. She maintains the information for all OES grants on a spreadsheet and provides summary reports when requested. The analyst also sometimes contacts grantees directly requesting required reports because OES grant officer representatives do not always perform the function. Monitoring compliance with grant terms is the responsibility of A/LM/AQM grant officers unless those responsibilities have been delegated to bureau grant officer representatives. Monitoring responsibilities have been delegated to OES grant officer representatives who reside within OES directorates, not the executive office. The executive office should not be overburdened with grantee compliance unless EX officers are assigned as grant officer representatives. Confusion related to monitoring responsibilities may have arisen because the bureau recently considered three organizational models for monitoring grantee compliance, with one model assigning responsibilities to EX. Although some within the bureau believe the issue has been resolved, others do not know who has received monitoring responsibilities. This should be clarified in writing. OIG also suggested that OES consider moving at least one of the program analysts from the EX to the PCI office that oversees programmatic aspects of some of the grants.

Recommendation 14: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should develop and post a policy describing grant monitoring responsibilities among executive office program and budget analysts, bureau points-of-contact (grant officer representatives), and bureau program managers. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION

Administrative services division operations are effective. The section manages inventories, procurements, the mailroom, and recently the travel function. A GS-13 ably leads the section, supported by four permanent employees, a stay-in-school employee, and one contractor. The deputy executive director transferred responsibility for the travel function from the financial management division to the administrative services division in January 2005 where it now receives adequate oversight. Prior to its transfer to the administrative services division, the travel office did not provide the Office of Medical Services with the required medical notices used to justify business class travel. The administrative services division now provides the necessary documentation. The division recently trained a number of bureau employees on the travel function and implemented an informal policy related to outstanding travel vouchers. OIG finds the progress encouraging and informally recommended posting the written travel policies and procedures on the EX web site. The policies should include frequently asked questions and should receive clearance from the travel and transportation management division of the Bureau of Administration before issue.

A number of bureau employees complained about the timeliness of travel authorization and travel voucher processing and of the lack of customer service orientation of one employee in the section. Development of performance standards for the timeliness and accuracy of travel vouchers, recommended in the Office of the Executive Director section of the report, should provide EX with an objective tool for managing customer expectations and measuring travel clerk performance. Additionally, EX should ensure that customer service orientation is highlighted in travel voucher clerk performance plans. Management controls over the security program are addressed in the management controls section.

MANAGEMENT CONTROLS

OES needs to devote more attention to management controls. Bureau of Resources Management-administered risk assessments disclosed control environment risks in the executive office above the norm. Additionally, OIG found that STAS, supported by the OES-DRL executive office, lacked standard operating procedures and was operating largely without the guidance and oversight from the executive office. OIG made a number of recommendations to bring STAS operations into the fold. The executive office risks are high owing to the level of funds managed within the section. Although the bureau has taken steps to improve grant fund oversight, shortcomings remain. The overall security posture within OES also needs attention, as do a number of human resources issues. Finally, 2 FAM 022.6 requires that each Assistant Secretary designate a management controls coordinator. The executive office director currently has that responsibility. OIG informally recommended that the Assistant Secretary reassign management controls coordinator responsibilities to another officer.

Grant Oversight and Payments

In 2004 the executive office initiated a review of grants management within OES. EX found that a number of grantees were not complying with grant terms, including reporting requirements. Additionally, no-cost extensions were commonly issued to grantees, though work had not even started. EX issued a number of reminders to grant officer representatives to monitor grantee compliance. When reminders did not suffice the Assistant Secretary assisted EX by issuing a reminder from the OES front office. The financial management division also trained OES representatives overseas on grand officer representative responsibilities. OIG found these steps encouraging. However, statistics show that grantee compliance has not yet improved significantly. OIG believes that inclusion of grant officer representative responsibilities in POC position descriptions and performance plans, as discussed in the PCI section, should encourage POCs to closely monitor compliance. OIG also informally recommended that PCI provide written input to POC evaluations regarding grant officer representative responsibilities. Increased A/LM/AQM grant officer engagement, recommended in the PCI section, should also ensure that grantees with a history of noncompliance on reporting and programmatic grant requirements not receive follow-on grants.

STAS grants were not part of the executive office's 2004 review, and STAS is not under PCI's purview. OIG found improper monitoring of a \$718,000 STAS grant for which there was no designated grant officer representative. Although EX has an informal policy that only grant officer representatives may approve grantee payments, OIG found that a STAS representative had been approving grantee payments. A/LM/AQM took immediate action during the inspection and assigned grant officer representative responsibilities to a STAS representative. Additionally, the STAS representative promptly requested that the grantee provide required reports. The executive office also suggested a grant officer representative course for the newly assigned STAS grant officer representative.

Monitoring the influx of OES, DRL, and STAS funds has been a challenge for the financial management section. At FY 2004 year-end, the section had trouble reconciling official Department accounting records with EX spreadsheets and DRL program office records. The section is currently trying to recover funds lost resulting from reconciliation problems and certified financial management system glitches. Acquisition and use of a database to track funds, rather than separate spreadsheets, would reduce some of the duplicative manual entries and reconciliation workload. During the inspection, EX initiated discussions with other bureaus receiving funding with similar reporting and tracking requirements to determine if existing databases within the Department could meet the section's needs. In the meantime, however, the section needs to routinely reconcile the status of funds in the certified financial management system accounting system with manual OES and DRL spreadsheets maintained within EX and the DRL program office.

Recommendation 15: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, should reconcile the status of funds in the Department's official accounting system with executive office and program office spreadsheets monthly. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL)

(b) (2)

(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)

Recommendation 16: (b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Time and Attendance

OES time and attendance procedures have improved over the last year. Office directors now sign time sheets and send them to EX. Employees now complete requests for overtime and compensatory time in advance. However, OIG found inadequate support for the approval of advanced leave. Although employees may be approved for advanced leave, the timekeeper should have written approval for the advance. OIG made an informal recommendation to address this shortcoming. Additionally, OIG found that a few timekeepers were entering their own time in violation of regulations. 4 FAH-3 H-525.3-4 prohibits timekeepers from posting their own time and attendance into official records, and requires a backup or alternative timekeeper within each office to maintain the timekeeper's time. OES's current practice opens the door for fraud and improper practices.

Recommendation 17: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs office directors should ensure that timekeepers are not recording their own time and attendance data and ensure that each timekeeper has an alternate. (Action: OES)

Work Requirements, Performance Plans, and Employee Evaluations

3 FAM 2823 sets deadlines for completion of Civil Service performance plans and Foreign Service work requirements. OIG found a number of deficiencies

in this area. One employee said she had worked for 18 months without work requirements. OIG noted that her performance evaluation was also submitted months late. Many performance plans were at least 120 days late, not in the required format, or not on the correct forms.

Recommendation 18: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should institute a system to track completion of work requirements and performance plans and to hold rating officials accountable for timely completion. (Action: OES)

Some Civil Service ratings for the cycle ending December 2004 are still outstanding. Although HRD sent reminders to supervisors and office directors in an attempt to elicit the evaluations, reminders have not been successful. 3 FAM 2834.3 requires that bureaus report delinquent raters to the Bureau of Human Resources, Office of Civil Service Personnel.

Recommendation 19: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should identify all outstanding 2004 Civil Service ratings and report all delinquent raters to the Bureau of Human Resources. (Action: OES)

Position Descriptions

OIG found that position descriptions are not current. Owing to staff shortages and a backlog in the human resources offices, there has not been a comprehensive review of the position descriptions. The Bureau of Administration hired a contractor to conduct a position management and classification review of all positions in the bureau starting with administrative and clerical positions. OIG informally recommended that OES review all position descriptions, develop time lines and milestones for the review, and communicate the progress to employees on a regular basis. Employees should also receive a copy of their position descriptions and work with supervisors to ensure that the position descriptions accurately reflect their responsibilities. The acting HR chief should meet with EX staff on a regular basis to discuss current HR projects.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECURITY

The OES/EX information management division (IMD) provides information technology support to OES, STAS, and DRL. IMD generally meets the needs of about 310 users by providing network management, hardware and software procurement, web site maintenance, help desk operations, and information technology contract administration. However, OIG found a number of management deficiencies and made recommendations to resolve the problems. Further, OIG identified information technology security concerns that can be mitigated through implementation of recommendations provided to OES.

The OES/EX/IMD information technology environment consists of nine servers for the unclassified network and 10 for the classified network. The servers support a total of 428 workstations connected to the classified and unclassified networks. IMD also supports four stand-alone workstations.

Information Management

The information technology staff consists of a division chief, an information system security officer (ISSO), two branch chiefs, a contract project manager, and seven contract employees. The IMD help desk is available from 8:00AM to 6:00 PM on weekdays. The IMD staff are well managed, trained, and motivated to provide the necessary support to its customers, who generally regard help desk services and computer support as above average.

At the direction of the IMD director, a detailed configuration management plan was issued in January 2004 and comprehensive standard operating procedures were issued in May 2004 and published on the OES-DRL web site where they are available to all bureau employees. Additionally, an information technology system/site security plan was completed in December 2004 and an information technology contingency plan prepared by the alternate ISSO was adopted for use by OES in January 2005.

Information Management Division Staffing Levels

Current staffing levels are adequate to maintain satisfactory operations. A complicating factor for IMD customer support staff is the maintenance of a walk-up window, which requires full-time staffing to handle customer requests. This is unusual for the Department, as most customer support is handled solely via telephone or e-mail. IMD officials told OIG that it would not retain the walk-up window after EX moves to a new location in mid-July 2005. The closure of the walk-up window will serve to ease pressure on IMD staffing. However, after the opening of a new satellite office to provide support to the North Korea negotiators and the Anti-Semitism officials, the demands on IMD staff will likely increase and may result in a need for additional IMD personnel. Bureau managers should monitor closely the ability of IMD to maintain adequate customer support. The development by EX of customer service performance measures as recommended elsewhere in this report should better enable managers to monitor support activities.

Computer Applications Not Reported to Office of Information Assurance

OIG found that OES has not reported use of two computer applications to the Office of Information Assurance for certification and accreditation in accordance with Department guidelines: the marine research vessel tracking system and TRACK-IT. These applications have therefore not undergone the required systems authorization process as established by the Department's Chief Information Officer in March 2003. This process is used to categorize applications and provide for certification and authorization to operate.

Recommendation 20: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should provide the Office of Information Assurance with the necessary information on two unreported systems, the marine research vessel tracking system and TRACK-IT, to initiate the system authorization process. (Action: OES)

OIG found that the marine research vessel tracking system needs an upgrade to continue functioning. The Department developed the system in the 1980s to provide diplomatic clearances for foreign vessels desiring to conduct ocean research within the 200-mile territorial limit of the United States and to obtain clearances

for U.S. flagged vessels desiring to conduct research within the territorial limits of other nations. The Department developed the clearance system to comply with Law of the Sea provisions.

According to the system manager, the number of annual clearance requests has increased significantly over the years and is causing the system to bog down. Further, the current system requires hand carrying clearance request cables to the message center in the Harry S Truman building. A Department notice dated May 5, 2005, states that beginning October 5, 2005, the message center will require electronic submission of all cables. The inspectors noted that the marine research vessel tracking system does not have this capability. The system operator has attempted to work with the Bureau of Information Resource Management's business center to develop an upgraded system. In the course of the inspection, the bureau allocated funds for the required upgrade and advised OIG that the marine research vessel tracking system will remain fully functional.

Accessibility of Web Site to Persons With Disabilities

A Bureau of Information Resource Management review of the OES web site identified four site pages not in compliance with provisions of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. s. 749d, as amended, which, in part, prohibits federal agencies from having electronic information sites that are inaccessible to persons with disabilities. IMD has determined that the problems are on web pages developed for them by the Bureau of Information Resource Management business center and is working with that office to fix any accessibility problems. OIG made an informal recommendation on this, and the business center informed OIG that it is working to resolve the issue.

(b) (2)(b) (2)

(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Information System Security Officer Roles and Responsibilities

OIG found that until recently the IMD computer support team leader was the designated ISSO and a contract information technology specialist was the designated alternate ISSO. The ISSO had been too busy with the requirements of managing the help desk and other issues and relied primarily on the alternate ISSO to carry out system security duties. The alternate ISSO was tasked with compiling the detailed configuration management plan, standard operating procedures, and information technology system/site security plan. They did not have sufficient time to address other ISSO responsibilities. An employee having full-time ISSO responsibilities was appointed on June 2, 2005. The designation of a full-time ISSO should alleviate the problems OIG identified during this inspection.

Security Metrics Reporting

OIG found that IMD has not responded to the last three quarterly data calls by the Department's Office of Information Assurance for information technology security information. The Office of Information Assurance has developed a web-based enterprise level data management tool, the State Automated FISMA* Information Reporting Environment (SAFIRE), to assist bureaus in submitting plans of action and milestones, National Institute of Standards and Technology 800-26 Self-Assessments, and the Office of Management and Budget security metrics. The SAFIRE reporting also provides information system security officers with information on the security status for Department systems and programs. The Office of Information Assurance issues 'all bureau' data calls quarterly requesting that bureaus report security performance records so it can produce the required FISMA corrective action plans and the annual report for the Office of Management and Budget's review.

Recommendation 21: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should ensure that it responds fully and accurately to future Office of Information Assurance calls for data on the systems and programs for which it is responsible. (Action: OES)

*The Federal Information Security Management Act, Public Law 107-347, Title III, Sec. 301(b)(1)

(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Recommendation 22: (b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Computer User Libraries

OIG found no indication that reviews of randomly selected user libraries and word-processing documents were being conducted on a monthly basis as required by 12 FAM 622.1-8 to ensure that users are properly handling sensitive and classified information and 5 FAM 723 which governs the personal use of government equipment. Although the alternate ISSO said he performed periodic reviews, OIG found no records indicating a routine monthly check of random selected users. Additionally, OIG found that systems user libraries contain significantly large files containing photos, audio and, to a lesser extent, movies. These personal materials are inappropriate for storage on Department systems.

Recommendation 23: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should review user library files monthly and remove inappropriate personal materials. Further, the bureau should issue guidelines concerning the amounts and types of files that are appropriate for storing on the systems. (Action: OES)

FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should prepare a mission statement for the Policy Coordination and Initiatives Office delineating the office's authority and accountability for strategic and resource planning, sustainable development, initiatives grants, and operational coordination with science and technology officers in overseas posts. (Action: OES)

Recommendation 2: The Under Secretary for Global Affairs, in coordination with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary and Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should propose a revised position description for the adviser that specifies more distinctly the adviser's role, authority, and accountability. The position description should specify that the adviser receives policy direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs and the Under Secretary for Global Affairs, coordinates with the bureau on all areas of activity with foreign policy implications, and obtains administrative and programmatic support from the bureau. (Action: G, in coordination with STAS and OES)

Recommendation 3: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should draft position descriptions for the office points-of-contact acting as grant officer representatives that spell out the duties of this new function and the bureau should develop a training plan on grants management for the points-of-contact. (Action: OES)

Recommendation 4: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should take steps to insure that bureau staff and science and technology officers in the field have regular updates and current information on the bureau's initiative grants program. (Action: OES)

Recommendation 5: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should request that the Bureau of Administration's grants officers meet at least quarterly with its grant officer representatives, program managers, and budget officers and at other times, including selection committee meetings, when their participation would facilitate the award and oversight of its grants. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/LM)

Recommendation 6: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should assign to a deputy assistant secretary the responsibility for a "corporate communication plan" that reaches beyond the bureau's current circle of supportive private organizations and specialist publications and that incorporates specific public affairs and public diplomacy strategies and desired outcomes throughout its annual Bureau Performance Plan. (Action: OES)

Recommendation 7: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should establish performance standards for administrative services under its direct control and develop a methodology for measuring the standards. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and A/GSSI)

Recommendation 8: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should institutionalize the rotation of the executive director's evaluation between the two bureaus serviced and the collection of written input from both bureaus and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary for placement in the executive director's official performance file. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and STAS)

Recommendation 9: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should initiate weekly meetings with the principal deputy assistant secretaries and the deputy to the science and technology adviser and the executive director to discuss bureau and office priorities. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and STAS)

Recommendation 10: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should highlight in the executive director's work requirement statement improvement in services, provision of accurate information, presence at meetings, and follow-up on requests. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL and STAS)

Recommendation 11: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should require that human resources division staff attend all executive office division director meetings. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Recommendation 12: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should require office directors to meet with human resources staff and review current staffing to ensure that all permanent and temporary staffing arrangements are properly reflected on the staffing pattern, phone list, and records for temporary staff including detailees, fellows, and interns. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Recommendation 13: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should develop a timeline for completion of a number of outstanding human resources tasks, including reviewing current staffing with all office directors, reviewing position descriptions, filling current outstanding vacancies, and completion of an orientation program. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Recommendation 14: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should develop and post a policy describing grant monitoring responsibilities among executive office program and budget analysts, bureau points-of-contact (grant officer representatives), and bureau program managers. (Action: OES, in coordination with A/EX)

Recommendation 15: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, should reconcile the status of funds in the Department's official accounting system with executive office and program office spreadsheets monthly. (Action: OES, in coordination with DRL)

Recommendation 16: (b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Recommendation 17: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs office directors should ensure that timekeepers are not recording their own time and attendance data and ensure that each timekeeper has an alternate. (Action: OES)

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.

Office of Oceans Affairs

There is a feeling among employees in the Office of Oceans Affairs that the office's tasks and responsibilities are not equitably distributed, in particular, that some FSOs have a relatively light load while a number of Civil Service employees are overburdened. This has affected morale at least among the Civil Service staff and possibly among the Foreign Service staff who also may believe they are underemployed.

Informal Recommendation 1: The Office of Oceans Affairs, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should review the distribution of work portfolios among its staff to ensure an equitable balance.

Office of Global Change

Employees in EGC sometimes feel out of touch with what is going on the office and the bureau because the office directors are frequently out of the office on official travel or otherwise unable to hold regular meetings.

Informal Recommendation 2: The Office of Global Change, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should hold staff meetings according to a regular schedule to ensure all staff members are kept informed of important activities in the office and the bureau.

Office of Environmental Policy

OES has not paid sufficient attention to the personnel problems in the trade and environment unit of ENV. The unit continues to operate under-complement with a steadily increasing burden of environmental agreements.

Informal Recommendation 3: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should focus attention on the trade and environment portfolio until it is satisfied the unit has the staffing and other resources it needs to fulfill its mandate.

Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation

Employees in ETC sometimes feel out of touch with what is going on the office and the bureau because the office director is frequently out of the office on official travel or otherwise unable to hold regular meetings.

Informal Recommendation 4: Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should hold staff meetings according to a regular schedule to ensure all staff members are kept informed of important activities in the office and the bureau.

Office of International Health Affairs

There is some confusion within the Department and among other federal agencies over the exact nature of OES responsibilities regarding bioterrorism, biodefense, and health security, although the bureau has articulated its role for the Department's senior leadership.

Informal Recommendation 5: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should inform other Department offices and other federal agencies of the exact nature of its authorities and responsibilities regarding bioterrorism, biodefense, and health security.

Office of Policy Coordination and Initiatives

OES office directors noted that the annual off-site planning meeting had included a dedicated session on the OES initiatives grants program, but that this dedicated session had dropped off the agenda recently.

Informal Recommendation 6: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should devote one session of the annual off-site planning meeting to a discussion of priorities for the next cycle of grant awards.

Public Affairs and Public Diplomacy

The Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs has not agreed to provide a dedicated allotment for OES public diplomacy activities, in part because OES has not submitted a comprehensive plan for the use of an allotment.

Informal Recommendation 7: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should give priority to preparing a comprehensive public diplomacy plan and presenting it to the Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs with a request for dedicated funding.

Executive Office Management

The executive office's portion of the web site is not balanced and does not contain useful information.

Informal Recommendation 8: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should ensure that the executive office portion of the bureau web site contains useful information.

Bureau customers sometimes do not receive timely or accurate responses. Although the executive office cannot answer all requests right away or within a day or two, the executive office can provide the requestor with a target response date.

Informal Recommendation 9: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should establish target response times for bureau requests. The executive office should post target response times on the executive office web site along with recommended service standards.

The executive office director currently serves as the management controls coordinator. OIG found that the executive director is not fully engaged in the bureaus serviced and believes that another officer should serve as management controls coordinator.

Informal Recommendation 10: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should reassign management controls coordinator responsibilities.

Human Resources

A number of employees raised concerns that there was discrimination against minorities and women in selecting candidates for high-level positions in the bureau.

Informal Recommendation 11: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should publish the name of equal Employment Opportunity counselors along with basic procedures on filing and processing equal employment opportunity complaints publicly (e.g., on the executive office section of the bureau's web site).

Bureau and executive office employees do not know who represents them in their human resources division office, now located in the Bureau of Administration. The OES phone list is out-of-date and the EX/HRD web site contains no information at all.

Informal Recommendation 12: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should update the bureau phone list to include names of current human resources division employees.

Informal Recommendation 13: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should include the names of human resources specialists on the human resources division section of the web site.

Human resources division staff are not aware of all detail assignments within the bureau. Additionally, in the past, there were improper approvals of detail assignments.

Informal Recommendation 14: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should develop and issue policies outlining proper procedures for detailing employees into and out of the bureau. The procedures should be posted on the executive office web site.

Many employees have not been given copies of their position descriptions.

Informal Recommendation 15: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should ensure all new employees receive a copy of their position descriptions as part of the bureau's check in process.

Documentation was not available to support approval of advanced leave.

Informal Recommendation 16: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should maintain written approval of leave beyond accrued leave.

OES employees have not found the OES orientation program useful. The HRD section is currently piloting an orientation checklist for use in OES, DRL, and the Bureau of Administration.

Informal Recommendation 17: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should develop and implement a formal orientation program for all new employees to the bureau. This orientation should include an overview of the substance of the bureau's operations.

Position descriptions are not current.

Informal Recommendation 18: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should review all position descriptions, develop timelines and milestones for the review, and communicate the progress to employees on a regular basis. Employees should receive a copy of their position description and work with supervisors to ensure that the position description accurately reflects their responsibilities. The acting human resources chief should meet with executive office staff on regular basis to discuss current HR projects.

Financial Management

The financial management section does not always respond to bureau requests in a timely manner.

Informal Recommendation 19: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should establish target response times for financial management requests and publish financial service standards with other service standards on the executive office web site.

The financial management division chief needs to exercise additional oversight to ensure that staff members meet their work requirements.

Informal Recommendation 20: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should ensure that monthly reviews of financial management staff work is conducted to include spot checking supporting documentation maintained for certified financial management system obligations, reviewing status of obligation reports, and ensuring that invoices are properly certified by either program managers or grant officer representatives.

The financial management chief needs to improve management skills, including interpersonal skills.

Informal Recommendation 21: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should ensure that the financial management chief's performance plan includes targets to improve management and interpersonal skills.

The financial management section's method of monitoring obligations could be more efficient if it used budget object codes and organization codes. Use of certified financial management system domestic organization codes, for example, would facilitate expenditures tracking by office.

Informal Recommendation 22: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should request the Bureau of Resource Management's accounting system help desk assist the financial management section in printing useful reports for fund monitoring, including reports by budget object class and organization code.

The executive office does not maintain supporting documentation for FY 1999 to FY 2002 obligations internally. When the budget officer receives invoices for old obligations, she checks the accounting system to ensure that funds are still available. She does not ensure that the invoice is consistent with obligating documents.

Informal Recommendation 23: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should retrieve and maintain supporting documentation for all open obligations.

Grantee compliance with grant terms continues to be a problem. According to OES statistics, 57 percent of grantees with open grants are not in compliance with the grant terms. The office points-of-contact (grant officer representatives) recently received grant officer representative responsibilities.

Informal Recommendation 24: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should require that the Office of Policy Coordination and Initiatives provide written input into point-of-contact performance evaluations regarding grant-monitoring responsibilities.

Two program analysts reside within the executive office and one maintains summary grantee compliance information and conducts some grantee oversight.

Informal Recommendation 25: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should consider moving at least one of the program analysts from the executive office to the Office of Policy Coordination and Initiatives, which oversees programmatic aspects of the grants.

The financial management section is not always aware of reimbursable details into or out of the bureau. The coordination is necessary to ensure that the funding is paid to or received from other bureaus.

Informal Recommendation 26: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should ensure that the financial management division has full details on financial arrangements for detailees.

The financial management section does not regularly review unliquidated obligations for all open years of all funding sources. Regular reviews of unliquidated obligations are necessary to ensure that OES funds do not expire and revert back to the U.S. Treasury. In conducting the reviews, budget officers should contact program managers to determine the status of projects and deobligate funds if necessary. Unliquidated obligation balances that remain unchanged over the course of a few months may signal ineffective program management.

Informal Recommendation 27: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should develop procedures requiring quarterly reviews of unliquidated obligations for all sources of funding for all open years. In conducting the reviews, budget officers should contact program managers responsible for managing the projects that the unliquidated obligations correspond to, to determine if funds should be deobligated. Budget officers should provide the executive director a list of all projects for which corresponding unliquidated obligations have remained unchanged for two quarters.

Administrative Services Division

Prior to its transfer to ASD, the travel section did not provide the required advance notices to the Office of Medical Services to justify business class travel.

Informal Recommendation 28: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, in coordination with the Bureau of Administration, should review all business class travel approved over the last year to determine inappropriate approvals of business class travel and recover funds if necessary.

Although the travel section recently implemented a number of informal policies, it has not issued the policies to bureau employees or posted them on the web site. The executive office should issue the travel policies in writing and should specify how many days in advance travelers should submit travel authorizations, the bureau policy on outstanding travel vouchers, and requirements for justification of expenses such as rental cars, cell phones, internet fees, and phone calls. The Bureau of Resource Management's Office of Financial Policy and Management Control provides assistance and advice on travel guidelines and should review OES travel policies and procedures before they are issued.

Informal Recommendation 29: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should develop and issue written travel policies and procedures, including frequently made mistakes, and post the policies and procedures to the executive office web site.

A number of bureau employees complained about the timeliness of travel authorization and voucher processing and of the lack of customer service orientation of one employee in the section.

Informal Recommendation 30: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should develop performance standards for the timeliness and accuracy of travel vouchers and add customer service orientation to travel voucher clerk performance plans.

Security

(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Informal Recommendation 31: (b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)

Informal Recommendation 32: (b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)(b) (2)
(b) (2)

Informal Recommendation 33: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should consider reassigning principal unit security officer duties to the deputy executive director.

Information Management

Informal Recommendation 34: The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs should ensure that its web pages comply with Section 508 accessibility requirements and follow up with the Bureau for Information Resource Management for assistance with correcting deficiencies on sites developed by the Business Center.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS

Title	Name	Arrival Date
Assistant Secretary	John F. Turner	01/02 (Resigned 7/8/05)
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary	Anthony F. Rock	07/01
	Acting Assistant Secretary	07/05
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries	David A. Balton	08/03
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health, Space and Science (Acting)	Arnold J. Croddy	03/05
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environment	Claudia A. McMurray	11/03
Senior Climate Negotiator	Harlan L. Watson	01/02
Office Director for Policy Coordination and Initiatives	Jonathan A. Margolis	06/1998
Office Director for Oceans Affairs	Margaret F. Hayes	07/01
Office Director for Marine Conservation	William H. Gibbons-Fly	03/04
Office Director for Global Change	Dan A. Reifsnyder	10/1

Office Director for Environmental Policy	Michael P. Glover	08/03
Office Director for Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation	Stephanie Caswell	06/03
Office Director for International Health Affairs	Arnold J. Croddy	07/04
Office Director for Space and Advanced Technology	Ralph L. Braibanti	05/1997
Office Director for Science and Technology Cooperation	George S. Dragnich	08/04
Executive Director	Roy E. Chavera	08/03

ABBREVIATIONS

A/LM/AQM	Bureau of Administration, Office of Acquisitions Management
AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
BPP	Bureau Performance Plan
DAS	Deputy assistant secretary
DRL	Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EGC	Office of Global Change
ENV	Office of Environmental Policy
ETC	Office of Ecology and Terrestrial Conservation
EX	Executive office
FISMA	Federal Information Security Management Act
FSO	Foreign Service officer(s)
FTE	Full-time equivalent
GPS	Global Positioning System
HRD	Human resources division
IHA	Office of International Health Affairs
OES	Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
OESI	OES Initiatives Grants Program
OIG	Office of Inspector General
OMC	Office of Marine Conservation
PCI	Office of Policy Coordination and Initiatives
PD	Public diplomacy

PDAS	Principal deputy assistant secretary
SAFIRE	State Automated FISMA Information Reporting Environment (SAFIRE)
SAT	Office of Space and Advanced Technology
SES	Senior Executive Service
STAS	Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary
STC	Office of Science & Technology Cooperation
T&E	Trade and environment unit of the OES Office of Environmental Policy