

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

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

Report of Inspection

U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Report Number ISP-I-05-08, February 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
Security	6
POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	7
Background	7
Reporting and Advocacy	8
Public Diplomacy	10
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	15
Memorandum of Understanding	15
Joint Administrative Structure	16
Staffing	17
Real Property	17
Information Management	17
QUALITY OF LIFE	19
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS	21
FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS	23
INFORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS	25
PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS	27
ABBREVIATIONS	29

KEY JUDGMENTS

- The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (USUNESCO) has existed only a matter of months and has only recently been adequately staffed and housed. Headed by an Ambassador with marked political gifts, the mission has made a sound beginning in advancing and protecting U.S. interests.
- A multitude of U.S. government agencies and U.S. nongovernmental organizations have a stake in the work of the mission and the organization. The Bureau of International Organization Affairs (IO) plays the pivotal role in coordinating U.S. policy, instructing the mission, and providing liaison with the National Commission for UNESCO.
- Mission personnel properly focus on the most problematic education, science, and culture initiatives and programs and on prompting program and budget discipline. They are also forging the relationships with secretariat staff and other delegations necessary for effective advocacy and negotiation.
- Two staff members are assigned to handle public diplomacy activities, but as yet that portfolio is ill defined.
- The mission should participate fully in Embassy Paris' International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS) system and terminate its memorandum of understanding with the U.S. Mission to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

The inspection took place in Washington, DC, between September 15 and 30, 2004, and in Paris, France, between October 26 and November 12, 2004. Ambassador Vincent Battle (team leader), William Cavness (deputy team leader), Andrea Leopold, Cheryl Martin, Robert Torres, and Matthew Worner conducted the inspection.

CONTEXT

The United States rejoined UNESCO on October 1, 2003, after a hiatus in membership of nearly nineteen years. The presence in Paris of First Lady Laura Bush at the head of the U.S. initial delegation highlighted the significance of the event and the importance the administration places on the work of UNESCO. Only one year has elapsed since the formal reintegration of the United States into UNESCO and the start of transforming what was the U.S. observer mission at UNESCO into the U.S. mission to UNESCO (USUNESCO). This one-year period has witnessed noteworthy success in bringing the mission into full operation. The Ambassador took up her position at the head of the mission in March 2004. Seven direct-hire Americans and eight locally employed staff (LES) support her in the work of the mission. The mission recently moved into new quarters in Paris, which it shares with another U.S. mission. The United States also has taken a seat on UNESCO's executive board and works single mindedly to nurture relationships with allies and other member states to achieve U.S. policy objectives.

The U.S. government's decision to leave UNESCO in 1984 grew out of its discontent with management practices and program priorities that had vitiated the utility of the organization for the United States. By 2003, the U.S. government assessed that under the leadership of UNESCO Director General Koichiro Matsuura UNESCO had overhauled its management structure sufficiently to enable the United States to rejoin. Nonetheless, UNESCO's reforms are as yet incomplete. Guiding change, ensuring fiscal responsibility, and revitalizing the organization in ways that advance U.S. goals and objectives are among USUNESCO's primary tasks.

The U.S. agenda for its substantive work with UNESCO is taking shape, with some issues dictated to the mission because they were already on UNESCO's agenda prior to the United States return to the organization and others that reflect new initiatives from the United States. This agenda spans the portfolios of many federal agencies. It, therefore, requires strong coordination and priority setting within the U.S. government. The National Security Council took the lead in ensuring that all interested U.S. government agencies came together, particularly in the lead up to U.S. reintegration to the organization, to implement the President's decision and to set interagency priorities for U.S. participation in UNESCO. The coordinative role in Washington now rests primarily with the Department of State's

(Department) Bureau of International Organization Affairs. The mission is also looking toward close cooperation with the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. This body has been slow in forming. Once it is established, with a full membership and a work plan in place, it will provide support for priority setting, coordination, and technical expertise. USUNESCO has made a strong start in shaping both itself as an institution and its agenda as a reflection of the priority concerns of the U.S. government.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTION

In the one year since the reintegration of the United States into the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the mission in Paris has shed its role as observer and is now fully established as the U.S. Mission to UNESCO. The Ambassador arrived in March 2004 after spending an extensive period of consultations in Washington touching base with most of the U.S. agencies and private sector organizations with interests in UNESCO. She recognized that even during the 19-year absence many federal agencies had issues on the table at UNESCO. She saw it as essential that when she arrived in Paris at the head of her mission, these agencies and other newcomers would understand completely the central coordinative role for USUNESCO that she envisaged. Getting staffing up to its full complement took much of the summer. With the arrival of the deputy chief of mission (DCM), political officer, and science and technology officer in August and September 2004, the U.S. direct hire staffing is now complete: an office management specialist, a public affairs officer (PAO), and three substantive officers who divide up the mission's tripartite portfolio between them — education, science, and culture. Eight LES ably support the Ambassador and these direct hire officers.

The Ambassador claims, with justification, that our return to UNESCO has been a success. She understood instinctively how important the first steps after integration were as symbols of U.S. commitment to UNESCO. At USUNESCO, she works from the realization that many of the root causes of the world's problems today, including terrorism, are global in nature; e.g., educational availability and water management. For this reason, the United States needs to be a player. There are, however, still some sticking points. Reform at UNESCO, an element critical to the U.S. decision to reenter the organization, is not complete. Under the Ambassador's direction, the U.S. mission will be at the forefront of continuing reform efforts. The framing of some issues of substance, such as cultural diversity, continues to pose risks to U.S. interests. Her team is hard at work deflecting the anti-American bias of a convention on the subject that is currently under negotiation.

Despite the themes of reform and occasional anti-American bias, the Ambassador's vision for USUNESCO is an overwhelmingly positive one. In her view, the mission must spend a more substantial portion of its time advancing U.S.

initiatives rather than deflecting attacks on U.S. interests or championing organizational reform. To this aim, she has set out to establish priorities. She works well with IO in coordinating the interagency approach to UNESCO but takes a very active part herself to both foster collaboration between agencies and set agendas. She decries the lack of a systemic mechanism to ensure that she is in the loop on all agency interactions with UNESCO. She uses the country clearance process, however, to impose discipline. She also insists on seeing delegations that come to town and uses her representational funds effectively for hosting some of these groups along with their UNESCO counterparts.

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO has not yet reformed, although an executive secretary is already on board at the Department to work through the bureaucratic hurdles to bring the commission into existence. The Ambassador anticipates working closely with the members of the commission, which she conceives as a “think tank” drawing from the private sector, academia, and non-governmental organizations knowledge and experience on the broad range of UNESCO subjects that she will be able to draw upon. Outreach beyond the government is already a hallmark of the mission. Nonetheless, the Ambassador cautions against the possibility that resource-rich commission members push individual initiatives by offering nonbudgeted funding to get their target projects on the agenda.

SECURITY

The regional security officer and his staff, assigned to Embassy Paris, provide security to USUNESCO. Security issues are covered in the inspection report on Embassy Paris. The front office is engaged in security issues.

POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

BACKGROUND

The President's decision for the United States to rejoin the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was enunciated in September 2002 in his speech to the UN General Assembly. That decision was only the first step in a complex process - including defining the executive branch mechanisms for determining policy, setting up, and staffing the U.S. mission to UNESCO and recreating the independent National Commission for UNESCO - that is yet to be completed.

After the United States withdrew from UNESCO in 1984, the relatively large section in IO that covered UNESCO was reduced to a single officer who followed UNESCO's activities and a parallel presence in Paris, in the form of a UNESCO observer, who had observer status with the organization and attended and reported on its major meetings and activities. Following the decision to rejoin, the National Security Council chaired an interagency working group which in several meetings determined which of the many UNESCO programs should receive immediate attention. Responsibility for interagency coordination on UNESCO issues thereafter reverted to IO, specifically the Office of Technical Agencies (IO/T), where it remains primarily in the hands of the UNESCO desk officer. IO was and is also responsible for liaison with the Executive Director, named in early 2004, and the yet to be reformed National Commission for UNESCO.

After the decision to rejoin was announced in 2002, the UNESCO observer in Paris became responsible not only for continuing to follow UNESCO's substantive deliberations but also for the many administrative tasks connected with re-establishing USUNESCO. He worked initially with two LES, later supplemented by the 2003 arrivals of two office management specialists, a PAO, and an education specialist seconded from the U.S. Department of Education. The Ambassador arrived in March 2004; the new DCM and officers covering the political and science portfolios arrived late that summer, along with a local-hire

office management specialist to assist both the officers and the administrative assistant. Initially working out of the embassy, the still-growing USUNESCO staff moved to the Raphael Building in August 2004.

USUNESCO is, naturally, experiencing some growing pains. In two years it has gone from a small, tight staff to a larger, more hierarchical one; moved from working in one room in the embassy to newer quarters that - at least for the present - separate management from most of the employees; and shifted focus from essentially observing selected UNESCO activities to trying actively to shape many of them. At an early stage USUNESCO began to host various high-level U.S. delegations to the major policy-making organs, the Executive Committee and the General Conference, and other meetings. All of these factors together meant that initially lines of responsibility were fluid and that the staff pulled together for whatever task was at hand. Now that USUNESCO is essentially fully staffed, it is working to formalize individual responsibilities in order to effectively oversee and help shape the U.S. response to a wider range of UNESCO programs.

Two elements complicate both communication and the work efficiency of USUNESCO: the two-floor separation between the executive office and most other staff in its new quarters and the distance between the mission and UNESCO itself. The two-floor separation within the Raphael building is less than ideal, but only a minority of the staff cited it as a significant impediment to their work - and, in any case, the space allocation in the building could be changed. Unchangeable, however, is the considerable distance between UNESCO headquarters and the USUNESCO mission building. USUNESCO, as other member delegations, has a small suite of three rooms, including a general meeting room, a secretarial office, and a computer-equipped workroom, at UNESCO headquarters. Many other national delegations to UNESCO use these suites as their permanent base. For security reasons, however, USUNESCO officers and visiting delegations may use these rooms only on an ad hoc basis, and their real workspace remains the offices in the Raphael building. No matter the mode of transport, it easily takes at least a half-hour to travel between the UNESCO and USUNESCO, so significant working time is lost every week to necessary travel between the two locations.

REPORTING AND ADVOCACY

The formal reporting and analysis staff at USUNESCO consists of three officers. A U.S. Department of Education officer has covered the education portfolio for over a year, but the science officer has only recently assumed her

duties and the political/cultural advisor is also new. It is thus difficult to make a firm judgment on the overall effectiveness of the mission and the program officers in regard to UNESCO's three major program areas. Nevertheless, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) believes that, on rather limited evidence, USUNESCO is on the right track on the major elements of its charge. Along with USUNESCO leadership, the reporting section is laying the human foundation necessary for multilateral work; it is concentrating on the issues of most direct U.S. concern; it is working to keep UNESCO efforts focused on core programs; and it is holding up its end of the reporting and operational dialogue with Washington and in terms of internal communication.

In multilateral diplomacy effective representation of a nation's interests is closely connected with establishing a network of working relationships with both secretariat and other mission representatives. This is not mere politeness: it is laying the groundwork for the constant exchange of information and, eventually, successful negotiation and advocacy. Both the Ambassador and DCM are making deliberate efforts to cultivate their opposite numbers in the other national delegations and higher-level UNESCO officers. The program officers are also finding ways to enlarge their contacts. The education officer, for instance, started what is now a standing Friday morning coffee, open to all, where the informal focus is education issues; likewise, the new science officer has parlayed several weeks of delegation escort duty into opportunities to establish direct contact with senior UNESCO Secretariat members. Even in the press of current operational responsibilities, it is important that the reporting officers continue making and deepening their contacts in the UNESCO secretariat and other missions.

UNESCO's complex organization is matched by a large number of programs and priorities in education, culture, and science that are of uneven concern to U.S. policymakers and interests. Some are of relatively marginal interest; a few - for instance, the importance of basic literacy, and the work of several scientific research organizations working under UNESCO sponsorship - dovetail nicely with existing U.S. priorities; and a handful are program initiatives that could have large and direct effects on U.S. social and commercial interests. At present, the critical issues include efforts to create a universal accreditation system and possible restrictions on for-profit educational institutions; a proposed cultural diversity convention that has implications for the free movement of media, including film; the push for a convention on doping in sports that could affect not only a nation's ability to host the Olympic games, but also the ability of athletes to participate in them, and another proposed convention on bioethics. The mission is correctly focused on these issues, reports important developments to Washington, and is working strategically to shape the debate and therefore the issues themselves.

One of the continuing, important tasks USUNESCO has is pressing for a degree of discipline in UNESCO. There are constant temptations, from Secretariat and member states alike, to pull the organization into new areas and to expand its natural and agreed mandate. A major element in this dynamic is extra-budgetary resources, the significant amount of voluntary contributions that come to UNESCO from member states to execute a particular program or initiative. Whether or not these new initiatives are directly related to UNESCO's mandate, or even valuable in their own right, they can have the effect of diverting resources from the core programs already agreed upon by the whole membership. In addition, member states may try to maneuver UNESCO into providing a forum for dealing with an issue that has been raised unsuccessfully elsewhere. It takes dogged but low-key diplomacy to successfully persuade the Secretariat and membership that concentrating efforts on existing key programs pays dividends, as does being careful not to duplicate efforts already made elsewhere. USUNESCO is already weaving these concerns into its formal presentations and routine interventions.

Communication between Washington, particularly IO/T as the coordinating office, and the mission varies as needed between e-mail, telephone conversations, and cables containing formal instructions, wrap-up reporting on meetings and delegation visits, and major developments. During meetings and what are often after-hour negotiations, direct contact with Washington is often by cell phone. While there have been relatively few reporting cables thus far, they cover important topics, such as an effort to give the European Union an enhanced observer status at the talks on a cultural diversity convention; they are clearly written, and are as concise as complex matters allow. Communication within USUNESCO remains generally informal; there are occasional all-hands meetings, but as each officer has delegation and meeting commitments throughout the working day it is often difficult to find a time when the entire staff is able to meet. A reading file passed from hand to hand, that includes a range of cables and UNESCO documents, gives USUNESCO staff another way to keep abreast of both critical and continuing issues.

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY¹

The USUNESCO PAO, an experienced FS-01 public diplomacy cone officer, arrived in Paris shortly before the formal reentry of the United States to UNESCO

¹ In this report, public diplomacy refers to the function of engaging, informing, and influencing key public international audiences. The public affairs section at an embassy directs public diplomacy.

in late 2003. In mid-October 2004, the public affairs office added an American local hire program assistant.

The mission and the public affairs section can take pride in several significant public diplomacy accomplishments. The U.S. reentry to UNESCO, featuring the First Lady's visit and a major cultural presentation, successfully launched the new U.S. mission. The Ambassador and the PAO made excellent use of several public diplomacy tools and programs to help dispel suspicions about U.S. motives in rejoining an organization it has heavily criticized in the past. Examples include distribution of the Department's publication on "The Ambassador's Fund for Cultural Preservation," a program unknown to many delegations - including delegations from countries where the United States has funded preservation projects. Another highlight was a program for the delegations featuring several prominent American writers. These symbols of visible U.S. interest in reestablishing itself as a leading participant in UNESCO, in preserving the cultural heritage of other countries, and in presenting outstanding U.S. intellectual and cultural achievements contributed to the positive reception accorded to the U.S. presence. Much work remains to be done, both with the delegations and in the Secretariat, if the United States is to achieve its goals in important areas of UNESCO focus and make effective use of the public diplomacy platform afforded to the United States by its reentry to the organization.

At this early stage in the mission's development, the role of the public affairs office and, in particular, the portfolio of the PAO, need better definition. The PAO and mission leadership should spell out clearly a strategy for outreach by the U.S. delegation to the delegations of other member countries and to the permanent staff of the Secretariat; the mission's public affairs profile, specifically media outreach; and, the weight of the PAO's public diplomacy responsibilities relative to responsibilities for coverage of and reporting on UNESCO activities of interest to the mission and the U.S. government. IO, which has oversight of the mission for the Department, should play an active role in defining the public affairs portfolio. OIG noted that the mission's web site, potentially a very valuable outreach tool, is not up-to-date.

The PAO in USUNESCO does not operate like a PAO in a bilateral mission. The multilateral environment of UNESCO presents special challenges to a public diplomacy program - especially in competing for scarce resources held by Washington support elements that normally deal with individual country programs overseas or groups of countries in geographic regions. For example, USUNESCO has no annual allocation for International Visitor exchange grants, nor is it likely to receive such funds as requested in the Mission Performance Plan (MPP) to send

Secretariat permanent staff to the United States. There are no funds designated specifically for speaker programs or other resources provided by the Coordinator of International Information Programs. Although media outreach is emphasized in the current MPP, the mission has opted to maintain a low media profile, so there is virtually no press activity or press coverage of the mission by journalists following UNESCO. IO, where oversight for USUNESCO lies, does not provide public diplomacy resources to the mission. In the process of staffing the new mission, there was some confusion as to what the public diplomacy officer should be and do. The position was advertised first as a FS-01 cultural affairs officer, then a FS-02 PAO, and finally a FS-01 PAO - all in the space of a few months. The heavy editing of the new mission's draft MPP goal paper on public diplomacy indicates that expectations on resources available to the public affairs section were unrealistic. The reassignment of the very important culture portfolio from the PAO to a political officer suggests an ongoing evolution of the PAO function. The public affairs section, the mission, and IO have not yet firmly established the conceptual framework for this aspect of USUNESCO's work.

Both the public affairs officer and the program assistant have responsibilities well beyond a traditional public diplomacy portfolio. The work requirements statement for the PAO emphasizes consulting and negotiating with other delegations on information and communication issues. The PAO also covers UNESCO committees working on internal administrative reform. Development of public diplomacy programs has a lower priority in his portfolio. The public affairs program assistant's primary responsibility, as indicated in his work requirements, is analytical and political reporting with public diplomacy support a lesser priority. In fact, the program assistant's actual responsibilities do include active program support, and OIG concluded that his position description needs revision. The program assistant supports the mission's busy administrative assistant and maintains an extensive database that tracks applications of U.S. citizens seeking employment in UNESCO. Increased employment of Americans in the UNESCO structure is a priority goal for the U.S. government, but assigning this tracking function to the public affairs assistant reduces his ability to support public diplomacy. The DCM is the program assistant's supervisor, another indicator that the PAO portfolio remains unsettled.

The multitude of tasks assigned to the public affairs section inevitably reduces the time available for the planning and execution of a well considered, high quality set of public affairs and public diplomacy programs. At a minimum, the mission should establish a clear public affairs and public diplomacy strategy, taking into account time demands for coverage of UNESCO meetings and subsequent reporting, to direct the PAO in planning his section's work. The mission might be better

served by reclassifying the PAO position as an additional reporting officer slot and assigning the limited public diplomacy/outreach function to the locally hired program assistant.

Recommendation 1: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in coordination with the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, should review the role of the FS-01 public affairs officer at the mission, along with the resources available to support a public diplomacy program, and amend the public affairs officer's work requirements statement to reflect actual duties and responsibilities assigned.
(Action: USUNESCO, in coordination with IO)

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The staff in USUNESCO includes six Department officers, a representative of the U.S. Department of Education, one locally employed American, two eligible family members, and seven LES. The mission's \$3.1 M budget includes about \$170,000 for public diplomacy programs and \$1.6 M for ICASS.

USUNESCO already pays for the complete range of ICASS functions. USUNESCO has also been depending on a memorandum of understanding between the U.S. Mission to the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (USOECD) and USUNESCO that was designed to provide limited administrative services for USUNESCO. It has not provided those services.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

USUNESCO pays for the full package of administrative services under ICASS; last year's payment was \$1.6 million. However, the mission has also entered into a memorandum of understanding with USOECD that provides limited administrative services, services that ICASS also provides. The memorandum states that USOECD will provide the same services it provides for its other customers. USOECD does not provide these services, however. The memorandum also does not meet the provisions of the Economy Act of 1932 (31 U.S.C. 1535 and 1536) that requires agencies entering into agreements with other agencies to reimburse the performing agency for the actual cost of services. In this case, the cost for services that are being provided has not been identified.

According to the memorandum, USUNESCO should compensate USOECD in equipment and staff. OIG found that USUNESCO pays the salary for one local staff at a cost of more than \$50,000 annually to provide information management services to USOECD and USUNESCO customers. This service would be provided under ICASS for which USUNESCO already pays. OIG recommends in its reports on inspections of USOECD and Embassy Paris that USOECD discontinue providing administrative services, including information management, and get them

from Embassy Paris' information management section. OIG also recommends, in accordance with 5 FAM 121.1 requirements, that Embassy Paris' information management officer supervise information management activities for USOECD and USUNESCO.

USOECD also provides accommodation exchange, supervised by the embassy's financial management section and represents USUNESCO on the embassy's housing board. All of the services USOECD provides are ICASS services for which USUNESCO already pays. USUNESCO is not well served by the memorandum.

Recommendation 2: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization should terminate the memorandum of understanding with the U.S. Mission to the Organization for Economic and Cooperative Development. (Action: USUNESCO)

JOINT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

OIG recommends in the inspection report for Embassy Paris and constituent posts that the embassy establish a joint administrative services structure to serve all three missions located in Paris. OIG has discussed this structure with Embassy Paris' management officials and DCM who agreed this structure would save salary and other resource costs for the U.S. government and continue to provide the same services it now provides for USUNESCO through ICASS. OIG believes USUNESCO would benefit from becoming a full participant in a joint administrative service organization and receive all administrative services through ICASS.

Recommendation 3: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in coordination with Embassy Paris, should become a full participant in Embassy Paris' joint administrative structure and seek all administrative services through the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services. (Action: USUNESCO, in coordination with Embassy Paris)

STAFFING

The sole administrative assistant began working for USUNESCO in May 2003, before it became a full mission. He played a key role in moving staff to its office space in the Raphael building and establishing offices for USUNESCO staff and visiting U.S. delegations at UNESCO headquarters. To complete administrative tasks, he works nearly 12 hours of overtime weekly. Further, without other administrative support, he has been unable to take time off. OIG believes the full merger with ICASS will alleviate this overtime requirement.

REAL PROPERTY

USUNESCO and USOECD share a recently renovated, short-term leased office building, known as the Raphael building. Renovations are not completed yet; a controlled access area for classified operations is under construction. The annual lease cost is about \$1.4 million with USUNESCO paying 30 percent and USOECD paying 70 percent. USUNESCO is primarily located in the basement area while USOECD is located throughout all the building levels. OIG believes space could be allocated more equitably.

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

USUNESCO and USOECD share the same information management system and staff at the Raphael building. Two locally employed American staff paid for by USOECD, and a third LES member whose salary USUNESCO pays, administer the system. A classified capability will soon be operational.

QUALITY OF LIFE

The morale throughout the mission is reasonably good. The elements that generally contribute to quality of life, such as the commissary recreational facility, occupational health unit, and community liaison office, are located at Embassy Paris' chancery. Schools and housing, also under the embassy's purview, receive high marks on OIG questionnaires.

MANAGEMENT CONTROLS

Chief of Mission Management Controls' Statement, dated June 2004, states that, taken as a whole, the system of management controls was effective and provided reasonable assurance that management control objectives were achieved. OIG agrees with this determination.

FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in coordination with the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, should review the role of the FS-01 public affairs officer at the mission, along with the resources available to support a public diplomacy program, and amend the public affairs officer's work requirements statement to reflect actual duties and responsibilities assigned. (Action: USUNESCO, in coordination with IO)

Recommendation 2: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization should terminate the memorandum of understanding with the U.S. Mission to the Organization for Economic and Cooperative Development. (Action: USUNESCO)

Recommendation 3: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in coordination with Embassy Paris, should become a full participant in Embassy Paris' joint administrative structure and seek all administrative services through the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services. (Action: USUNESCO, in coordination with Embassy Paris)

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.

Public Diplomacy

The incumbent PAO does not devote much time to public affairs and public diplomacy. Indeed, designating this position as a PAO job and staffing it with a public diplomacy officer may not be warranted.

Informal Recommendation 1: The mission should amend the Mission Performance Plan to reflect accurately mission emphases and priorities.

The current MPP contains public diplomacy resource requests that the mission is unlikely to receive.

Informal Recommendation 2: The public affairs officer should request that the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Bureau of International Organization Affairs review the mission's Mission Performance Plan and confirm what public diplomacy programs and resource requests they will support.

The position description for newly hired public diplomacy program assistant does not spell out the actual scope of his responsibilities.

Informal Recommendation 3: The program assistant's supervisor should revise the current work requirements statement.

OIG noted that the mission web site is not up-to-date. Responsibility for maintenance of the site is in the public affairs section, but this is not formally noted in work requirements statements.

Informal Recommendation 4: The mission should develop a plan to maintain and expand the web site as an outreach tool, and formally assign responsibility for that function.

Resource Management

USUNESCO does not have an impact (credit) card.

Informal Recommendation 5: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization should request an impact (credit) card to purchase small dollar value supplies and services.

The mission has not established a training plan in accordance with 3 FAM 7630.

Informal Recommendation 6: The U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization should establish a training plan for its staff in accordance with Department regulations.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS

Ambassador	Louise V. Oliver	03/04
Deputy Chief of Mission	Andrew C. Koss	08/04
Public Affairs Officer	Raymond F. Tripp	08/03

ABBREVIATIONS

DCM	Deputy chief of mission
ICASS	International Cooperative Administrative Support Services
IO	Bureau of International Organization Affairs
IO/T	Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of Technical Specialized Agencies
LES	Locally employed staff
MPP	Mission Performance Plan
OIG	Office of Inspector General
PAO	Public affairs officer
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
USOECD	U.S. Mission to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
USUNESCO	U.S. Mission to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization