

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 112TH  
CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION**

---

---

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————  
MARCH 16 THROUGH DECEMBER 8, 2011  
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 112TH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION**

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 112TH  
CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION**

---

---

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————  
MARCH 16 THROUGH DECEMBER 8, 2011  
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

74-273 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2012

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
112TH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

BARBARA BOXER, California	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania	MARCO RUBIO, Florida
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire	JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
TOM UDALL, New Mexico	MIKE LEE, Utah

\*FRANK G. LOWENSTEIN, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Republican Staff Director*

\*Note: WILLIAM C. DANVERS (assumed *Staff Director* position as of October 3, 2011)

## NOMINATION

---

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 2011

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

---

Joseph M. Torsella, of Pennsylvania, to be Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador and Alternate U.S. Representative to the 65th session of the U.N. General Assembly

---

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:20 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Robert P. Casey, presiding.

Present: Senators Casey, Rubio, DeMint, and Lee.

### **OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., U.S. SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA**

Senator CASEY. The hearing will come to order.

First of all, I want to thank the nominee, Joe Torsella, for being here and for taking the time to come back.

And I appreciate the attendance here of our ranking member, Senator DeMint.

Today the Foreign Relations Committee meets to examine the nomination of Joe Torsella to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador and Alternative U.S. Representative to the 65th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Joe Torsella has been here before, and we're grateful that he's back. His wife, Carolyn, is with us. And I'm told that your daughter, Grace, is here and your son, Joe—is that—did I get that right? Thanks very much for being here. We're grateful.

And we know that—as I think I said before, that when a public official, elected or appointed, puts himself forward for public service, I know that's a commitment that you make, but also that your family makes. And I know that's a challenge, and we're grateful that your family is here to support you.

In the past 2 years, the world has witnessed a shift, in the United States foreign policy, toward a comprehensive multilateralism which is embodied in our renewed commitment to the international system that the United Nations represents. This new direction is critically important to how we conduct foreign policy and how we relate to the United Nations.

The United States was one of the primary architects of the United Nations and its affiliated bodies. And as a world leader, the United States not only has role to play to be an active participant in the United Nations, but also has an obligation to ensure that the U.N. has measures of accountability applied to it.

To that end, Joe Torsella's record as a dedicated and innovative reformer will serve him well in this important post as U.S. Representative to the United Nations for Management and Reform.

In these times of sweeping geopolitical change, the administration has worked, for the past 2 years, to make America stronger and more secure by pursuing a strategy of national renewal and energetic global leadership. Ambassador Rice has made this case before, and I'd like to take the opportunity to discuss briefly how the United Nations fits into that strategy—why we need the U.N., how it makes us all safer, and what we're doing to fix its shortcomings and help fulfill its potential.

In these tough economic times here in the United States, and indeed, around the world, we're all focused on a growing economy. We're in recovery, but we've got a long way to go. We want to make sure we're doing everything possible to provide jobs for Americans who are hurting and out of work.

Yet, even as we get our own house in order, we cannot afford to ignore problems beyond our borders. When nuclear weapons materials remain unsecured in many countries around the world, we are all put at risk. When states are wracked by conflict or ravaged by poverty, they can incubate threats that spread across borders, from terrorism to pandemic disease, from criminal networks to environmental degradation. Like it or not, we live in a new era of challenges that cross borders as freely as a storm, challenges that even the world's most powerful country often cannot tackle on its own. In the 21st century, indifference is not an option. Withdrawing from the world community is not only bad policy, it is, in fact, dangerous.

America cannot police every conflict and every crisis, and—or shelter every refugee. The United Nations provides a real return on our tax dollars by bringing the world's countries together to share the cost of providing stability, vital aid, and hope in the world's most broken places. Because of the U.N., the world doesn't look to America to solve every problem alone. Our participation in the U.N. is a wise investment. But, with any investment, I should say, we must constantly work to better ensure that management and effective reforms are in place for that organization; in this case, the United Nations.

The Foreign Relations Committee has taken steps to address our Nation's arrears to the U.N. over the past 2 years. However, in doing so, the committee has called upon the U.N. to implement a series of reforms and to improve its evaluation and transparency policies. As the biggest contributor to the U.N., we expect, and we deserve, accountability to ensure that our taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

The United Nations can be more efficient and effective, and I know that Joe Torsella has ideas on how to make that happen. I support his confirmation to serve our country at the U.S. mission at the United Nations, because I believe he has the background and experience and commitment to public service to enhance our active U.S. presence at the U.N. by ensuring that our tax dollars are spent wisely.

Joe has been a faithful public servant and a leading entrepreneur in Pennsylvania throughout his career. As deputy mayor for policy and planning in Philadelphia, he helped lead Philadelphia out of its economic and fiscal crisis by implementing strategic reforms that the New York Times described as "the most stunning turnaround in recent urban history."

Most recently, he has served as the chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of Education, one of the Nation's largest public school systems, with over 500 public school districts and 14 State universities. Under Joe Torsella's leadership, the Board of Education adopted and implemented groundbreaking State education standards and new high school graduation requirements. These reforms require students to demonstrate proficiency in core subject matters in order to receive a diploma, thereby strengthening public education in the Commonwealth and holding schools accountable. These reforms don't come easily. They are a result of building consensus with a variety of stakeholders. And Joe has gotten results.

Joe has also been instrumental in the establishment of Philadelphia's National Constitution Center. The center is dedicated to increasing the public's understanding of, and appreciation for, the U.S. Constitution.

Finally, I will enter into the record a letter from President George Herbert Walker Bush which indicates his close working relationship with Joe Torsella when Joe was the chairman of the board of the Constitution Center. And I'll enter that into the record and just read, for the record, one sentence from that letter. And I'm quoting former President Bush. "As a former Ambassador to the United Nations, I could not be more confident in Joe's qualifications for this job. I would have been proud to have him on my team. He's a man of character and principle and will represent our Nation well."

I think that's well said by one of our former Presidents.

With Joe Torsella representing the United States on management reform issues, we can have the confidence that our Nation's interests will be effectively championed and that this portfolio will be professionally and efficiently managed on behalf of the people of the United States.

[The letter referred to by Senator Casey follows:]

GEORGE BUSH

December 8, 2010

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to support the nomination of Joseph Torsella as the nominee for Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform and Alternate Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I worked closely with Joe when I served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the National Constitution Center of which he was President and CEO. During his tenure, Joe turned this remarkable center from mainly a tourist attraction to a national and international center where people came to discuss and learn about not only our Constitution, but the great issues of the day. For example, President Obama chose the NCC as the site of his speech on race in America during the 2008 presidential campaign.

Many of the qualities that made Joe such a good leader at the NCC will also make him an outstanding representative to the United Nations: excellent people skills; a great communicator; an instant grasp of issues; and a knack for bringing together diverse groups of people.

As a former ambassador to the United Nations, I could not be more confident in Joe's qualifications for this job. I would have been proud to have him on my team. He is a man of character and principle and will represent our nation well.

Sincerely,



Senator CASEY. And, with that, I turn to our distinguished ranking member, Senator DeMint.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JIM DeMINT,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA**

Senator DeMINT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Torsella. I appreciate your meeting with me in our office. I feel very good about your nomination.

I appreciate the chairman pointing out the importance of the United Nations. Having an international body is obviously critical to a lot of things in the world, which makes the problems perhaps that much more important, as well.



And whether it comes to budget processes or peacekeeping operations, oversight, or transparency, the United Nations has been unacceptably slow to reform. Waste, fraud, abuse, and general mismanagement are widespread at the U.N. Yet, the position of U.S. Representatives the United Nations for Management and Reform has been vacant for over 2 years. That makes it appear that the United Nations oversight has simply not been a priority to the administration, which I hope you can change.

This is unfortunate. The United States is by far the largest contributor to the United Nations, donating more than \$6 billion in 2009 alone. I believe American taxpayers deserve more accountability for their dollars.

One major area of concern is the mandated items Americans are forced to pay for our nonvoluntary U.N. contributions. Because of this, Americans end up paying for programs that do not align with our national security and foreign policy objectives. For example, since 2006, nearly half of the country-specific resolutions passed by the United Nations Humans Rights Council, which Americans are required to fund, have focused on condemning Israel. Meanwhile, notorious human rights offenders, like Iran and Cuba, have been ignored.

In the past, the United States has pressured the U.N. to review their mandates. This process has stalled, largely because U.N. member states are focused on protecting the funding for their pet programs. Over 9,000 of these programs currently exist. Programs that duplicate each other, and outdated mandates, must be streamlined, eliminated, and merged.

The United States also sends the United Nations voluntary contributions. President Obama's bipartisan debt commission proposed making a reduction in the amount of voluntary contributions the United States gives the U.N. on its draft of spending-cut proposals. And we should go much further. The United Kingdom, as you're aware, has recommended cutting funding for four agencies, and put on notice—put others on notice for urgent improvement, or they would face cuts, as well. The United States should examine these cuts and take similar actions.

Finally, U.N. peacekeeping missions must have more accountability—much more. According to a 2007 report by the United Nations Office on Internal Oversight Services, of roughly \$1.4 billion in peacekeeping contracts examined, significant corruption schemes were involved in roughly 44 percent of these contracts, totaling about \$619 million. This is a topic I'd like to pursue further during the question-and-answer period, but I'll stop and let you give your statement.

And Mr. Chairman, I suspect if they call the vote sometimes, we can listen to his statement, and then come back and ask some questions, if that suits you.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator DeMint.

Mr. Torsella, if you could provide your opening. And we may have to take a brief break to go to vote.

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you.

Senator CASEY. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH M. TORSELLA, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS FOR U.N. MANAGEMENT AND REFORM, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR AND ALTERNATIVE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE 65TH SESSION OF THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Mr. TORSELLA. Chairman Casey, thank you for that introduction. Senator DeMint, thank you for your comments and for your courtesy on our recent visit.

Chairman, Ranking Member, Senator Lee, I'm honored to be here today.

I will abbreviate my full statement slightly, in the interest of the voting you have to do, and submit the full testimony for the record.

Senator CASEY. Let me just say, it will be made part of the record.

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you. And I would also like to recognize—in addition to the family members who are here today—our two children, Kelly Logan and Travis Logan, who are older, and who are not here—for good reasons, in one case, because she has a job; and, in the second case, because he's enlisted in the National Guard Reserve and is at basic training. So, they're with us in spirit and behind the nomination, as well.

I'm deeply honored to come before you as the President's nominee for this position, and grateful to the President, to Secretary Clinton, and Ambassador Rice for their confidence in me.

And I want to echo what you said, Chairman Casey, that the United Nations was born, in part, here in this committee, that your predecessors were among the earliest advocates and architects and, when appropriate, constructive critics of the United Nations, because they believed that an effective U.N. that had vigorous American leadership was in our national security interest. Their beliefs, in my judgment, remain true today. At its best, the U.N. can be a powerful tool to the United States, and a force multiplier to advance our interests and our values.

When U.N. peacekeepers are on the ground, they are there at a fraction of the cost and the risk of the United States acting alone. When the U.N. builds the civic muscles of a failing state, or a fragile state, it helps protect American citizens from the threats that can grow in failed states. And when U.N. agencies, such as UNICEF, for example, work to eradicate polio around the globe, we're protecting the health of Americans here at home.

But, neither the U.N. nor its member states are always at their best. And all too often, we have seen them at their worst. As Ambassador Rice has said, there is a serious gap separating the vision of the U.N.'s founders from the institution of today. And the investments that we've made and the challenges that we face are both too great for us to tolerate any waste, inefficiency, or abuse anywhere in the U.N. system. The global stakes are too high to allow biased agendas, narrow interests or political grandstanding to prevail anywhere in the U.N.'s Chambers.

In recent years, U.S.-led comprehensive reform efforts have gathered steam and achieved some real, meaningful results, but there is much, much more work to be done to help the U.N. achieve a culture of economy, effectiveness, ethics, and excellence. I can further detail the steps that I believe lie ahead. In general, oversight

and auditing must be strengthened, management and procurement systems must be upgraded, human resource reforms must be undertaken, and business processes need to be streamlined and brought into the 21st century. Those early steps that have been taken, on whistleblower protection, for example, need to be fully protected and fully implemented.

I've spent much of my career bringing reform and accountability to public organizations in challenging contexts. As chairman of the Pennsylvania State Board of Education, as you said, Senator, I oversee a system with 500 school districts and 14 universities. And the hallmark of my tenure there has been implementing an accountability measure that was contested and hard-fought in the face of some determined opposition that guarantees that taxpayers get results for the dollars that we spend on education in Pennsylvania.

When I was deputy mayor of Philadelphia that city was on the verge of bankruptcy—decades of poor management practices made it a city, in the words of one magazine, “that set the standard for municipal distress in the 1990s.” My portfolio was management reform. I helped negotiate groundbreaking contracts with Philadelphia’s 25,000 employees, of which the Wall Street Journal said, “Taxpayers can only applaud.” I spearheaded reforms, from contracting out to civil service reforms, overhauling a bloated disability benefit system, and making innovative investments in productivity that closed a \$1.4 billion cumulative deficit without raising taxes. As you said, the New York Times and others called it the most stunning turnaround in history.

And finally, when I came to the National Constitution Center, that project was in some public and financial turmoil. And I’m proud to say that I steered it to an on-time, on-budget, and bipartisan success. And I led it to a thriving program of public diplomacy. The Constitution Center has introduced tens of thousands of international visitors to American ideas and ideals. We’ve worked in Afghanistan on democracy education efforts. We’ve hosted hundreds of international leaders, heads of state and heads of government, to grassroots democracy activists, from Australia, Brazil, and Cameroon, to Serbia, Tunisia, and the U.K.

So, I come here today as a proud patriot who also has a deep commitment to America’s engagement with the world and at the United Nations, a demonstrated history of managing taxpayer dollars carefully, a willingness to listen to good ideas from all quarters, and a lifetime of experience as a strong voice for reform in public institutions, and a builder of coalitions to achieve it.

It would be a great privilege, if confirmed, to use that experience, working with others in the administration, in Congress, and most especially here in this committee, to help the U.N. live up to both its ideals and potential, to renew and strengthen it for our century, just as your predecessors, in 1945, did for theirs.

Thank you. And I look forward to answering questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Torsella follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOSEPH M. TORSSELLA

Thank you Chairman Casey, Ranking Member DeMint, and distinguished members. I am honored to come before you as the President’s nominee to be the U.S. Representative to the United Nations for Management and Reform, and I am grate-

ful to President Obama, Secretary Clinton, and Ambassador Rice for their confidence.

The United Nations was born, in part, in this committee. Your predecessors were among its earliest architects, advocates and, occasionally, constructive critics because they believed that an effective United Nations—with vigorous American leadership—was in America's national security interest.

Their beliefs remain true today. At its best, the U.N. can be a powerful tool and force multiplier for advancing our interests and values. When U.N. peacekeepers are on the ground helping to protect civilians and advancing peace globally, they do so at a fraction of the cost and risk of the U.S. acting alone. When the U.N. builds the civic muscles of fragile states, American citizens are made safer from the threats that grow in failed states. When U.N. agencies such as UNICEF work to eradicate polio around the globe, we protect the health of Americans here at home.

But neither the U.N. nor all its member states are always at their best; all too often, we have seen them at their worst. As Ambassador Rice has said, a serious gap still separates the vision of the U.N.'s founders from the institution of today. Both the investments we've made and challenges we face are too great to tolerate waste, inefficiency, or abuse anywhere in the U.N. system. And the global stakes are too high to allow biased agendas, narrow interests, or political grandstanding to prevail in any of the U.N.'s chambers.

In recent years, U.S.-led comprehensive reform efforts have gathered steam and achieved some meaningful results. But there is much more work to be done to help the United Nations nurture a culture of economy, effectiveness, ethics, and excellence.

Oversight, auditing, and evaluation must be strengthened to better ensure that U.S. funds are spent wisely and cleanly. Management and procurement systems must be upgraded and updated for accountability and transparency throughout the U.N.'s activities worldwide. Critical human resource reforms are essential to equipping the U.N. with a workforce that is held accountable for delivering results. Business processes need to be streamlined, aligned with best practices, and brought into the 21st century. And important first steps achieved in the areas of whistleblower protection, financial disclosure, and budgetary discipline must be protected and fully implemented.

I have spent much of my career bringing reform and accountability to public organizations in challenging contexts. As chairman of the Pennsylvania State Board of Education, I oversee a system with 500 school districts, 14 universities, and billions in public funds. Under my leadership we've made the board's workings more transparent and open to the public, and passed a landmark accountability measure—in the face of determined opposition—which implemented rigorous new high school graduation requirements, the first such change in a generation.

As a deputy mayor of Philadelphia at a time when that city was on the verge of bankruptcy and decades of poor management practices had made it, in the words of *City and State Magazine*, "the city that . . . set the standard for municipal distress in the 1990s," my portfolio was management and reform. I helped negotiate groundbreaking contracts with Philadelphia's 25,000-person workforce of which *The Wall Street Journal* said "taxpayers can only applaud." I spearheaded reforms—from competitive contracting out of city services to civil service reform, from overhauling a bloated disability benefits system that encouraged abuse to innovative investments in productivity—that closed a \$1.4 billion cumulative deficit without raising taxes. *The New York Times* called it "the most stunning turnaround in recent urban history."

And I came to the National Constitution Center when that \$185 million project was in public and financial turmoil. I'm proud to say that I steered it to an on-time, on-budget, and bipartisan success, and led it to a thriving program of public diplomacy.

The Constitution Center has introduced tens of thousands of everyday international visitors to American ideas and ideals, worked in Afghanistan on democracy education efforts, and hosted hundreds of international leaders, from heads of state and government to grassroots democracy activists, from countries ranging from Australia, Brazil, and Cameroon to Serbia, Tunisia, and the United Kingdom.

So I come here today as a proud patriot who also has a deep commitment to America's engagement with the world and at the United Nations, a demonstrated history of managing taxpayer dollars carefully, a willingness to listen to good ideas from all quarters, and a lifetime of experience as a strong voice for reform in public institutions and a builder of coalitions to achieve it.

It would be a privilege, if confirmed, to use that experience—working with others in the administration, in Congress, and especially in this committee—to help the

U.N. live up to both its ideals and potential, to renew and strengthen the U.N. for our century, just as your predecessors in 1945 did for theirs.

Thank you, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Senator CASEY. Thank you Mr. Torsella.

We will take a break for what are two votes, and get back here as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Senator CASEY. Well, thanks, everyone. We're back. And I know that other members will be joining us. We just had two votes, and I did a little running, so I got a little exercise in between.

But, let me start with some questions. And I know that Senator DeMint, and maybe Senator Lee, will be back, as well, for questions.

I wanted to ask you about your experience, which obviously is relevant to any nomination hearing. But, I did note, for the record, some of the experience, but, in my judgment, it's a substantial body of experience that bears directly on the assignment you'd have at the United Nations. It's easy to talk about reform in management and accountability. It's harder to do it in the real world of the private sector, or even, maybe even harder on some days, the real world of government. And as someone who's not only run for public office, but was in a position in two different State government agencies where we had to change the way business was done, and throw out the old ways and start down a new path. I know how difficult that can be, so I have great admiration for what you've done.

But, I wanted to give you some time just to kind of walk through some of what you covered in your statement, your previous experience and how that bears directly on the job you'll have.

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you, Senator. Thank you.

As I alluded to in my statement, I began my career in public affairs as deputy mayor of Philadelphia at a very difficult time. And almost all the attention of those of us who were in government then, and I was one of the deputy mayors for the city, was around a crisis of management, reform, and accountability. It was not only a financial crisis, but a broader crisis of confidence that people had in government. And over the course of several years and painstaking coalition-building, we changed the way the city did business, and did it in a way that translated to the bottom line, and didn't do it by any of the easy, obvious solutions, which, at the time, was, you know, raising taxes, because our judgment was that the city couldn't bear it.

I later had my own business, and subsequently was at the Constitution Center on two different tours of duty, for a total of 10 years, both in the institution "building" phase of the project, which was a nearly \$200 million project, and then in the running of it. I am proud to say that, for all the years I ran it, despite the situation when I got there, we never ran a deficit, we never borrowed a dime, and we, as I suggested, debuted it in a way that won bipartisan applause, and has put it above politics.

And then, finally, at the State Board of Education, when I came in, the proposal to require graduates to pass competency exams in

basic subjects was dead. It had been dead on arrival for more than about 6 months in a State where 40 percent of our graduates weren't reading or doing math at grade level. And we had a total of many billions of dollars in the system, producing graduates who had diplomas that weren't worth all that much. And I sorted through the issues, found the common ground, persuaded opponents to become supporters, and pushed something across the finish line.

All these are complicated public institutions with multiple constituencies and high stakes and in circumstances where people didn't expect results.

Now, I want to note that if confirmed, I'd have the profound honor of being "our ambassador," standing up for "our interests and our values," not full authority over the whole system, but I think that those talents of building coalitions, finding common ground on reform, standing up, making progress when you can, with partners when you can, standing up when you can't, and calling attention to things. I think all those things are relevant and will be useful, and I look forward, if confirmed, to deploying them.

Senator CASEY. Before turning to Senator DeMint, who was very patient when I was running late, earlier today, so I will stay within my question timeframe, but—and you may have to do this more than just in the 2 minutes or so, please preview, based upon your knowledge of the United Nations, and the management and other reforms you'd have to bring to bear on the—at the United Nations—just maybe a list or a summary would be helpful, I think.

Mr. TORSELLA. Well, I do—thank you for the opportunity to talk about this—I do want to reserve my final say on this until I have the benefit of talented people in the mission and the State Department and, I hope, like-minded reform colleagues from different member states at the U.N. But, as I see it today, I think there are three broad priorities for the next Representative for Management and Reform.

No. 1 is institutionalizing and strengthening the oversight function at the U.N. Senator DeMint alluded to a report of a few years ago about procurement. That report is what a healthy oversight function can do. The United States led the effort to establish the Office of Internal Oversight Services at the U.N. There is a terrific new head of that office, who is at the beginning of her 5-year term but it is not fully staffed, not fully staffed at some high levels. And it has not been given the financial and operational independence it needs to be the watchdog, which is, I know, a term from your past, Senator, that you are familiar with—that keeps things on the straight and narrow.

No. 2 is, broadly, budget discipline. As we heard, the U.N. budget has grown substantially, and we are the largest contributor to the U.N. budget. And it is eminently in our interest that there be appropriate belt-tightening and management for effectiveness. It is also, though, I want to say, in the interest of other members states in the U.N., and the U.N., as an institution, because its credibility is directly related to the perceptions people have. So, broadly, the budget discipline and budget processes, and dealing with those resources.

And then, third, those reforms that I believe can have a systematic impact, not just the impact of 1 month or a headline, but whether that's extending the ethics framework—the disclosure requirements on financial interests, or whether it's software systems that'll reap tens and hundreds of millions in benefits, things that make real, longstanding change.

Senator CASEY. Thank you very much.

Senator DeMint.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you, Chairman Casey.

I'd like to focus for a minute on the peacekeeping operations and the U.S. contributions to those. Even though the United Nations supposedly has a zero-tolerance policy when it come to abuses against women and children, peacekeeping missions have been plagued with allegations of misconduct by U.N. peacekeepers. I mean, this is deeply disturbing. And I know that this has been none of your doing, at this point, but I think the record is important. And I'd like to start by reading you a few figures about these allegations, and how much money American taxpayers have spent on those very missions.

In 2010, 83 allegations of misconduct against U.N. peacekeepers and civilian personnel were reported. The U.S. contribution to U.N. peacekeeping activities was roughly \$2.13 billion that year.

In 2009, there were 40 reported allegations of sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The U.S.-assessed contribution for that year in the DRC was roughly \$210 million.

In 2007, U.N. peacekeepers were accused of serious allegations of widespread sexual exploitation and abuse in the Ivory Coast. U.S. contributions to that mission in 2007 were roughly \$138 million.

A 2007 source reported that 20 allegations of U.N. peacekeeping sexual misconduct with children in Southern Sudan. U.S. taxpayer-funded contributions for that mission in 2007 was roughly \$215 million.

Just a couple of more of these. But, in November, 2007, peacekeepers were removed from Haiti following allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse of children. U.S. contributions to this peacekeeping mission were around \$96 million.

In 2005, U.N. peacekeepers were reported to have traded in gold and sold weapons to militia groups. U.S. taxpayers, in 2005, gave over \$293 million to the peacekeeping mission in the DRC.

That brings me to my question. Are you willing to cut funding for these missions where women and children have been abused? If not, why should American taxpayers continue to pay for missions where women and children have been hurt?

And we realize that, again, the special interests that are involved here are going to be very determined to keep the funding without the oversight that you talk about. And the culture of the U.N. is going to be very difficult to change. But, as you look at these figures, as you hear them—and I'm sure you're aware of a lot of them—how do you intend to address it? And what are you going to do, as far as funding versus mission, if we know there's a problem of this kind?

Mr. TORSELLA. Well, thank you, Senator. I want to wholeheartedly agree that any incidence of sexual exploitation, by any peacekeeper, is something that ought to trouble us greatly and is unacceptable. Even against the context of 120,000 deployed in 14 different missions, the numbers of incidents is deeply troubling, offensive, and unacceptable.

Peacekeeping is something that cuts across many of the portfolios of the senior team at the mission, from the Permanent Representative to others. And I would look forward to working with my colleagues to continue to make strides on this problem. There have been some recent reforms put in place. There are now conduct and discipline teams deployed who weren't before. But, there is clearly much to do to support the zero-tolerance policy that the U.S. Government has gotten behind, that there should be no more such reports as we go forward. And we need to work with the whole U.N. system, and other member states, to make sure that that is the case.

Senator DEMINT. Can you help explain—and again, I know you're looking at this, relatively new—but, what could be the explanation, after, you know, more than 5 years of these reports—and some of them have been publicized in the international media—why so little has been done at the U.N. to address this? You would think they understand the importance of the credibility and the international community, but there has been resistance even to deal with this.

Mr. TORSELLA. Well, as you suggest, Senator, it's difficult for me to talk about what precedes what I hope will be my tenure.

Senator DEMINT. Right.

Mr. TORSELLA. But, I think one of the broader contexts that you alluded to is that this has been an area of tremendous growth in a very short period of time, that the size and scope and complexity of peacekeeping operations, over approximately the last decade, has almost, I think, essentially quadrupled, and not just in size, but what used to be very conventional kinds of truly peacekeeping missions have become much more complicated in some much more difficult circumstances. So, that obviously makes everything that has to do with peacekeeping more challenging. And I think that the architecture of managing this has lagged behind what we've expected them to do.

Now, I think what we need to do is make sure that that's no longer the case, not just to be a moral voice, but to understand this comes down to who are the leaders of each mission, which is something we need to devote attention to, and how are they pursuing these matters.

Senator DEMINT. Just a quick question before I run out of time. Will you be willing to hold the budget hostage, in effect—our payments, our contributions to various aspects of the United Nations—in order to get the attention of these people here? Are you willing to come back to us and suggest we withhold funding until we get certain reforms? Because I think that's the only leverage we are ultimately going to have.

Mr. TORSELLA. Well, Senator, I am willing to get the attention and make the progress. And I'm willing to—and hope to work with you to do that. The U.S. Government position on withholding has



been that our best chance of getting reforms comes from advocating from the position of strength that, thanks to all of you, we now have. No one can say the United States has not done its share and is not paying its assessed dues.

I understand that there are valid concerns. There are good people with different points of view around this issue. And what I want to take away from that debate is a universal commitment to changing the results that we see, and leveraging the resources we have to get those results.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you, Mr. Torsella.

Senator CASEY. Senator Lee.

Senator LEE. Thank you for joining us today, Mr. Torsella.

I had some questions about the U.N. Human Rights Council. Since 2006, the Human Rights Council has adopted a total of, I believe, 67 country-specific resolutions. Of those 67, 32, almost half of them, focused specifically on Israel. And the U.S. membership on the U.N. Human Rights Council hasn't exactly reversed this trend. In 2010 alone, I think there were a total—there have been a total of eight resolutions adopted condemning Israel in some way, or Israel's actions.

Can you tell me whether you perceive an anti-Israel bias in this? And, if so, what can be done about that?

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you, Senator.

As I believe it's been described by senior officials in this administration, the Human Rights Council has been a poster child for some of what's wrong with the U.N. And there has been, as Ambassador Rice has said, a grotesquely unbalanced treatment of Israel in the resolutions, for example, that you've talked about.

The administration's decision to join the Human Rights Council is based, again, on the premise that, as I've heard it said, "If we're not at the table, we're probably on the menu," and that we can do best by such allies by showing up for the fight. It doesn't mean we're going to win all of them, but we'll win more than we would if we didn't show up.

Now, I would hope to be a part of the efforts that the Ambassador described, to remedy that disproportionate treatment, and to stand up against it. And I do think the Human Rights Council is an institution that is in need of reform. And I'd hope, working with others in the administration and in the mission, to advance that cause.

Senator LEE. Yes. No; I think that's good. I'm pleased to hear that.

Do you know what, if anything, the Human Rights Council has done to address serious human rights problems in China, Iran, and Venezuela, just to name a few examples?

Mr. TORSELLA. Well, the Human Rights Council is widely considered by the administration to be far from what we and others hoped it would be when it replaced its predecessor body. There is a good argument to be made that the engagement of the administration has resulted in progress—three examples that I could talk about, quickly. One is the extension of the mandate for the special expert on Sudan, which was opposed by others and we succeeded at. No. 2, the appointment of a special rapporteur for freedom of assembly, which was again resisted by some of the notorious viola-

tors. And No. 3, our very visible efforts to keep Iran from winning a seat on the Human Rights Council to avoid making a further mockery of its intent.

Now, those are three examples where it worked. There are other examples, as you point out, where the results aren't acceptable. But, I think what it comes down to is the elbow grease and determination to keep showing up, keep having the fights, and use the platform for the purpose for which it was intended.

Senator LEE. OK. Thank you.

Now, funding for some U.N. programs, including the U.N. Office on the High Commissioner—Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the U.N. Environmental Fund—are funded on a voluntary basis. Are there other programs that you think could be funded on a voluntary basis that are not, currently?

Mr. TORSELLA. I would not want to express a judgment today about particular programs. And I'd also note that it is the strong view of the administration that assessed programs are a treaty obligation, but also, the administration believes voluntary programs are a platform from which we can argue effectively for looking broadly.

What I'd say from following some of the discussions that have been going on over the last few months, and what I hear when people talk about the voluntary programs, is that they maintain a higher standard of transparency, a higher standard of accountability, and a very natural sense of wanting to be responsive to donors, and deliver results. I think those themes and things like sharing audit information are something that ought to apply across the board, period, in the U.N. system.

Senator LEE. Right. Accountability is an important thing in any government or any quasi-government body or international group. And yet, within the United Nations, you don't have quite the same forces that apply here. It comes with some of the trappings of a legislative body. It appears, on some levels, to be something like that. And yet, the people serve on that body, not as elected representatives of any group of people, but as representatives of various countries. And some of the countries' officials are not, themselves, elected; some of them are despots and tyrants and so forth. So, accountability becomes a difficult thing. It's not like they can vote and then expect to be accountable to any one group of people. Is there anything we can do to offset the lack of accountability that happens as a result of that?

Mr. TORSELLA. Well, the short answer is, I hope so. And the longer answer is that I don't want to give you the impression that my arrival is going to be greeted with ticker-tape parades and champagne.

Senator LEE. It should be. It should be. [Laughter.]

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you, Senator.

But, I believe—as I outlined, at the beginning of my testimony, a case that an effective U.N. is in our interest. But, I believe that it's also in the enlightened self-interest of the U.N., as an institution, and in the interest of many Member States, obviously not all, and never all. I will do my best to make that argument and to figure out the practical politics of moving these issues forward.

There was recently, by the way, at great effort and cost to the U.S. political capital, the adoption by the General Assembly, for the first time ever, of a definition of accountability for all U.N. employees. That was a herculean struggle, and that's a start.

Senator LEE. Great.

Thank you very much, sir.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator Lee.

Senator Rubio.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you.

Good morning, Mr. Torsella.

A couple of questions. I want to build on what Senator Lee asked about the human rights entity. It has such distinguished members, now, as Libya and Angola. Libya, in fact, was approved by 145 of the U.N. Member States, which is appalling since Libya, today, is what they were back then, too. So, my question is, when the United States—when this administration made the decision to join the commission—you stated earlier—and I get the point you're trying to make—that you're not on the table, you're on the menu. The counterargument to that, however, is that joining it gives this organization, or this entity, legitimacy, that, in essence, it makes it look like a real organization, when, in fact, it appears to be largely a collection of human rights abusers, for the most part.

So, obviously, you don't agree with that assessment. I would hope you can expand further on why it's important that we are a member of that. And the previous administration chose not to join it; they felt that our participation in it gave this organization legitimacy.

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you, Senator. And again, I want to be careful not to speak to decisions that I wasn't a part of, or to suggest that decisions will be only in my portfolio. But, the administration's view of vigorous engagement is the guiding principle, and has been the guiding principle, across the board, that with that engagement comes the opportunity to be a critic, when that's appropriate, and that that's easier to do, and easier to do effectively, when we're around the table.

Now, I know that there are strong critics of the Human Rights Council. And I believe people of goodwill can disagree on this. There are strong critics of the Human Rights Council, though, who are glad that we're there to stand up, as we do. And there have been a number of votes that have been won—or, in the past, lost—by a margin of one, where there would have been some difference, if we weren't involved.

I don't want to, even for a minute, suggest that it's an institution that is living up to what the hopes of the U.N. founders might have been. I don't want to suggest, for a minute, that the disproportionate and biased treatment of Israel ought to be acceptable. But, there has been progress made. And when you talk about, for example, the case of Libya being elected—a lot of what happened in the past was that—because of the way that the election system worked, there were uncontested regional elections. And since engaging, the U.S. Government has been active in the politicking. And I think you saw, in the expulsion of Libya from the Human Rights Council, a historic first, may be one of the fruits of that policy.

So, I would argue that we ought to continue to use our voices and our votes. And as I say, we will not win all those fights, but we will win more than if we weren't there.

Senator RUBIO. Well, that premises the notion that we would see behavior after we joined that looks different from behavior before we joined it. And yet, it's hard to find any examples of things that we prevented from happening.

For example, the Council still has not addressed human rights violations in China, in Cuba, in Iran, and other places. In essence, I'm struggling to find examples of how joining it has actually influenced, or whether the Council continues to behave exactly the same way it did before we joined it. The only difference being, of course, that now the U.S. is a part of it. So, instead of pointing it out for what it is—you know, a charade—people can now say, "But, you're a member, you're at the table, and ultimately, you've blessed and legitimized this process."

Mr. TORSELLA. Senator, I'd like to take the particulars of the cases you raised for the record and get you some further information.

[The written information from Joseph Torsella follows:]

Generally, I do believe that there are differences. Where on the spectrum they are between what the unacceptable reality is and where the ideal ought to be, I think we can both agree, they're at the real low end. But, in the case of action on Sudan, in the case of keeping Iran off, in the case of the number of special sessions devoted to Israel in the time that we were off versus the time that we were on, I do believe that it's progress. And so, we're both going to agree that, on the scale of where it ought to be, it is not moved nearly far enough along.

While there is still much work to be done to reform the Human Rights Council into an institution that lives up to U.N. values and U.S. aspirations, in recent months, the Council has achieved several victories for human rights that could not have been accomplished without U.S. leadership and support:

- In March 2011, the Council took assertive action to highlight Iran's deteriorating human rights situation by establishing its first country-specific Rapporteur—a Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights Situation in Iran.
- In February 2011, the United States played a pivotal role in convening the Council's Special Session in which the Council condemned the recent human rights violations and other acts of violence committed by the Government of Libya, created an independent Commission of Inquiry to investigate those violations, and recommended to the U.N. General Assembly that it suspend Libya's membership rights on the Council. Days later, in an unprecedented consensus decision, the General Assembly suspended Libya.
- The United States was instrumental in galvanizing support for a consensus resolution that marks a sea change in the dialogue on countering offensive speech based upon religion or belief through the "Combating Discrimination and Violence" resolution, rejecting limitations on free speech and embracing dialogue and education. This effort was lauded by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom.
- After the violence following elections in Côte d'Ivoire last December, we worked closely with the African Group to hold a special session on the human rights crisis that was taking place. This led directly to the establishment of a Commission of Inquiry for Côte d'Ivoire in the March session.
- In September 2010, the U.S. Government cosponsored a resolution to create the first-ever Special Rapporteur to protect Freedom of Assembly and Association, to monitor crackdowns on civil society groups and advance protection of the right to free assembly and association through its vigilant exposure of state conduct.
- Just last week, U.S. efforts led to a Human Rights Council Special Session on the human rights situation in Syria resulting in a resolution condemning the ongoing violence and calling for a mission to investigate violations and ensure full accountability.
- The United States has maintained a vocal, principled stand against the Council's biased focus on Israel. We've been there to contest moves to single Israel

out unfairly. The United States is by far Israel's strongest supporter on the Council. The Government of Israel has regularly expressed appreciation for the role the United States plays in the Council. The March session included six resolutions targeting Israel. The United States opposed all six resolutions and issued strong explanations of votes pointing out how biased and unhelpful these resolutions are. We cast the only "no" vote on five of these resolutions. If the United States were not on the Council, we would not have the opportunity to make these statements from the floor and these resolutions would have passed by consensus.

Mr. TORSELLA. Generally, I do believe that there are differences. Where on the spectrum they are between what the unacceptable reality is and where the ideal ought to be, I think we can both agree, they're at the real low end. But, in the case of action on Sudan, in the case of keeping Iran off, in the case of the number of special sessions devoted to Israel in the time that we were off versus the time that we were on, I do believe that it's progress. And so, we're both going to agree that, on the scale of where it ought to be, it is not moved nearly far enough along.

Senator RUBIO. And again, I know you didn't make this decision, but, I do want to drive the point home, because it's an important thing, going forward. Sudan is really low-hanging fruit. I mean—OK, Sudan. But, where we really—where an entity like this would really grow and be a legitimate entity that you could look at and say, "Boy, I'm glad we have this," is for them to say something about—like torture and other outrageous things that are happening in places like China; the constant daily roundup of dissidents in Cuba and multiple other places like that, where they don't get to. On the other hand, they dedicate this inordinate amount of time to Israel. And so, it's hard for me to see where us joining this Council has changed what it is, other than the fact that us joining it may have given it legitimacy it once did not have.

But, I want to—my time is running out—I did want to ask your view—and, in particular, the administration's view—on the propriety and effectiveness of using funding as leverage to achieve reforms. I think there is, in my opinion, a well-documented history of U.N. reforms that have been the result of a congressional determination to withhold funding for the organization or certain functions of the organization. What are your views on it? What are the administration's views? Is this a legitimate tool in our arsenal that we will use to hopefully push for some of these reforms, or not?

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you, Senator. And I guess I would answer that I think that using the resources that we bring to bear to this as a tool is legitimate. The disagreement may be about whether using that means using the authority they give you, or withholding them at the beginning. And I think that's where the administration would differ.

In terms of the assessed contributions that we make to the U.N., the administration clearly believes, and I agree, that we have a better ability to effect change by having paid our dues, as we have done, and that, within that U.N. budget, there are going to be things that we and any reasonable person ought to think are inappropriate. But, there are also things that are vitally important to our national interest—like the enormous programs that the U.N. is responsible for, in both Afghanistan and Iraq, where there are close

to 4,000 civilians in the civilian surge, letting us bring our troops home—that is in the regular budget, for example.

So, I don't disagree that we ought to use the position of being the largest funder, use the talents of the U.S. Government, and use that authority to speak for reform.

Senator RUBIO. I'm sorry. Now I'm over time. I want to ask one quick question. This administration has brought us current. What reforms have we gotten? What meaningful reforms have happened as a result of that?

Mr. TORSSELLA. Senator, I would hope to be able to give you the best answer to that after I've been on the job for a year or two, if I have the honor to be confirmed. There has been real progress in establishing the Office of Internal Oversight Services. There is a terrific and talented and independent and tough auditor, the Canadian, Carman LaPointe, who's the head of that. There is the new establishment of a U.N. ethics office, although its writ has not been extended far enough. And there has been, within the last week, the news report of the Secretary General instructing a 3-percent cut in the budget, from current levels, which is—that we may argue, and I probably will, about whether that's sufficient. But, that is the first time in 10 years that's happened.

Now, against the larger story of some of the troubles that were revealed over the course of the last few years, are we where we need to be? No. But, I believe that we ought to use the investments that we've made to demand that those changes be made and to put together, carefully, the coalitions that it takes to get them.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator Rubio.

I'll make three quick points before turning to—Senator DeMint, I know, has at least one question, if not more.

First of all, on the question of Libya, what has transpired recently. We know that—as you noted in your testimony, that Libya's been suspended from the Human Rights Council. It was a unanimous vote, I guess, on March 1, if I'm correct. So, I think—I just wanted to amplify the record on that.

Second, with regard to the important questions that Senator DeMint raised, I don't think there's much, if any, disagreement in this room that not only will the administration demand results from the U.N. and from the administration itself, but this committee will demand results. And I think the United Nations needs to know that, and the administration needs to know that, when it comes to those horrific crimes that were committed that Senator DeMint spoke to.

And finally—and I would say, in the interests of further endorsing the nominee who is before us, Mr. Torsella, in his record—if you read his record, and read the results that come from that record, when it comes to all of these issues, in terms of getting results and ensuring that justice is served, especially for people that are vulnerable, I think he'll be unyielding, and will insist upon results.

And one final point. Some of these issues are a little beyond his purview. I just want to note, for the record, the basic responsibilities of the U.S. Representative for the United Nations for Management Reform. It's, basically, five. One is on the issue of U.N. re-

form; second, budget management; third, fraud and mismanagement; fourth, procurement practices; and then, fifth, interaction with business. And I think that's a pretty broad portfolio, but I know that, even if a question arose that came across his radar screen that he had any voice that would speak—that he had a chance to speak to with his voice, I think it'll be unyielding, and not just getting results, but also protecting the vulnerable people.

Senator DeMint.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We'll keep honing in, here, on really, cleaning up the act of the U.N., because of its importance. I don't think anyone here is trying to undermine the importance. But, it has been frustrating, over the years, to see things that just were unaddressed that seemed so obvious.

Right now, the acting director of the U.N.'s Investigation Division, Michael Dudley, is under investigation. The U.N.'s Internal Oversight Office is suffering from a lack of credibility. Secretary General ignores its recommendations. And the former head of the office wrote a scathing end-of-mission report, which described the Secretary General as unaccountable and unworthy of the position.

If confirmed, will you use the voice and vote of the United States to ensure that a reputable, independent, and qualified chief investigator is appointed?

Mr. TORSELLA. Yes. Senator, I think that goes to the core of giving every interested party an assurance that things really are different and there will be a new day. I think, as you know from your experience in government, the existence of oversight institutions which cannot be tampered with and that don't have their budgets and their authority changed is absolutely crucial. I think that is among the first items on my list. And having someone in that position, as well as having the staff slots on the Financial Crimes Unit of that office, which we were instrumental in demanding be formed—having those positions filled is virtually my highest priority.

Senator DEMINT. Well, thank you for your answers. Thank you and your family for being here. And I know we all look forward to your confirmation.

Mr. TORSELLA. Thank you, Senator.

Senator CASEY. Thank you, Senator DeMint, our ranking member.

And, Mr. Torsella, thank you very much. And I'm using the "Mr." to be formal here, but I—once in a while, I can call you Joe.

But, you've done well in this hearing and in your previous engagement with this committee. We're grateful for your time and your commitment to public service. I think you've done well on behalf of your family and your friends and supporters in southeastern Pennsylvania. But, I want to note, for the record, that you're a proud son of Danville, Pennsylvania.

So, we thank you very much.

This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:45 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

## ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF JOSEPH TORSSELLA TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY  
SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR

*Question.* Various administration officials have stated that the administration is fighting hard to increase transparency, accountability, and budgetary restraint at the United Nations. However, few specific details have been offered about what reforms have been adopted and implemented to address these goals over the past 2 years.

- Please provide a detailed account of the U.N. reforms achieved at the behest of the United States over the past 2 years, the degree to which those reforms have been implemented and are being observed, and specific examples of how those efforts are serving to improve transparency and accountability in the U.N. and resulting in reductions in the U.N. regular and peacekeeping budgets.

*Answer.* The administration has pushed aggressively for sound management and budgeting, accountability, and transparency at the U.N. For example, the United States has been a force in achieving the following recent reforms.

1. In December 2008, the United States, along with other likeminded Member States, succeeded in securing a General Assembly resolution to transfer the function and caseload of the Procurement Task Force (PTF) to the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS).

2. As a result of strong U.S. leadership, the General Assembly in June 2009 endorsed a 3-year pilot for investigations hubs of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) in Nairobi, Vienna, and New York designed to enhance investigative capacity in the field.

3. In July 2009, with strong U.S. support, a new comprehensive internal justice system for addressing staff grievances came into effect that consists of professional and independent tribunals to expedite the resolution of cases and an informal dispute resolution process to enable staff to seek redress before resorting to litigation. The new internal justice system enhances transparency, fairness, efficiency, and accountability in the management of U.N. personnel.

4. In the past 2 years, the United States has led efforts to streamline the U.N.'s myriad staff contract arrangements and harmonizing conditions of service across the U.N. system. In December 2010, the General Assembly established parameters for granting continuing contracts and made significant strides in harmonizing the conditions of service for staff across the U.N. system serving in nonfamily duty stations.

5. The United States played a leading role in the establishment of U.N. Women, which on January 1, 2011, consolidated four U.N. agencies into one, strengthening and streamlining the U.N.'s work to advance gender equality and women's empowerment.

6. The United States led efforts in the Security Council to adopt Resolution 1820, which gives the U.N. better tools to combat sexual violence in conflict zones and established the first-ever U.N. Special Representative for Sexual Violence in Conflict in order to bring more focus on these serious issues.

7. The United States succeeded in securing General Assembly adoption of the U.N. Global Field Support Strategy, which will yield greater efficiencies in administrative and logistics support for U.N. field operations.

8. The United States was instrumental in achieving the passage of a General Assembly resolution in March 2010 on accountability that will hold U.N. officials responsible for safeguarding resources and achieving results.

9. The United Nations has not established a single new peacekeeping mission in the past 2 years. In 2010, the U.N. peacekeeping budget decreased for the first time in 6 years. The United States supported the closure of MINURCAT (U.N. peacekeeping mission in Chad and the Central African Republic), saving up to \$600 million per year. The United States also led efforts to end the U.N. Special Political Mission in Nepal once its contributions reached the point of diminishing returns.

I would also like to mention two areas where the United States was successful in ensuring that hard-fought reforms remain in place. First, in 2009 during negotiations over the scale of assessment for the U.N. regular budget, the United States succeeded in beating back attempts to increase the U.S. share of the U.N. budget and thereby averted hundreds of millions in possible new assessments. Second, the United States in March 2010 was critical in securing a General Assembly resolution that preserves the existing mandates governing OIOS as well as those that allow access to OIOS reports by Member States. Maintaining access to OIOS audit reports is crucial to fulfilling our fiduciary responsibilities and building a culture of trans-



parency and accountability at the U.N. The United States continues to ensure that OIOS has the resources it needs and serves as the primary investigative oversight role in the U.N.

The administration's commitment to U.N. reform is clear, as is the need for much more to be done throughout the U.N. system. If confirmed, my mission would be to build on the progress made to accelerate the implementation of reforms that would make it more efficient, transparent, and productive.

*Question.* The U.N. Headquarters is undergoing a major renovation.

- What is the current projected budget of the Capital Master Plan?
- Is the CMP schedule on time?
- What is the next major benchmark?
- What is the cost to the United States for the CMP?
- Will the administration require any additional funding?

*Answer.* In 2006, the U.N. General Assembly approved a project budget of \$1.88 billion in 2006 for the U.N. Headquarters renovation. The United States is paying 22 percent: \$75.5 million annually over 5 years, plus contributions made during the design phase for a total of approximately \$415 million.

Construction began in May 2008 and is expected to be complete in 2014, with the project being bid in multiple parts. Additional time is being built into the project schedule in order to complete perimeter security enhancements.

During 2011, construction work will continue on the Secretariat and Conference buildings and the basement areas of the complex. The Secretariat building is scheduled for completion in 2012. Work on the General Assembly building will commence in 2012 as well.

The U.N. has been steadily reducing the projected cost overruns on the project and remains confident this project will be completed on or very close to budget. The U.N. continues to work with its design team to find ways to reduce costs through the value engineering process and has been able to bring some parts of the project in under budget through competitive bidding and tough negotiations. This does not take into account additional costs of approximately \$162.5 million for items related to but not included in the scope of the Capital Master Plan such as permanent furnishings and construction security. The General Assembly is expected to consider in the fall how these costs will be financed (i.e. through the CMP budget or in the regular budget) given that the U.N. has indicated not all of these costs will be able to be absorbed within the Capital Master Plan budget.

*Question.* Earlier this year, the House voted on legislation to seek the reimbursement of \$179 million owed to the United States from the U.N. Tax Equalization Fund. On the morning of the vote, the State Department notified Congress that it had given the U.N. \$100 million of that money to the U.N. for unspecified security upgrades.

- Who authorized this decision and when was the decision made?
- Under what legal authority did the State Department make that decision?
- Have you received a detailed plan for those upgrades and a comprehensive explanation of how the U.N. arrived at the \$100 million cost for the upgrades?
- Why weren't these upgrades included as part of the U.N. Capital Master Plan, which would have reduced the U.N. share of the costs from \$100 million to \$22 million?
- Does Congress have your guarantee that none of the \$100 million will be used to pay for upgrades inside the U.N. building or on the grounds or for any other purpose that should be handled jointly by the U.N. Member States under the Capital Master Plan?
- Is it true that the city of New York requested these changes—please provide a copy of any such request.

*Answer.* Under Secretary Kennedy informed the relevant committees, including the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in a December 29, 2010, letter that the United Nations is taking action to address significant physical security concerns related to the protection of the U.N. Headquarters complex in New York and will use \$100 million from the U.N. Tax Equalization Fund (TEF) to fund these critical enhancements. It is the view of the Department of State that the United Nations' application of those fund balances, since the original U.S. contributions had been previously obligated and disbursed, does not require further authorization under U.S. law.

I would make it a high priority, if confirmed, to see that the formulas and procedures related to the TEF are changed so that such fund balances do not accrue in the future.

In a January 11, 2011, letter to the U.N., Under Secretary Kennedy acknowledged the United Nations' use of these funds, and, to ensure appropriate oversight of the project, asked that the United Nations provide detailed monthly updates on its status.

In response to this request, the U.N. has agreed to provide the Department with monthly reporting on the project's progress and the associated use of funds. This report provides a mechanism for the United States to monitor how the funds are being expended and to ensure that it is consistent with the agreed elements of the project. I have been informed that providing structural upgrades within the U.N. complex is the best practical measure for mitigating the security threat from adjacent New York City streets, given the inability to close or realign those streets. As a result, some of the work to implement the perimeter security enhancements will be completed within the U.N. complex.

The U.N. had shared plans and cost documents with the Department on the security work it plans to undertake as a result of extensive consultations with the Department and the city of New York. The city of New York has urged the U.N. to incorporate more stringent security measures into the ongoing renovations [see attachment].

These heightened security requirements evolved during the execution of the CMP. In recent years the U.N. has faced increasing attacks around the world, such that the threat environment for the institution had significantly increased. The proposed upgrades adapt the project design to the new threat environment since the CMP scope originally agreed in 2006 was based on a lower anticipated threat level. I understand that in order to fully integrate the perimeter security enhancements into the CMP, General Assembly agreement would have been needed, which would have further delayed vital upgrades to the Conference Building, and would have likely resulted in cost escalation for the overall CMP.



THE POLICE COMMISSIONER  
CITY OF NEW YORK

April 27, 2010

Under Secretary Patrick F. Kennedy  
Under Secretary of State for Management  
United States Department of State  
2201 C Street NW  
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Kennedy,

I am profoundly disturbed by the lack of progress toward providing an adequate level of structural protection to the United Nations Headquarters Campus. After several years of work, the United Nations and the State Department lack a plan and even a clear commitment to remediating the problem.

As you know, over the past two decades, New York City has been the target of multiple significant terrorist plots, including the attacks against the World Trade Center in 1993 and 2001. The recent guilty pleas from Najibullah Zazi and one of his co-conspirators who targeted the New York City subway system show that this threat has not abated. Moreover, United Nations facilities around the world have been targeted by terrorists, most notably the 1993 "Landmark" plot against the United Nations Headquarters, the 2003 attack on the United Nations compound in Baghdad, and the 2007 attack on a United Nations facility in Algiers. Given the unique role the United Nations plays in world affairs, it is unlikely that this threat will diminish.

Yet the renovation of the Campus proceeds, guided by a set of modest security standards that are wholly inappropriate for a facility as significant as the United Nations Headquarters. These standards are far below those expected of even ordinary U.S. diplomatic installations abroad, much less the iconic seat of global governance. To make matters worse, the United Nations Headquarters will fail to meet even these inadequate standards after the completion of the current Capital Master Plan (CMP) – unless, of course, the City consents to additional encroachments on public roadways. This is an unreasonable expectation and an unfair burden, particularly given that the State Department failed to consult with the City when it specified the post-CMP security standards for the United Nations.

In his letter to Secretary Clinton of April 19, 2010, Mayor Bloomberg promised a detailed list of recommendations regarding the security of the United Nations Headquarters. These recommendations are listed below, organized into three categories: near-term steps, long-term studies, and revised security standards.

*Near-Term Steps*

1. Reprogramming of conference room space. The City recommends that the United Nations hold no more meetings in the Security Council chamber, the Trusteeship Council chamber, or the ECOSOC chamber until the structural security standards recommended below are met. Similarly, the City recommends that the lower-level rooms on the eastern perimeter of the Conference Building be used for storage rather than meeting space.
2. First Avenue perimeter plan. The City recommends that the United Nations develop a perimeter protection plan for First Avenue that is acceptable to the City and that addresses the needs of the United Nations. This could include, for example, installation of bollards along First Avenue, with partial wraparound on 48<sup>th</sup> Street and 42<sup>nd</sup> Street. All vehicle interdiction devices should be K-12 rated and no taller than 36 inches.
3. Off-site delivery, so that only trusted vehicles are permitted access to the campus. The City recommends that the United Nations adopt off-site screening of vehicles, possibly in Long Island City, implementing a trusted-vehicle program that would prevent unscreened and/or unsealed vehicles from approaching the Campus.
4. Surveillance partnering. The City recommends that the United Nations integrate existing camera feeds from the United Nations complex into the NYPD Domain Awareness System.

*Long-Term Studies*

5. FDR Drive study. The City recommends that the United Nations jointly commission with the City an integrated traffic flow, traffic safety, engineering, and blast analysis study of the FDR Drive and the eastern exposure of the UN campus. The purpose of this study would be to specify the full range of feasible mitigations and associated costs and traffic impacts. This study should be designed to weigh the traffic impacts of potential lane closures against the protection benefits gained by such closures assuming maximum structural hardening.
6. 42<sup>nd</sup> Street off-ramp study. The City recommends that the United Nations jointly commission with the City an integrated traffic flow, traffic safety, engineering, and blast analysis study of United Nation's southern exposure along the 42<sup>nd</sup> Street FDR off-ramp. The purpose of this study would be to specify the full range of feasible mitigations and associated costs and traffic impacts.

*Revised Security Standards*

7. Design basis threat. The Department of State should revise the security standard it set in 2004-5 for the United Nations Headquarters, bringing it in line with the standards

that apply to other high-risk buildings in New York City. Specifically, the design basis threat for structural collapse of the United Nations Headquarters should be 10 times the Headquarters' current design basis threat, which is referred to as the W1 charge weight. I recognize that it may not be physically possible to harden some elements of the Campus to the 10 x W1 design basis threat, particularly the eastern exposure along the FDR Drive. In such cases, the United Nations should design retrofits to meet the maximum design basis threat achievable and jointly consider with the City options for creating additional standoff based on the results of the long-term studies recommended above.

Given the ongoing nature of our joint efforts to address these structural security deficiencies, it seems appropriate that you include a significant financial reserve for this purpose in the Department's 2011 budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget.

Protecting the United Nations is an enormous challenge and responsibility, which is possible only if we work closely together. I look forward to deepening our security collaboration in the future.

Sincerely,



Raymond W. Kelly  
Police Commissioner

C: Hon. Hillary Rodham Clinton, Secretary of State  
Hon. Susan E. Rice, Ambassador of the US to the UN  
Hon. Gregory B. Starr, Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security  
Hon. Marjorie B. Tiven, Commissioner, NYC Commission for the United Nations,  
Consular Corps and Protocol

3

*Question.* The Secretary General called for the next U.N. budget to be cut by 3 percent. As you know, the current proposed 2-year budget for 2012 and 2013 is \$5.5 billion.

- What areas would the administration like to see reduced or eliminated from the U.N. budget?
- On what basis are these cuts being justified since the U.N. has failed to follow through with its mandate review?
- Why do U.N. funds and programs that receive vast amounts of funding such as UNEP and UNWRA, which both receive less than 5 percent of their budgets from the U.N. regular budget still receive funding through the U.N. regular

budget? Shouldn't the United States look to trim the U.N. regular budget by ending the token support for these offices through the regular budget?

- In December 2009, the U.N. approved a 2-year budget of \$5.156 billion for 2010 and 2011. Thus, even assuming that the Secretary General is able to get a 3-percent cut from the proposed budget, the U.N. budget would be growing by 3 percent based on the previous budget. As you know, the U.N. budget has grown even faster than the U.S. budget since 2000. Is that expansion justified?
- Do you think that the Secretary General's proposed 3-percent budget cut is sufficient?
- Why doesn't the United States insist on a zero-growth budget proposal based on the initial proposal in 2009?

Answer. The United States has consistently sought to make reductions in those areas of the U.N. budget where resources are not being utilized as efficiently and effectively as possible. We believe the U.N. can meet its responsibilities without growing the budget by increasing efficiencies through streamlining processes, examining structural costs at all levels, eliminating unproductive administrative practices and obsolete functions, leveraging modern technology, and adopting proven best practices. We also believe that the U.N. should critically review its staffing levels and opportunities for competitive contracting of some services. These efforts to increase efficiencies and reduce the budget can be accomplished without eliminating mandates. However, it is important to recognize the difficulties inherent in trying to achieve U.S. priorities within the U.N.'s framework of universal membership and consensus-based decisionmaking. The U.S. Government strives to strike a balance between making what reductions are possible while also maintaining the support needed from others to achieve our highest diplomatic and security priorities.

For programs such as UNWRA and UNEP, my understanding is that the USG goal has generally been to prevent the provision of additional resources from the U.N. regular budget.

In 2010, the General Assembly invited the Secretary General to prepare the 2012–13 biennium budget on the basis of the \$5.397 billion estimate, reflecting an increase of less than 1 percent over the current 2010–11 biennial budget of \$5.367 billion. Although the U.N. regular budget has more than slightly doubled since the 2000–01 biennium, Special Political Missions (SPMs) have increased from \$115.3 million to \$1.2 billion during this same period, with much of the increase in SPMs attributable to the U.N. Assistance Missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. As we work to contain unnecessary growth in the U.N. budget, we must keep in mind the extent to which U.S. priorities have contributed to expansion of the regular budget.

While I do not believe that any single step, such as the Secretary General's proposed 3-percent reduction, is itself sufficient to achieve the effective, economical U.N. we hope for, I strongly support the Secretary General's initiative to try to implement a 3-percent reduction in the regular budget. This would be the first proposed reduction compared to the previous year of spending in 10 years. It is notable that the U.N. has recognized the need to demonstrate greater budget discipline in response to the difficult budgetary environment faced by many Member States. This initiative will create challenges for the U.N. given such exercises have typically been poorly received by many Member States. However, if the Secretary General is successful in putting this forward to the General Assembly, it offers a more favorable basis for discussions on the 2012–13 budget during the fall UNGA, which we and many like-minded Member States will seek to capitalize on. We will work with other Member States to achieve a budget outcome that reflects restraint while allowing the U.N. to maintain operational effectiveness.

*Question.* Please provide a breakdown (by percent and dollar figure) showing the top five recipient countries of U.N. procurement orders for the following U.N. agencies/offices/programs, for the most recent U.N. fiscal year: U.N. Peacekeeping operations; World Food Programme; U.N. Capital Master Plan; UN/UNDP Headquarters in New York.

Answer. *U.N. Systemwide:* Across the entire U.N. system, which includes the U.N. Secretariat, funds and programs, and specialized agencies, procurement orders totaled \$13.8 billion in 2009<sup>26</sup>. The breakdown of the top five recipient countries of procurement contracts systemwide is as follows:

Countries		Percent
United States	\$1,734,000,000	12.57
Switzerland	843,800,000	6.11
India	676,700,000	4.90
Sudan	641,700,000	4.65
Russian Federation	463,200,000	3.36
Other	9,440,600,000	68.41

\*A thorough breakdown for 2010 is not yet available.

*U.N. Capital Master Plan (CMP):* Skanska trade contracts represent the majority of CMP procurement orders. The Skanska trade contracts for 2009\* total \$633,197,529. The breakdown of the top five recipient countries of CMP procurement contracts is as follows:

Countries		Percent
United States	\$605,363,903	**95.60
Mexico	8,055,998	1.27
Germany	2,243,446	0.35
Canada	1,113,347	0.18
China	1,048,412	0.17
Other	15,372,423	2.42

\*A thorough breakdown for 2010 is not yet available.

\*\*Of the total procurement contracts.

*U.N. Peacekeeping Operations:* The Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) procurement for 2010 totaled \$2,483,011,729. The breakdown of the top five recipient countries of DPKO procurement contracts is as follows:

Countries		Percent
Sudan	\$269,614,943	10.86
United States	187,838,135	7.56
Switzerland	139,590,239	5.62
Italy	132,391,948	5.33
Panama	75,360,992	3.03
Other	1,678,215,472	67.59

*World Food Programme (WFP):* In 2010, WFP globally procured 3,166,320 metric tons of food commodities, with a total cash value of US\$1,250,000,000. The breakdown of the top five recipient countries of WFP procurement contracts is as follows:

Countries		Percent
Pakistan	\$214,356,000	17.15
Ethiopia	88,416,000	7.07
South Africa	65,738,000	5.26
Ukraine	63,644,000	5.09
Indonesia	60,235,000	4.82
Other	757,611,000	60.61

*United Nations Development Programme (UNDP):* The UNDP awarded \$252,109,847 worth of contracts in 2010. The breakdown of the top five recipient countries of UNDP procurement contracts is as follows:

Countries		Percent
Germany	\$64,744,075	25.69
The Netherlands	36,759,115	14.58
Germany/Cyprus*	35,108,085	13.93
Austria	30,643,265	12.15
India	16,155,931	6.41
Other	68,699,376	27.25

\*The contract was jointly awarded to both countries, and a breakdown was not provided.

**Question.** As you may be aware, some have expressed concern with a February 2009 report by the U.N. Independent Audit Advisory Committee (IAAC), Vacant Posts in the Office of Internal Oversight Services, which found that OIOS had vacancies in over 27 percent of its authorized posts, including all three director-level positions. The report expressed concern that the high vacancy rate will have an “adverse impact on the capacity and ability” of OIOS to accomplish its work. Please provide a staffing pattern for OIOS showing all positions and indicating which are vacant and the length of their vacancy. Identify which positions are encumbered by American nationals.

**Answer.** I am providing the most recent staffing chart for OIOS, dated February 28, 2011.

**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

L/gna

Internal Audit Division

Location	Fund	Level	Post No.	Nationality	Gender	Incumbency as of 28 Feb	Length of Vacancies	Remarks
New York	UNA	D-2	5612	Senegal	F			
New York	UNA	D-1	33148	India	M			
New York	GSA	D-1	45423	United Kingdom	F			
New York	UNA	D-1	67011				vacant since 30 April 2010	IAO had prepared all incumbent lists by instance of U.N. Country before 30 April 2010 (New York). However, due to technical problems that could not be resolved by OHRM VA could not be issued in G-assy JO posted on 15 Feb 2011
New York	UNA	D-1						
Nairobi	UNA	D-1	604907	Philippines	F			
Geneva	HAM	D-1	509569	United Kingdom	M			
UNDOA	GSA	P-5	78631	Malaysia	M			
Sudan	GSA	P-5	68944	India	M			
Port-au-Prince	GSA	P-5	51508	South Africa	M			
New York	GSA	P-5	998	Republic of Korea	M			
New York	UNA	P-5	5641	Philippines	M			
New York	UNA	P-5	5642	United Kingdom	F			
New York	GSA	P-5	21699	Russian Federation	M			
New York	CMP	P-5	46356	United Kingdom	M			
New York	PFN	P-5	50381	United States of America	M			
New York	GDA	P-5	52872	Bhutan	M			
New York	GSA	P-5	58181	Liberia	M			
New York	UNA	P-5	67012	Italy	M			
Nairobi	UNA	P-5	603724	Cote d'Ivoire	M			
Nairobi	HCM	P-5	605886	Kuwait	M			
Monrovia	GSA	P-5	52481	Jamaica	F			
Lebanon	GSA	P-5	52465	Malaysia	F			
Kolono	GSA	P-5	39653	Zambia	F			



**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

Kinshasa	QSA	P-5	39455					vacant since 31 Aug. 2010	Selection made pending travel arrangements
Geneva	HAM	P-5	512165					vacant since 30 Oct. 2010	JO posted on 24 Feb. 2011
Geneva	UNA	P-5	512966	Finland		M			
Geneva	HAM	P-5	517984	Canada		F			
Darfur	QSA	P-5	68192	Canada		M			
Chad	QSA	P-5	78120	Australia		M			
Abidjan	QSA	P-5	52166					vacant since 30 May 2010	Selection made On-boarding
LINSCA	QSA	P-4	78834	Philippines		M			
The Hague	HLA	P-4	50420					vacant since 30 Sep. 2010	JO posted on 4 Feb. 2011
Syria	HGM	P-4	518111					vacant since 31 Dec. 2009	JO posted on 4 Feb. 2011
Sudan	QSA	P-4	66945	Nepal		M			
Sudan	QSA	P-4	66946	Uganda		F			
Sudan	QSA	P-4	66947	Ghana		M			
Sudan	QSA	P-4	66948					vacant since 1 Feb. 2011	Selection made On-boarding
Sri Lanka	HGM	P-4	520248	Pakistan		M			
Senegal	HGM	P-4	520249	Senegal		F			
Port-au-Prince	QSA	P-4	51529	Sierra Leone		M			
Port-au-Prince	QSA	P-4	72913	Ghana		M			
New York	QSA	P-4	1264	United States of America		M			
New York	UNA	P-4	5934	Turkey		M			
New York	UNA	P-4	5935	Nigeria		M			
New York	UNA	P-4	5936	Republic of Zambia		M			
New York	UNA	P-4	5937					vacant since 31 Jan. 2010	Selection made on 14 Oct. 2010. Selected candidate to be reappointed
New York	QSA	P-4	11940	Germany		M			
New York	QSA	P-4	11941	Republic of Korea		M		vacant since 31 Oct. 2010	to be filled through internal mobility programme
New York	QSA	P-4	11942	Israel		M			
New York	QSA	P-4	34004	India		M			
New York	OHA	P-4	34258	New Zealand		F			
New York	PFN	P-4	50362	United States of America		M			
New York	ODA	P-4	52873	Australia		M			
New York	QSA	P-4	58152	Saint Kitts and Nevis		F			
New York	PFN	P-4	83018	Netherlands		F			

**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:

								posts blocked for legitimate incumbents
								vacant posts
								D-2 vacancies
New York	CMP	P-4	65029	Kazakhstan	F			
New York	QSA	P-4	66920	Kenya	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	67015	Uzbekistan	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	67014	Senegal	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	67013	Nepal	M			
New York	QSA	P-4	76830	United Kingdom	F			
Nairobi	HGM	P-4	603110	Germany	M			
Nairobi	UNA	P-4	603725				vacant since 1 Jan. 2011	JO posted on 4 Feb. 2011
Nairobi	OTA	P-4	603866	Zambia	M			
Nairobi	HGM	P-4	605690	Netherlands	M			
Monrovia	QSA	P-4	52462	Nigeria	M			
Monrovia	QSA	P-4	52463	Cote d'Ivoire	M			
Monrovia	QSA	P-4	58186	Nepal	M			
Lebanon	QSA	P-4	52466	Canada	F			
Lebanon	QSA	P-4	66831	Kenya	F			
Lebanon	QSA	P-4	66830	Liberia	M			
Kosovo	QSA	P-4	36647				vacant since 30 June 2010	IAD presence in UNMIK to be phased out. To be abolished
Kinshasa	QSA	P-4	39464	Mauritania	M			
Kinshasa	QSA	P-4	46074	Pakistan	M			
Kinshasa	QSA	P-4	52467	India	M			
Kinshasa	QSA	P-4	66929	Nigeria	M			
Geneva	HAM	P-4	509983	France	M			
Geneva	HAM	P-4	509984	India	M			
Geneva	ACK	P-4	510729	South Africa	M			
Geneva	UNA	P-4	512967	India	M			
Geneva	HAM	P-4	513116	India	M			
Geneva	UNA	P-4	513340	Russian Federation	M			
Geneva	HCA	P-4	516157	Kenya	F			
East Timor	QSA	P-4	66950	United Kingdom	M			
Darfur	QSA	P-4	66243				vacant since 30 Sep. 2010	Selection made. On-boarded
Darfur	QSA	P-4	66245	United Kingdom	M			
Darfur	QSA	P-4	66246	Philippines	F			
Darfur	QSA	P-4	66247	Philippines	M			
Darfur	QSA	P-4	66782				vacant since 31 Dec. 2009	Selection made. On-boarded
Chad	QSA	P-4	75509	Cote d'Ivoire	M			
Bonn	UNFCCC	P-4	604787				vacant since 31 Dec. 2009	JO posted on 4 Feb. 2011

**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

Anusha	TUA	P-4	50423						vacant since 31 Dec. 2009	JO posted on 11 Feb. 2011
Ashkan	GSA	P-4	52172	India	M					
UNSOA	QSA	P-3	78832						vacant since 30 April 2010	Offer accepted - Pending OHRM clearance
The Hague	HLA	P-3	50427	Philippines	F					
Sudan	QSA	P-3	66949	Kenya	M					
Sudan	QSA	P-3	66950	Kenya	M					
Sudan	QSA	P-3	66951	Brazil	M					
Port-au-Prince	QSA	P-3	35745	Kenya	M					
Port-au-Prince	QSA	P-3	56180	Viet Nam	M					
New York	OKA	P-3	995	Romania	M					
New York	UNA	P-3	5820	Australia	F					
New York	UNA	P-3	5229	Bahamas	F					
New York	UNA	P-3	5830	Japan	F					
New York	QSA	P-3	11938						vacant since 31 Oct. 2010	JO posted on 24 Feb. 2011
New York	QSA	P-3	18622	Guinea	M					
New York	PFN	P-3	64900	China	M					
New York	QSA	P-3	68921	United States of America	F					
New York	QSA	P-3	68622	Kenya	M					
New York	UNA	P-3	67016	United Kingdom	F					
New York	UNA	P-3	67017	Germany	F					
New York	UNA	P-3	67018	Japan	M				vacant since 30 Sep. 2010	Blocked until 10 April 2011
Nairobi	HGM	P-3	603111						vacant since 1 Dec 2010	JO posted on 4 Feb. 2011
Nairobi	HGM	P-3	603233						vacant since 1 Nov. 2010	JO posted on 4 Feb. 2011
Nairobi	UNA	P-3	603726	Sweden	F					
Nairobi	UNA	P-3	603727	Italy	M					
Nairobi	HFU	P-3	603886	Zimbabwe	F					
Monrovia	QSA	P-3	38856	India	F					
Monrovia	QSA	P-3	56190	United Kingdom	M					
Lebanon	QSA	P-3	66933	Russian Federation	M					
Lebanon	QSA	P-3	66934						vacant since 31 Dec. 2009	JO posted on 19 Feb. 2011
Kinshasa	QSA	P-3	39496						vacant since 30 July 2010	Selection made - On-boarding pending reference checks
Kinshasa	QSA	P-3	40409	Kenya	M					
Geneva	HAM	P-3	509988	Italy	M				vacant since 31 July 2010	Selection for TVA 4 November 2010 - Selected Candidate withdrew 16 January 2011



**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

Geneva	HAM	G-6	509960	Guzemata	F		
Geneva	UNA	G-8	512974	Philippines	M		
Geneva	UNA	G-8	517394	United States of America	F		
Geneva	UNA	G-5	517398	United Kingdom	M		
New York	QSA	G-5	45425	Belarus	F		
Nairobi	OTA	G-5	603646	Kenya	F		
Geneva	HAM	G-5	509990			vacant since 31 Aug. 2010	On-boarding on-going
Geneva	UNA	G-5	512973	Philippines	F		
Geneva	HAM	G-5	520503	Ghana	F		
New York	OKA	G-4	893	Philippines	F	vacant since 8 Dec. 2010	TVA selected candidate declined
New York	OKA	G-4	994	Guyana	M	vacant since 1 Oct. 2010	Blocked until 30 April 2011
New York	UNA	G-4	5913	Australia	F		
New York	UNA	G-4	5914	Myanmar	F		
New York	UNA	G-4	5915	United States of America	F		
New York	UNA	G-4	5972	United States of America	F		
New York	OKA	G-4	11806	Philippines	M		
New York	QSA	G-4	11936	United States of America	M		
New York	UNA	G-4	13373	United States of America	F	vacant since 26 Sep. 2010	TVA under recruitment progress
New York	PFN	G-4	50363	Guyana	F		
New York	QDA	G-4	52874	Philippines	F		
Darfur	QSA	FS-6	69761	Haiti	F		
Darfur	QSA	FS-6	69763	Afghanistan	M		
Sudan	QSA	FS-4	66952	Canada	M		
Sudan	QSA	FS-4	66953	Eritrea	F		
Sudan	QSA	FS-4	66954	Congo	M		
Port-au-Prince	QSA	FS-4	51673	Liberia	F		
Monrovia	QSA	FS-4	52464			vacant since 30 June 2010	JG to be posted
Lebanon	QSA	FS-4	56188	Kenya	F		
Lebanon	QSA	FS-4	68636	Ghana	F		
Lebanon	QSA	FS-4	66930	United States of America	F		
Kinshasa	QSA	FS-4	37118	Gambia	M		
Kinshasa	QSA	FS-4	43287	Kenya	M		
Kinshasa	QSA	FS-4	66930	Australia	F		
East Timor	QSA	FS-4	69657			vacant since 31 Dec. 2009	TVA issued on 10 Dec. 2010 interview stage
Chad	QSA	FS-4	75511	Haiti	F		
Abidjan	QSA	FS-4	30518	United States of America	F		

**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:



posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

Investigations Division

Location	Fund	Level	Post No.	Nationality	Gender	Incumbency as of 28 Feb	Length of Vacancies	Remarks
New York	UNA	D-2	6091	United States of America	M		Vacant since 31/7/2006.	INSPIRA JO applicants under evaluation
Nairobi	QSA	D-1	605743				vacant since 1 July 2009	Two separate vacancy announcements failed to produce qualified candidates. The IAAC and 5th Committee have been informed that current operational requirements do not warrant the filling of this post.
Vienna	QSA	D-1	202280				vacant since 1 April 2008	IAAC and 5th Committee have been previously informed that current operational requirements do not warrant the filling of this post.
New York	UNA	D-1	67019	United States of America	M		vacant since 1 Jan. 2009	blocked for Mr. Dudley
Nairobi	QSA	P-5	605744	Australia	M			
Vienna	UNA	P-5	202622	Canada	M			
Vienna	QSA	P-5	202446				vacant since 1 July 2009	IAAC and 5th Committee have been previously informed that current operational requirements do not warrant the filling of this post.
New York	QSA	P-5	75522	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-5	67980	Czech Republic	M			
New York	UNA	P-5	6014	South Africa	F			
Nairobi	QSA	P-4	605745				vacant since 1 July 2009	Selection made, OHRM processing recruitment
Nairobi	UNA	P-4	604908				vacant since 1 Feb. 2010	Selection made: On-boarding
Nairobi	QSA	P-4	604192	Canada	M			
Nairobi	QSA	P-4	603866				vacant since 15 April 2010	Interview stage

**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents

vacant posts

D-2 vacancies

Nairobi	QSA	P-4	603764	United States of America	M			
Nairobi	UNA	P-4	603728	Kenya	M			
Vienna	QSA	P-4	202441	Kenya	F			
Vienna	QSA	P-4	202438				vacant since 1 Jan. 2009	Selected candidate transferred to Nairobi. New JO to be initiated in Inspira
Vienna	UNA	P-4	202062	Hungary	F			
Vienna	UNA	P-4	202047	Canada	M			
Beirut	QSA	P-4	78837				vacant since 1 Jan. 2009	Galaxy selected candidate declined. Re-advertised in INSPIRA. JO posted.
New York	UNA	P-4	77990				vacant since 1 June 2010	Selection made, OHRM processing recruitment
New York	QSA	P-4	76525	Romania	F			
New York	QSA	P-4	75524				vacant since 1 July 2009	Selection made on 23 Nov 2010. On-boarding, pending reference checks
New York	QSA	P-4	75523	United States of America	M			
New York	UNA	P-4	67989	Australia	F		vacant since 19 July 2010	Blocked for staff on temporary assignment until 16 July 2011
New York	UNA	P-4	67023	Senegal	M			
New York	UNA	P-4	67022				vacant since 25 April 2010	Selection made on 23 Nov 2010. On-boarding, pending reference checks
New York	UNA	P-4	67021	Poland	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	67020	Brazil	F			
Darfur	QSA	P-4	66963	New Zealand	M			
Port-au-Prince	QSA	P-4	61784				vacant since 1 July 2009	Galaxy VA failed to produce qualified candidates. JO posted.
Monrovia	QSA	P-4	61773				vacant since 1 July 2009	Second selection made, OHRM processing recruitment
Goma	QSA	P-4	61758	Australia	M			
Khartoum	QSA	P-4	58820	South Africa	F			

**CIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

Location	Grade	Category	Number	Country	Gender	Status	Remarks
Abidjan	QSA	P-4	58815				Second selected candidate declared selection New . O initiated in Inspira to re-advertise the position for the third time
Nairobi	TUA	P-4	50424	Nigeria	F		
New York	UNA	P-4	5012	United States of America	F		
Nairobi	QSA	P-3	605746				vacant since 1 July 2010
Nairobi	QSA	P-3	604476	Kenya	M		Selection made. OHRM processing recruitment
Nairobi	QSA	P-3	604193	Switzerland	F		
Nairobi	QSA	P-3	604185				vacant since 1 July 2009
Nairobi	QSA	P-3	603804	United Kingdom	M		Interview stage
Nairobi	QSA	P-3	603785				vacant since 23 Feb. 2011
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202498	United States of America	F		Recently vacated. Blocked
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202440				VACANT sine 1 Jan 2011.
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202438				vacant since 1 July 2009
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202285	South Africa	F		Inspira JO 18071 pending approval and posting by OHRM
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202284	Sweden	M		Selection made. Selected candidate to be traveled
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202283				VACANT sine 17 Dec. 2010.
Vienna	QSA	P-3	202282	Mongolia	M		Inspira JO 15921 posted on 30/08/10
Vienna	UNA	P-3	202051	Australia	F		
Vienna	UNA	P-3	202050	Sweden	F		
Vienna	UNA	P-3	202048	Italy	M		
New York	UNA	P-3	77991	Ukraine	M		
New York	QSA	P-3	75526	Germany	M		
New York	UNA	P-3	67027	Belarus	M		
New York	UNA	P-3	67025	Nepal	F		
Monrovia	QSA	P-3	61774				vacant since 1 Oct. 2010
New York	QSA	P-3	61522	Uruguay	M		Selection made. OHRM processing recruitment
Khartoum	QSA	P-3	58621				vacant since 1 Dec. 2010
Khartoum	QSA	P-3	58622	Egypt	M		JO posted
Goma	QSA	P-3	58819	Switzerland	F		
Monrovia	QSA	P-3	58612	Cote d'Ivoire	M		



**UNOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
vacant posts  
D-2 vacancies

Nairobi	TUA	P-3	50425					vacant since 1 Mar. 2010	Selection made On-boarding
New York	UNA	P-3	6627	United States of America	F				
Vienna	UNA	P-2	202613					vacant since 1 Nov 2010	ID HM reviewing P2 NICE roster candidates
Vienna	UNA	P-2	202612	Republic of Korea	M				
Vienna	UNA	P-2	202611	Switzerland	F				
Vienna	UNA	P-2	202610	Greece	M				
Goma	GSA	NGS-DL	65649	Congolese	M				
Monrovia	GSA	NGS-OL	62967	Liberia	M				
Nairobi	UNA	L-L	603730					vacant since 14 Dec. 2010. Selection made, on-boarding	Selection made On-boarding
Vienna	GSA	G-7	202452	Austria	F				
New York	UNA	G-7	19574	Canada	M				
New York	UNA	G-7	5943	United States of America	F				
Nairobi	GSA	G-6	605596	Kenya	F				
Nairobi	GSA	G-6	605597	Kenya	F				
Nairobi	GSA	G-6	604465					vacant since 14 Nov. 2010	JD posted
Vienna	GSA	G-6	202442	Austria	M				
Vienna	GSA	G-6	202286	Croatia	F				
New York	GSA	G-6	65028	Philippines	M				
New York	UNA	G-6	6005	Argentina	F				
Nairobi	GSA	G-5	603786	Kenya	M				
Vienna	OIA	G-5	202370	United States of America	F				
Vienna	UNA	G-5	202052	Sweden	F				
Vienna	UNA	G-4	202609	United Kingdom	M				
New York	GSA	G-4	75528	Philippines	F				
New York	GSA	G-4	75527	Trinidad and Tobago	F				
New York	UNA	G-4	67028	Uruguay	M				
New York	UNA	G-4	5918	United States of America	F				
New York	OIA	G-3	60063	United States of America	M				
Khartoum	GSA	FS-4	66962	Colombia	M				

Inspection and Evaluation Division

Location	Fund	Level	Post No.	Nationality	Gender	Incumbency as of 28 Feb	Length of Vacancies	Remarks
----------	------	-------	----------	-------------	--------	-------------------------	---------------------	---------

OHOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)

Logtype

posts blocked for logtype counts  
vacant posts  
D-2 \*vacants

Location	Fund	Level	Post No.	Nationality	Gender	Incumbency as of 28 Feb	Length of Vacancies	Remarks
New York	UNA	D-2	7778	Norway	M		Vacant since 1 Jan 2006.	RSPRA JO applicants under evaluation.
New York	UNA	D-1	8000	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-5	30288	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-5	8013	United States of America	F		Vacant since 1 June 2008	On boarding on going
New York	UNA	P-5	5977	Norway	M			
New York	USA	P-4	76119	China	F			
New York	USA	P-4	48190	China	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	30297	Germany	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	30289	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	18672	India	M			
New York	UNA	P-4	6009	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	5903	Bolivia	M		Vacant since 1 Jan 2011	Blocked for 3m who will return on 15/2/11
New York	UNA	P-3	71348	Madoc	F			
New York	UNA	P-3	71347	Republic of Korea	F			
New York	UNA	P-3	71346	Germany	F			
New York	UNA	P-3	5931	Marshall	F			
New York	UNA	P-2	7770	Germany	F			
New York	UNA	P-2	71351	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-2	71350	Van Nam	F			
New York	UNA	P-2	71349	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-2	15936	Adrian	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	7769	United States of America	M			
New York	UNA	G-4	13385	China	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	5974	Philippines	M		Vacant since 1 Feb. 2011	Blocked TVA applicants under review
New York	UNA	G-4	5973	Kenya	F			

Executive Office

Location	Fund	Level	Post No.	Nationality	Gender	Incumbency as of 28 Feb	Length of Vacancies	Remarks
New York	UNA	P-5	19667	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-4	37834	China	F			

**OIOS Budgetary Vacancy Table (as of 28 February 2011)**

Legend:

posts blocked for legitimate incumbents  
 vacant posts  
 D-2 vacancies

New York	QSA	P-3	48205	Philippines	F			
New York	UNA	P-3	6008	China	F		vacant since 1 July 2010	blocked until 31 Mar. 2011
New York	QSA	G-7	72023	Philippines	F			
New York	UNA	G-7	32489	United States of America	F			
New York	QSA	G-6	66919	United States of America	F			
New York	QSA	G-6	86918	Haiti	F		vacant since 27 Sep. 2010.	Staff member returning on 26 April 2011.
New York	UNA	G-6	37835	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	70811	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	70810	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	32490	United States of America	M			

**Office of the Under-Secretary-General**

Location	Fund	Level	Post No.	Nationality	Gender	Incumbency as of 28 Feb	Length of Vacancies	Remarks
New York	UNA	USG-1	17712	Canada	F			
New York	UNA	P-5	32492	Republic of Korea	M			
New York	UNA	P-4	5839	United States of America	F			
New York	UNA	P-3	37832	France	F			
New York	UNA	G-7	5647	Canada	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	19570	Sri Lanka	F			
New York	UNA	G-4	5917	Philippines	F			

*Question.* In your remarks to the committee, you mentioned concern regarding the U.N.'s Whistleblower policy. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current policy?

*Answer.* In 2005, the Secretary General issued the U.N. whistleblower protection policy (ST/SGB/2005/21). This policy was developed after months of consultation with outside experts and State Department officials. The Government Accountability Project, a public advocacy group dedicated to advancing corporate and public accountability and promoting whistleblower protections, hailed the U.N. whistleblower policy as the "benchmark for other Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs)" to follow.

The U.N.'s whistleblower policy clearly establishes that reporting misconduct and cooperating with U.N. audits and investigations are protected activities. It also establishes a recourse mechanism for U.N. personnel who are subjected to retaliation or threatened with retaliation.

While the Secretary General's ethics framework for the U.N. funds and programs (ST/SGB/2007/11) created the U.N. Ethics Committee to unify ethical standards across organizations, whistleblower protections vary greatly across the various funds and programs. Compared to the Secretariat's policy, whistleblower protections at the funds and programs are considered weaker and less comprehensive. If confirmed, I would work to ensure the strengthening and implementation of whistleblower protections throughout the U.N. system.

*Question.* As part of your pledge to help institute oversight responsibilities, if confirmed, will you continue the policy established during the Bush administration of posting U.N. audits on the USUN Web site? If not, why not?

*Answer.* The Obama administration has continued the practice of posting audits by the U.N. Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on USUN's public Web site, and if confirmed I plan to continue to post U.N. audits on USUN's public Web site.

You can find these reports at: [http://usun.state.gov/about/un\\_reform/oios/index.htm](http://usun.state.gov/about/un_reform/oios/index.htm).

*Question.* The United Nations Development Program is a major implementer for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria, and Tuberculosis. According to the UNDP, as of January 2011, UNDP is currently Principal Recipient in 27 countries, managing a total of 60 active grants amounting to more than \$1.1 billion. Policies of the Executive Board of the UNDP only allow Member States, not nongovernmental organizations such as the Global Fund or World Bank, access to internal audits, even when fraud is suspected in the grants.

- What actions should the United States pursue to increase the transparency and ensure the integrity of United States taxpayer investments in the Global Fund that are managed through UNDP?

*Answer.* The United States is committed to ensuring Global Fund resources reach people in need and are used as effectively and efficiently as possible to save lives. We strongly support the Global Fund's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), and its ongoing efforts to strengthen the Global Fund's oversight systems. We have consistently advocated for increased transparency, accountability, and oversight over U.S. contributions to the Global Fund, including Global Fund resources managed by UNDP.

The United States has had high-level discussions with UNDP management on the importance of sharing relevant audit information with the Global Fund's OIG and cooperating with the OIG in instances of suspected fraud. While UNDP does not currently share its internal audit reports with the Global Fund, UNDP has taken several interim steps to coordinate with the Global Fund's OIG, including (1) consulting with the OIG on development of UNDP's annual audit plan; (2) sharing summaries of UNDP's Global Fund-related audits; and (3) bringing potential irregularities involving Global Fund projects to the attention of the OIG whenever and wherever they are found. These steps are helpful but not sufficient, and the United States is continuing to push for full Global Fund access to relevant UNDP audit reports.

With strong U.S. encouragement, UNDP management has agreed to present options for allowing increased access to its audit reports to the UNDP Executive Board for consideration and approval in September 2011. The United States is working to build support among UNDP Board members for amendments to UNDP's audit disclosure policies that would allow increased transparency, accountability, and oversight over resources under UNDP management.

In addition, the United States is committed to sound management and accountability within the Global Fund and strongly supports the establishment of the Global Fund Board's Comprehensive Reform Working Group and the High-Level

Panel on Global Fund Fiduciary Controls and Oversight, which is being chaired by Former Secretary for Health and Human Services, Michael Leavitt, and the former President of Botswana, Festus Mogae.

*Question.* On March 1, 2011, the United Kingdom Department for International Development issued a Multilateral Review. This report evaluated the 43 international funds and organizations to which the United Kingdom contributes on value for the money and each fund's and organization's effectiveness in combating poverty, taking in account transparency and accountability. In trying to maximize our multilateral investments, should the Department of State, in consultation with USAID and Department of Treasury conduct a similar study?

*Answer.* I am reviewing the DFID Multilateral Review and look forward to discussing its findings with U.N. officials, if confirmed.

A broad and standardized review of agency performance, such as the DFID Review, is a worthwhile approach that merits thorough and thoughtful consideration. If confirmed I would review the suggestion of such a study carefully, against the background of the U.S. Government's current evaluation mechanisms.

I understand that the previous U.S. Ambassador for Management and Reform established the U.N. Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI) to verify that concrete improvements in management and accountability are being made by the U.N. system. If confirmed, I look forward to reviewing the successful UNTAI initiative and possibly improving its usefulness and relevance. In the current budget environment, it is important for international organizations to show that they are having the impact that recipients and donors expect. If confirmed, one of my main tasks will be to assess the U.N.'s performance and push for improvements wherever necessary. I would keep Congress, and this committee in particular, fully informed of what I find.

