

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 110TH  
CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION**

---

---

**HEARINGS**

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

—  
JANUARY 30 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 24, 2008  
—

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



**NOMINATIONS OF THE 110TH CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION**

S. HRG. 110-777

# NOMINATIONS OF THE 110TH CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION

---

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JANUARY 30 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 24, 2008

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

48-281 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2009

---

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  
110TH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	NORM COLEMAN, Minnesota
BARBARA BOXER, California	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
BILL NELSON, Florida	JOHN E. SUNUNU, New Hampshire*
BARACK OBAMA, Illinois	GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JIM DeMINT, South Carolina
ROBERT P. CASEY, Pennsylvania	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JIM WEBB, Virginia	DAVID VITTER, Louisiana

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Staff Director*

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

\*Note: Reassigned to Committee on Finance January 24, 2008.

---

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
110TH CONGRESS—SECOND SESSION

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	NORM COLEMAN, Minnesota
BARBARA BOXER, California	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
BILL NELSON, Florida	GEORGE V. VOINOVICH, Ohio
BARACK OBAMA, Illinois	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	JIM DeMINT, South Carolina
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
ROBERT P. CASEY, Pennsylvania	DAVID VITTER, Louisiana
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming*

ANTONY J. BLINKEN, *Staff Director*

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

\*Note: Appointed February 12, 2008.

## NOMINATIONS

---

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2008

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

Hook, Brian, to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs  
Lebedev, Gregori, to be Representative of the United States to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, and to be Alternate Representative of the United States to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations  
Reynolds, Matthew, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs

---

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Bill Nelson presiding.

Present: Senators Nelson and Corker.

### OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BILL NELSON, U.S. SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Senator NELSON. Good morning, everybody. If the officer at the door would close the door for a moment, we are going to observe a moment of silence in recognition of those who lost their lives when we were attacked on September 11.

[A moment of silence was observed.]

Senator NELSON. Thank you.

We are going to, as the committee, consider the nomination of three individuals for key leadership positions at the Department. We are also joined by several distinguished colleagues who will introduce our nominees, Senator Grassley, Senator Robb, Congressman Dreier. I want to welcome you all.

Mr. Brian Hook has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. Mr. Gregori Lebedev has been nominated to be representative of the United States to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, and that is with the rank of Ambassador, and to be Alternate Representative of the United States to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the U.N. And I will be seeing you up there because I am going to be representing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Matthew Reynolds has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs.

And so what I would like to do now—you all have been told ahead of time that I am not going to have you read your statements. Your written statement is going to be entered in the record and we will just get right into questions.

[The prepared statements of Mr. Hook, Mr. Lebedev, and Mr. Reynolds follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BRIAN H. HOOK, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

Thank you Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee for the opportunity to appear before you today as the President's nominee to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. I am grateful to President Bush for nominating me to this position, Secretary Rice for her support, and I thank Chairman Nelson and Senator Vitter for convening this hearing during a very busy time.

If confirmed, I look forward to continuing the good work of my predecessor in advancing U.S. interests before the United Nations, its affiliated bodies, and other international organizations to which the United States is a party. United States leadership in multilateral organizations has never been more important. Many of the challenges we face today are international in scope and require action on a multilateral level. These challenges include international terrorism, nuclear proliferation, the protection of human rights, promotion of democracy and good governance, poverty eradication, disease prevention and treatment, and food security. Working constructively within the United Nations, through the U.N. Security Council, the U.N. General Assembly, and the many U.N. agencies, we are better able to address constructively many of these challenges. Of course, any such success requires not only the shared commitment of our international partners, but also rigorous oversight of the agencies in question to ensure effective, efficient, transparent, and accountable outcomes.

If confirmed, I will apply what I learned while serving at the U.S. mission to the United Nations for 2 years. During that time, I was the ambassador's lead negotiator on Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions on Iran, Sudan, al-Qaeda, and the Taliban. I also helped to negotiate the resolution authorizing deployment of the U.N./AU peacekeeping mission in Darfur.

I believe it is necessary to further strengthen U.S. leadership in the United Nations and to facilitate the necessary reforms to the organization.

Of course we face many challenges throughout the world, but we should also recognize progress in a number of key areas, including:

- In March we adopted Security Council Resolution 1803, which imposed legally binding Chapter VII sanctions on Iran for its failure to comply with its prior U.N. Security Council obligations. This is the third time that the council acted to impose Chapter VII sanctions on Iran since the IAEA reported Iran's non-compliance to the council in February 2006, and Secretary Rice has expressed her commitment to a fourth resolution should Iran continue to act in defiance of council's directives.
- Last fall the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution on the elimination of rape and other forms of sexual violence in conflict situations, as well as a resolution on women, peace, and security during our Council Presidency in June. Both these resolutions call attention to states that condone the use of rape by their own forces or surrogate militias as a weapon of war.
- The last General Assembly also adopted United States cosponsored resolutions condemning the human rights records of Iran, Belarus, the DPRK, and Burma, communicating to these regimes and to their victims that the international community will not countenance such blatant disregard for the fundamental rights and freedoms of their people.
- The World Food Program delivered 3.3 million metric tons of food aid to more than 86.1 million people in 80 countries last year. The United States provided approximately 31 billion, or roughly 40 percent of the resources needed to accomplish this. The World Food Program continues to reach those in need quickly and effectively, despite physical and political obstacles. A recent example of this was its response to Cyclone Nargis in Burma.
- U.N. peacekeeping operations continue to successfully facilitate the difficult transitions to stability and democratic governance underway in Haiti, Liberia, the Congo, and Timor-Leste.

While we can point to such notable achievements, we must be frank in acknowledging failures and the continuing challenges the U.N. faces.

Russia's recent military actions in Georgia and recognition of the Georgian regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as independent states are inconsistent with previous Security Council resolutions reaffirming Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity. We are closely engaged with our colleagues to promote a constructive role for the council in addressing this crisis, but that will ultimately depend on Russia's willingness to play a constructive role in any council decisions.

At times, the U.N. has neglected to act with the moral clarity that defined its establishment. The U.N. Human Rights Council, for example, was established in 2006 as a replacement for the discredited former Commission on Human Rights. The council was intended to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Unfortunately, it has consistently failed to address grave and ongoing human rights violations in countries such as Zimbabwe and Iran, and has protected notorious human rights abusers from scrutiny. In its first year the council eliminated the special rapporteurs on the situations of human rights in Cuba and Belarus. Furthermore, it has taken only weak and ineffective action on Sudan, while a political agenda has led to the passage of 20 unbalanced resolutions and other actions against a single country—Israel. Regrettably, in its first 2 years the Human Rights Council has proved to be even worse than its predecessor, and we are now focused on ways to correct the council's deficiencies, including its membership structure, when its mandate and functions are renewed by the UNGA no later than 2011.

We are also disappointed that the U.N. plans to hold a second World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance in Geneva in April 2009. The United States withdrew from the first antiracism conference in Durban, South Africa, in 2001 due to the pervasive anti-Semitism that characterized the conference itself, as well as the inclusion of anti-Israeli language in the Draft Declaration and the Program of Action. We have no confidence that the second conference will avoid the anti-Semitic undertones that plagued the conference in Durban. Accordingly, and in compliance with section 695 of the 2008 Foreign Operations Act, we will withhold from our regular U.N. budget assessment an amount equivalent to the U.S. share of funding for the Human Rights Council and the Durban review conference.

The work of the U.N. has also been hampered in some cases by systemic weaknesses in the organization. Many U.N. programs are outdated, irrelevant, or ineffective. As we have pressed the U.N. for greater oversight, accountability, and transparency, serious problems have come to light that need greater attention by U.N. management, including cases of sexual misconduct by U.N. peacekeepers and management failures in the United Nations Development Program.

Such failures underscore the need for continued efforts to reform the U.N. to ensure the organization is prepared to confront directly and effectively the great problems of our time. There is widespread recognition that the U.N. is not living up to its full potential.

If confirmed, my central focus will be to advance reform and facilitate substantive progress in the following areas:

#### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

We will continue to work for a United Nations that meets the highest standards of integrity. The United States has launched the U.N. Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI) to encourage action to improve oversight, transparency, and accountability at the U.N. specialized agencies, funds, and programs. We will continue to reinforce this initiative. Within the U.N. Secretariat, we are working to strengthen the independence of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and will continue to demand responsible and effective stewardship of limited U.N. resources.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

Due to the regrettable record of the U.N. Human Rights Council and in light of the United States longstanding commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights, the United States has decided that it can no longer participate as an active observer in the council. We will further intensify our efforts in the U.N. General Assembly's Third Committee, which has jurisdiction over human rights and related issues, and will continue to pursue constructive interaction with the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights and with the U.N. Special Rapporteurs on country-specific and thematic human rights questions.

## PEACEKEEPING

We will work to achieve full troop deployment of the joint United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) and continue to call on all U.N. member states to provide full support for the peacekeepers. Simultaneously, we will support the U.N. Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) peacekeeping operation in its efforts to facilitate the Comprehensive Peace Agreement between North and South Sudan, as a means to promote long-term reconciliation and an end to Sudan's suffering. We will continue to rally international diplomatic support for U.N. operations that are rebuilding peace and stability in transitioning countries such as Liberia, Haiti, and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

## NONPROLIFERATION

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction remains the preeminent threat to U.S. national security. We will work within the U.N. Security Council, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and other international organizations to strengthen the barriers against access to WMD, associated technology, and their means of delivery.

## DEMOCRACY FUND

We believe the U.N. should take a more active role in promoting democracy around the world through such mechanisms as the U.N. Democracy Fund. The Fund is the U.N.'s only entity devoted solely to democracy promotion primarily by supporting civil society. While other U.N. organizations such as UNDP typically regard host governments as their primary development partners, the Democracy Fund supports civil society directly—making it possible for the U.N. to fund democracy promotion regardless of whether it is a priority for the host government. In only 2 years of programming, the fund has already made important contributions in countries around the world, particularly for those most in need. We anticipate that the fund will take action on its second round of grants during the month of September. This will include funding for projects in China, Zimbabwe, and Venezuela, among others.

## DEVELOPMENT

We will work with the U.N. to help developing countries eradicate poverty and hunger. This goal, along with the other Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), can only be achieved and sustained through a strategy of economic growth. The United States is proud to be the world's largest contributor of development assistance, but our focus and that of the U.N. must be more on the quality and effectiveness of our efforts than on the quantity of our contributions. Development requires national responsibility, good governance, openness to trade and investment, and a free and robust private sector.

## TERRORISM

The U.N. provides a unique venue for member states to take collective action against terrorism, particularly those that may be reluctant to cooperate openly with the United States bilaterally. We will work with our allies to ensure that U.N. counterterrorism bodies and programs are streamlined and that they engage with each other and with other international bodies to ensure maximum efficiency and systemic coherence. We will also continue to work toward ensuring that the Global Counterterrorism Strategy and Plan of Action, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in September 2006 to enhance national, regional, and international efforts to counter terrorism, is implemented effectively.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to be here today, and I hope that I have the privilege of working with you and your colleagues in the future. I would be happy to respond to the committee's questions.

---

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GREGORI LEBEDEV, NOMINEE TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS FOR U.N. MANAGEMENT AND REFORM, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, AND TO BE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Vitter, and distinguished members of the committee for the opportunity to appear before you today as the President's nominee to be the U.S. Representative to the United Nations for Management and Reform.



I am grateful to President Bush and to Secretary Rice for their confidence and support.

For nearly 30 years, I have worked in the foreign affairs community—as State Department Assistant Inspector General for Foreign Assistance, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security and Consular Affairs, as Executive Vice President for International Policy at the United States Chamber of Commerce, as a senior partner in a global consulting firm whose clients included multilateral organizations, and currently as chairman of the Center for International Private Enterprise, one of the four institutes of the National Endowment for Democracy.

During that same period, I also acquired considerable experience in management and finance, having served as a CEO, a COO, and a CFO of industry associations; provided consulting advice to public and private as well as foreign and domestic organizations about management, financial structures, and human resources; evaluated economic and military assistance programs as a State Department Assistant Inspector General; and have spoken frequently about public corruption and its corrosive effects upon private enterprise. I believe these experiences have provided me with uniquely relevant insights which will permit me to effectively address the challenges of the position for which I have been nominated.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, I will focus on our shared interest in improving the management and governance structures of the United Nations, and thereby heighten the efficiency and effectiveness of this important institution. The time I will spend at the U.S. mission will measurably contribute to the continuity of attention on governance and management reform—the linchpin to any broader institutional initiatives that may be pursued. To be sure, without the requisite measure of accountability, transparency, and fiscal discipline the U.N. will forever be unable to meet the high expectations that we, and other member states have for this critically important multilateral organization.

Filling the currently vacant position of U.S. Representative to the United Nations for Management and Reform is key to meeting America's commitment to U.N. reform and fiscal stewardship. Placing a seasoned policy and management professional in this role sends a very clear signal to the international community that the United States, as the U.N.'s largest contributor, has not turned away from its fiduciary duty to advance the changes that are needed. To be sure, to leave this post vacant—and thus dim the spotlight on reform—would weaken the ability of the administration to continue to achieve much-needed improvements in the U.N. system.

In his 2007 speech to the General Assembly, the President spoke to the critical mission of the United Nations and its role in the liberation of people from four universal enemies: tyranny and violence; hunger and disease; the chains of illiteracy and ignorance; and poverty and despair. Progress can be made toward the realization of these long-term objectives, but only if the U.N. and its affiliated bodies are effective, transparent, and accountable. Our belief in the importance and value of the United Nations is enduring, but our commitment is not unconditional. Reports of scandal, mismanagement, and dishonesty shake the confidence of donors and cast doubt on the organization's ability to deliver results to those in need. Consequently, if confirmed, I intend to devote much of my attention and energy to the following areas:

**Transparency and Accountability Initiative**—In 2007, the United States launched a U.N. Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI) to apply common governance standards throughout the U.N. system, including independent internal oversight, disclosure of internal audits, ethics protocols, whistle-blower protections, and financial disclosures by staff. This initiative came about in the wake of abuses by the North Korean Government while a beneficiary of U.N. humanitarian and development activities. UNTAI draws upon existing practices within the U.N. Secretariat, and seeks to have them implemented in the U.N. Funds and Programs—in particular UNDP and UNICEF in New York, as well as all the other programs and specialized agencies throughout the U.N. system. If confirmed, I will work to continue our progress on this important program of work.

**UNDP Accountability**—There have been serious concerns about U.N. Development Program (UNDP) operations and the lack of internal controls in several countries, most recently in North Korea where U.N. auditors discovered that UNDP had violated U.N. rules. We have similar concerns about UNDP as an implementing agent for the Global Fund to Combat HIV, Malaria, and Tuberculosis in Burma.

The Department of State has been working with senior UNDP officials in an effort to help that organization meet the standards of the U.N. Transparency and Accountability Initiative, and to begin to more aggressively disclose audit and programmatic information, promote ethical behavior, and protect whistle-blowers. If confirmed, I will be forceful but fair in working with UNDP to improve the quality of the oversight of its programs.

**Budget Issues**—If confirmed, I will also be a strong advocate for fiscal responsibility within the U.N. The General Assembly approved an initial budget for 2008–2009 of \$4.2 billion; however, this did not include approximately \$1.1 billion in budgetary add-ons identified last fall but about which U.N. members decided to defer action rather than face tough decisions. The United States rightly objected to the adoption of this budget because this piecemeal approach clearly undercuts any rational process for fiscal planning. If confirmed, I will be actively involved in negotiations this fall to limit any increases to only those that are most vital to U.S. goals and interests.

While there have been a number of positive achievements in the U.N. reform arena, we are not yet satisfied with the progress that has been made throughout the U.N. system. Certainly, more work remains to be done. Although, I would not suggest that the tasks that remain could be completed over the next few months, I believe we must continue to advance our initiatives without interruption in order to bridge the gap between this and the next administration. I look forward to this opportunity and challenge.

In summary, the diversity of my experience is uniquely relevant to the challenges presented by the U.S. agenda for U.N. management and reform, and if confirmed, I look forward to working with you, the members of this committee and all those who are committed to making the U.N. a more effective and efficient organization.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have at this time.

---

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MATTHEW A. REYNOLDS  
TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to appear before you today in regard to my nomination as Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs. I would like to thank President Bush and Secretary of State Rice for the confidence placed in me. I am honored by this opportunity to serve.

I would also like to thank my former chairman, mentor, and friend, Representative David Dreier, for introducing me before the committee today. While the U.S. Senate is solely responsible for confirmations—and I hope to achieve the Senate's approval through this hearing—the Bureau of Legislative Affairs serves both chambers of Congress and I value Mr. Dreier's endorsement as a representative from the House.

I have spent most of my professional career directly serving U.S. Senators and Representatives. Over my 18 years working in Congress, I gained a wide range of experience managing both Members' personal offices and standing committees of Congress. One of my most rewarding assignments was serving as a professional staff member of this committee. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, it is good to be back, though it is a bit more intimidating now sitting at the witness table than it was enjoying the relative anonymity of the staff bench behind you.

For the past 5 years, I have been at the State Department in the Bureau of Legislative Affairs gaining knowledge and appreciation of the responsibilities and capabilities of the agency. With this firsthand understanding of both Congress and the Department, if confirmed, it will be my highest priority to further strengthen the already solid relationships between the State Department and the Congress and with this committee, in particular.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the State Department's Bureau of Legislative Affairs has three major responsibilities:

- First, is to be responsive to your concerns and to requests for information from you and your staff, as well as to assist your constituents on consular and other matters. This is a customer service bureau and this Congress is its customer.
- Second, is to consult with you—as well as with other committees that have oversight responsibilities for foreign affairs—to ensure that your views are considered in the State Department's policy formulation process.
- Third and finally, is the responsibility to articulate, to explain, and to defend the positions, policies, and financial requests of the Department of State.

As this is the end of an administration, I also recognize that the position of Assistant Secretary has another important responsibility that arises only periodically, and this is one of those times. Namely, the task of facilitating a smooth and seamless transition with the new, incoming administration. If confirmed, I plan to carry out this mission to the highest level of success and professionalism possible to ensure the continuity of quality service.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to be here today. I would be pleased to respond to any questions that you may have.

Senator NELSON. But as a courtesy I want to get to Senator Grassley, Senator Robb, and Congressman Dreier. We will let the three of you go first and then you can excuse yourselves, if you would so desire, and then we can get on with the hearing.

Okay. Senator Grassley?

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES GRASSLEY,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM IOWA**

Senator GRASSLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Nelson. I am very pleased to have an opportunity to introduce a friend and also a fellow Iowan to this Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Of course, I congratulate all the witnesses on their nominations, and I thank you, Chairman Nelson, this late in the session, for taking time to hold this hearing.

I have known Brian Hook for many years, and I strongly support his nomination to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations. I had the opportunity to first meet Brian way back in 1991 when, obviously—he is still young, but very young then when he was an advisor to former Iowa Congressman Jim Leach.

When he returned to Washington in 2000, after attending law school at the University of Iowa, I became better acquainted with him as he became a weekly jogging partner of mine. We would always have breakfast afterwards, and my wife Barbara and I have come to know Brian and his wife Amy very well.

Brian comes from an Iowa family with a tradition of public service that goes back generations. His great, great grandfather was a Member of Congress who represented the 3rd District of Iowa during Teddy Roosevelt's presidency. One of Brian's grandfathers was mayor of DeWitt in Clinton County. His other grandfather was a civic leader in the Quad Cities, and Brian's father was President of the Bettendorf School board. So it is no surprise that Brian continues this tradition of public service.

During his career, Brian has served as an advisor to a Member of Congress, an advisor to a Governor of Iowa, an advisor to an assistant attorney general, advisor to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the Secretary of State, and the President.

Brian has extensive foreign policy experience, negotiated difficult Security Council resolutions on a range of issues at the top of our foreign policy agenda relating to Iran, al-Qaeda, the Taliban, North Korea, Darfur, Zimbabwe, and Georgia. He has also worked to advance U.N. reforms, human rights, and humanitarian relief.

The President has placed great trust in Brian by nominating him to this position, and I know that his trust is well placed. Brian brings great energy to his work. He has a strong work ethic and he believes in getting results. I know that Brian believes in building up a stronger, more effective U.N. to help advance our foreign policy goals and the ideals of the U.N. Charter.

So, Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to introduce Brian to the committee. I support his nomination, obviously, and ask that it move as quickly as possible and will look forward then to endorsing his confirmation to the full Senate. Thank you.

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Senator Grassley.

Senator Robb, welcome back.

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES "CHUCK" ROBB, FORMER  
MEMBER, UNITED STATES SENATE**

Senator ROBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am delighted to be able to join you and your members in absentia this morning to introduce Mr. Greg Lebedev to be the U.S. Representative to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform.

I had a little trouble finding out what exactly the job description was for this particular post. As I understand it, if confirmed, Ambassador Lebedev would be the lead U.S. diplomat on U.N. management, finance, and reform. He would represent all U.S. interests surrounding the \$4.2 billion regular U.N. budget, as well as the \$7 billion for peacekeeping missions. He would address the various integrity lapses such as Oil for Food, and he would advance the U.S.-initiated reform agenda, i.e., work to persuade a reluctant U.N. to embrace a series of government principles and procedures involved in transparency, ethics standards, whistle-blower protections, and the like.

I have known Greg Lebedev for about 3 years, and I believe he is about as qualified as anyone possibly could be to undertake some of these often thankless tasks. I first got to know him in his capacity as senior advisor to the Robertson Foundation, a fund which is dedicated to supporting talented men and women wishing to pursue government careers in national security and in national affairs.

He has a very impressive background in the areas covered in this appointment: senior advisor to Adelphi Capital; Chairman of CIPE, the publicly funded Center for International Private Enterprise that promotes free market institutions and emerging economies throughout the world. He has been the President and CEO of the American Chemistry Council, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President for International Policy and National Security Affairs for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; President of the Center for Corporate Citizenship; Senior Vice President for Management and Finance at the ATA; Senior Vice President of IPAC where he helped direct projects in the reconstruction of Kuwait following the first gulf war. Until 1990, he was the senior partner of the Hay Group where he directed all business and international sector consulting contracts with major work in South Africa and the Middle East. President Ford appointed him Assistant IG of Foreign Assistance at the Department of State. He served on the White House staff. President Bush 41 nominated him to be IG of the DOD right at the end of his term, which did not continue, so he did not have a chance to serve in that particular post.

He is a seasoned internationalist. He has spent almost 30 years in and around the international community. He has highly relevant experience in management, finance, and government. And he is also a respected lawyer and an engaging conversationalist.

Mr. Chairman, I hope it will be the pleasure of this committee to approve his nomination quickly and get him to work as soon as possible. Anyone who thinks the U.N. could not use a little help in sorting through some of their daunting challenges probably has not spent much time at the institution.

With that, Mr. Chairman, unless you have any questions for me, in keeping with established tradition, I will asked to be excused and leave Mr. Lebedev to the tender mercies of this distinguished committee. And I thank you.

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Senator Robb.  
Congressman Dreier, welcome back.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID DREIER,  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA**

Mr. DREIER. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Senator Corker. I appreciate the warmup that my friends, Chuck Robb and Chuck Grassley, have provided, and I hope you will be equally as kind.

I want to say that Senator Corker will some day learn what it is like to see very, very young, diligent, hardworking staff members emerge to prominent positions. I have heard the fact that people have known the individuals they are introducing for periods of time. Actually I have known Matt Reynolds for 20 years. I was just recalling that in 1988, when he was working as a staff member for my former California colleague, Bob Lagomarsino, who at that time was the Chairman of the National Endowment for Democracy's International Republican Institute. We had the chance to engage in some very, very interesting and important travel. In fact, I recall our being the first congressional delegation following the liberation of Kuwait in 1991 to go to that country. And Matt Reynolds was a very, very important part of that.

When our colleague, Congressman Lagomarsino, left the Congress, Matt continued to work on Capitol Hill, and I was very pleased that he came to work when I had the privilege to serve as Chairman of the House Rules Committee. And he just reminded me that 7 years ago at this moment, we were all together in the House Rules Committee, and what a challenging time that was for us.

And I cannot help but think as we have all of these potential public service individuals before you, Mr. Chairman, how important the efforts in dealing with diplomacy are. A very important part of that diplomacy, of course, exists between the Department of State and the first branch of Government, that being us. The job that Matt Reynolds is actually serving—acting in right now and did in 2005 is such an important one because we all know what that separation of powers consists of. And while Matt works for the executive branch, he has had such a distinguished career working in the legislative branch.

And I will say that while he will continue to work for the executive branch, after you do what I certainly hope you will do, Matt is one who does understand—and please do not tell everyone this—that Article I happens to be the first among equals. And so his experience here, I think, will lead him to do the very important things that his job consists of.

His name is Matt Reynolds, but we often refer to him as Map, M-a-p, Reynolds because of the tremendous knowledge that he has of circumstances that exist throughout the world. And I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that he is going to continue to do the superb job that he has in this very important work as we deal with the many challenges that exist around the world and within the United

States Congress. Just as my colleagues have, I encourage you to proceed as expeditiously as possible with his confirmation.

And thank you very much for including me.

Senator NELSON. And we are going to proceed expeditiously. Thank you, gentlemen.

The ranking member's opening statement will be entered in the record, as are your written testimonies. So let us get right to the questions.

[The prepared statement of Senator Nelson follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BILL NELSON,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM FLORIDA

Before we begin, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the significance of this day, September 11. I propose that we observe a moment of silent reflection to commemorate the lives we lost on that tragic day 7 years ago, as well as remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the defense of our great Nation.

Today, the committee meets to consider the nominations of three individuals for key leadership positions at the Department of State.

Mr. Brian H. Hook has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Mr. Gregori Lebedev has been nominated to be Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for U.N. Management and Reform, with the rank of Ambassador, and to be Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. Matthew A. Reynolds has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs.

I would like to recognize and welcome the nominees' family and friends who are with them today. We are also joined by several distinguished colleagues who will introduce our nominees—Senator Charles Grassley, former Senator Chuck Robb, and former Congressman David Dreier. Welcome, gentlemen.

Mr. Hook, you are currently serving as the acting Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs and recently testified as the administration witness at the subcommittee hearing I held on U.N. peacekeeping. Since you have had a few months to settle into your role as head of the bureau and to manage our complex relationship with the U.N. you already know the challenges you face.

The United Nations is an imperfect body, but over 60 years after its founding, it is still the only multilateral body in the world in which all 192 countries can consult over the most important issues of our time—war and peace, poverty and development issues, HIV/AIDS and malaria, and climate change among other topics. Next week the United Nations General Assembly will begin in New York. I look forward to hearing the administration's priorities for this important session.

Mr. Reynolds, you are currently serving as acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs. You too are well-acquainted with your duties—to serve as the principal advisor to the Secretary of State on legislative matters and as the Department's principal liaison with Congress.

If confirmed, your long service as a professional staff member in the U.S. Congress will serve you well as you manage this important relationship.

Mr. Lebedev, you have been nominated to serve as Representative of the United States to the U.N. for Management and Reform as well as to serve as Alternate Representative to the General Assembly. If confirmed you would become the point person in trying to achieve an important, but thus far elusive, United States priority: reform at the U.N.

Thanks to all three of you for testifying today and for your willingness to serve our country in these important positions within the Department of State.

Mr. Hook, we have got this coming session that is going to open up in another week. Senator Corker and I will be representatives of this committee up there in New York. What do you think are the top priorities for the United States at this session?

Mr. HOOK. We are very pleased that you are going to be representing the United States as delegates for the 63rd General Assembly. This will be President Bush's last opportunity at the GA. It will also be Secretary Rice's last opportunity.

So it is going to be a little bit of an opportunity to take stock in terms of all the progress that I think we have made at the United Nations in a range of issues. When you look at advancing freedom and democracy, curbing nonproliferation, humanitarian assistance, addressing threats to international peace and security, protecting human rights, these are all categories I think where we have made a lot of progress over the last 7 or 8 years.

And for the 63rd General Assembly, we will be certainly working on a number of resolutions in the General Assembly that would speak to human rights abuses that are taking place around the world. Some of them will be introduced by the United States. Some will be introduced by other countries. We did do an Iran resolution last year to shine a spotlight on the human rights abuses that are taking place there. That only passed out of the third committee by one vote.

One of the things that I have been working on—and I am making it a priority for this General Assembly—is changing the rate of voting coincidence among countries with respect to the United States. In 2002, it was around 30 percent, and now it is around 18. I just made a trip down to Central America and met with a number of foreign ministers. These are countries where we have very strong bilateral ties, and yet when we go into the United Nations, somehow there are more disagreements than there are agreements on some of these General Assembly votes which, when I read it, did not make a lot of sense to me because we agree in so many areas, the areas that I just talked about.

And so I am going to be making a focused effort on trying to change some of the voting outcomes in the General Assembly. It is not acceptable to me, I think, for us to have—at the United Nations where we play a leadership role, in overall voting in the GA, we are only at 18 percent voting coincidence with the United States. I think that number needs to improve. And that is something which I will be looking at across the board if we are doing resolutions on Iran or Zimbabwe. I am sure there will be thematic resolutions. I would like to see our voting improve in the General Assembly.

I do know that during the time that you are up there, Burkina Faso will be doing a Security Council meeting, a thematic debate on mediation and settlement of conflicts. That will be on Tuesday when the President addresses the General Assembly. It is sort of helpful for Burkina Faso because they happen to be presiding over the Security Council at the time when all the heads of state are in town. And so I think there will be some focus on that issue.

But that is broadly what I am hoping to focus on in the 63rd.

Senator NELSON. Have you thought about what you ought to do with the U.N. peacekeeping force in Haiti, given the fact that Haiti has been racked by these recent hurricanes?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, after we had our hearing in July, I went and visited Haiti. I was there 2 weeks ago and I met with the head of MINUSTAH, Heddi Annabi, whom I knew when I served up in New York at the U.S. mission. I think MINUSTAH is doing a very good job. In the last 2 years, it had very good leadership under Mullet, and now under Heddi Annabi who was the number two official in DPKO, he is now heading up MINUSTAH. And I met at length with Heddi, and he briefed me on sort of some

of the strengths and weaknesses of MINUSTAH. But I think on balance, I think we are seeing more strengths than weaknesses.

There is no doubt in my mind, in light of the devastation of three hurricanes and a tropical storm, that they are stretched. I did ask them, because we have a mandate renewal coming up for MINUSTAH, if they would like to see any change in their mandate, and they do not want to see any change.

Now, in light of these hurricanes, which have really been devastating, I will be getting back in touch with him. I do not want to sort of get in the way of him doing his job, but I think when things settle down a little bit, I will be in touch with Mr. Annabi to ask him, in light of the hurricanes, do we need to enhance the mandate to help it accomplish its duties a little more effectively.

When I was in Haiti—actually I was there the day that Hurricane Gustav hit and had to be evacuated through the Dominican Republic. But I had said before leaving that I thought MINUSTAH was expanding the space for political progress and economic development. Safety in the hierarchy of human needs is first, and it also happens to be the prerequisite for economic development. And I think MINUSTAH is doing a good job of that. It is then important for the government to take advantage of this space that I think MINUSTAH is helping to expand so that we can make some progress, I think, on economic development.

Senator NELSON. Were you able to travel freely throughout Cite Soleil?

Mr. HOOK. Cite Soleil I was planning on visiting on Tuesday, and that is when the hurricane hit, and so it was on my schedule but we ended up having to cancel it. There was not going to be any problem with traveling freely through the city. There were no security concerns raised.

Senator NELSON. What about the vetting of the national police? That started about 2 years ago trying to expel the corrupt. What do you observe there?

Mr. HOOK. Well, I think they are doing, I think, good work on—you have corruption issues and you have human rights abuses. And I believe that MINUSTAH is doing a good job of changing both categories. And they are graduating more police from their training programs. I saw a number of the police while I was in Haiti. I met with the U.N. police chief, who I think is doing a very good job. I think the head of the police operation and then the general I met with, the general of MINUSTAH—I was astonished at how well they worked together. They are a great team. And I left feeling fairly inspired about the work they are doing.

But you have been to Haiti and it just breaks your heart to see the kind of poverty and challenges they face, but I think we have the right people in place and I think they are doing a good job on policing. There is a lot more to do. We are trying to get to a goal of 14,000. That is the goal, to get to 14,000 police. You know, it is interesting in Haiti you have got a population about the size of New York City, and New York City has about 35,000 police. I think Haiti is somewhere around 9,000 or less. They are trying to get to a goal of about 14,000 under the U.N. training program. So I strongly encourage that because, again, it gets to this issue of cre-



ating more sort of safety and security so that then we can make progress in other places.

Senator NELSON. Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. I will follow on and welcome both of you. Thank you for your service.

And I would agree with you. The general who is heading up MINUSTAH in Haiti is most impressive. So we are speaking of something that I think in that particular specific regard is going well from the standpoint of the United Nations.

In general, though, as you look—and I realize I have no idea how long you guys will be in these positions, you know, 4 months, 5 months, maybe a long, long time. Who knows? So some of these questions may be fair and some unfair.

But as you look at what the U.N. does well and you look at what the U.N. does not so well, give me sort of an outline of those areas that you think they do an exceptionally good job and those that you think really are gross failings or need improvement.

Mr. HOOK. Thanks for your question, Senator.

I would probably break it down by agency. We often refer to it as “the U.N.,” this monolith, but it is, in fact, this organization. The org chart is really something to behold for the United Nations. But I think in some programs, especially the ones where our funding is voluntary, you see, I think, pretty effective work being done.

The World Food Program. We are the biggest donor to the World Food Program. They do a fantastic job of getting aid out the door and into the hands of people who need it.

The Food and Agriculture Organization does not have—I think they have had a lot of management problems. We think this food security—the crisis we are going through is a real chance for them to reform. We have been leading reform in the Food and Agriculture Organization.

On human rights, the Human Rights Council, deeply disappointing. We certainly did everything we could to create a body that would be worthy of its name. Now we have a body that is, in fact, curtailing I think its focus on a lot of human rights abuses that are occurring around the world, particularly in Cuba and Belarus.

The U.N. Security Council. I think the end of the cold war allowed for a great deal more cooperation on peacekeeping operations. We now have 20 around the world. At the end of the cold war, we did not have nearly that number. There is a 75 percent coupon people talk about when we have U.N. peacekeeping operations go out because we are able to do it—you know, if we send the military out, it is 75 percent sort of more expensive than if you would send a U.N. peacekeeping—because you are sharing the burden. And I think some peacekeeping operations have been successful. Others, as the chairman knows from our hearing, talking about the 60th anniversary of peacekeeping operations, some have been there for a very long time. But I think there have been successes in peacekeeping.

Today we have challenges in the Security Council. We think it is very important for the credibility of the Security Council to effectively address threats to peace and security. And I think that has been a mixed record.

Senator CORKER. I get the feeling in dealings with the United Nations, either being there or being in front of testimony here, that it is a really—it is more than a feeling. I think a fact. I mean, it is a place where change is very difficult to occur. I mean, the issues of transparency, of ethics.

I know that you have been there for a while in an assistant position. But what are the real obstacles there to causing the organization to handle itself in a way that is appropriate for all the donors and for those involved in the organization?

Mr. HOOK. We certainly use our contribution—we are the leading funder of the U.N., as you know. We try to leverage our financial support to effect the reforms that are necessary. I remember at the end of Oil for Food, Chairman Volcker's report talked in the U.N. about a culture of inaction, which is what you just sort of were referencing in the beginning of your remarks. It is a body of 192 member states, and progress can be grindingly slow.

I think the U.N., because of our leadership over the last 7 or 8 years, is improving on transparency and accountability. Our UNTAI initiative, which we launched just a couple of years ago, I think is helping. On a lot of these funds and programs, especially with UNDP, we need to see internal audit reports. There ought to be whistle-blower protection. There ought to be accounting standards which hew to sort of the highest possible standard.

Senator CORKER. So you ought to. And there are probably not many people who would disagree. So why is that not the case? Why is that not just the case tomorrow?

Mr. HOOK. Well, I have often said to some folks I have been discussing at the U.N. that we should not be having an argument about transparency and accountability. But the U.N. is a system that is very resistant to change, and we certainly do everything we can. I raise it at every opportunity in my meetings with U.N. officials.

But as I said, we are one member of 192. We are its leading funder. We leverage that as best we can, but much of it depends on the will of the body to change itself. And we cannot make it change itself. We can only sort of make the best arguments why it should, and when there is corruption in violation of U.N. rules, we shine a spotlight on it.

Senator CORKER. Is there any sense with this resistance to change? Let me go back and say that certainly we as an institution, just the way we operate here in Congress and just in our Federal Government, have not changed with the times enough to meet the needs. And I think we all realize that. But the U.N. seems to me to be continually, because of that lack of change, in many ways losing relevance as it relates to solving some of the major issues that we have. I wonder if you could give any editorial comment.

Mr. HOOK. Well, I have made exactly that point in my conversations, that in order for the United Nations to be credible and relevant in terms of meeting the very high obligations that the U.N. Charter imposes on it, it needs to be accountable and transparent to its member states. And some of the problems we have are with member states themselves who do not share our vision for reform.

I think Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon has got a commitment to reform. I think he is doing the very best he can. It is a very hard job pleasing 192 different member states.

Senator CORKER. Does the Secretary-General really have a position of power, or is it more of an anarchical kind of organization?

Mr. HOOK. Well, the funds and programs do report to the Secretary-General, but they have a certain independence which they protect robustly. And some of the challenges that we face are that the Secretary-General can agree with us, but then we also had to have that same conversation with funds and programs who may be in a different place than the Secretary-General. And in some cases, like I said, like the World Food Program, UNICEF, they are I think doing a very good job.

We have other organizations which we think have had enough of a history in terms of either not following the kinds of ethical standards that are necessary to maintain its credibility. It is very hard to get it to move. It is like sometimes it feels like turning a battleship, but I am committed to it.

Senator CORKER. I will let the chairman resume and I may resume after, or he may adjourn. I do not know what he is planning.

Senator NELSON. China and Russia are fueling the arms going into the Sudan, and I am getting ready to introduce a resolution to strengthen that arms embargo. What is going to be the action that the United States is going to take in the U.N. Security Council on the Sudan?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to pursue additional sanctions against Sudan not just sort of against the government, but against all the parties to the conflict.

When I was in New York advising a U.S. Ambassador, I had negotiated the Security Council resolution that imposed targeted sanctions against some individuals who are responsible for committing genocide or promoting hostilities.

The arms embargo is something which—you know, expanding the arms embargo could be a very effective tool. We also face a circumstance where some on the P5 engage in robust military trade with Sudan. So we need nine votes and no vetoes to pass a resolution that would impose an arms embargo.

We have an arms embargo on Sudan but it is not complete. It is partial. We all know that arms are getting into Darfur, so the U.N. arms embargo, the existing one, could very well be strengthened. Doing it in the Security Council I think will be a challenge in light of the military trade that some members of the council are engaging in.

Senator NELSON. Some of that P5 you are talking about is Russia and China.

Mr. HOOK. Yes.

Senator NELSON. What has been the impact of the International Criminal Court deciding to charge Bashir?

Mr. HOOK. The indictment referral, or at least the referral from Ocampo to the ICC, has actually had a very positive effect in terms of improving President Bashir's behavior. Right after the referral was made to the judges, suggesting an indictment, we saw enhanced cooperation in a number of areas.

We are not a party to the ICC, but many members of the council are. We think that from what I have heard from folks on the ground, that it is having a salutary effect. The indictments, if they are issued by the ICC judges—it may be some time before we see them. Ocampo made the referral. He made the recommendation, but we seen any indictments yet, only the recommendation that he be indicted for war crimes and genocide. But it has had a positive effect on the ground so far.

Senator NELSON. Well, that is good to hear.

The 2009 administration budget request underfunds the U.S. contribution to the U.N. by about \$600 million. So I know you are not the head of Office of Management and Budget, but I would like to know your opinion on how do we justify continuing to short change the peacekeeping budget while continuing to vote for additional peacekeeping missions in the U.N.?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, we want to continue to work with Congress to pay our bills in full and to meet our assessed contributions. You know, at this time last year, I do not think we could have predicted that UNMIH would cease to exist, nor could we have predicted that the operation in Georgia, UNOMIG, would be in the kind of limbo that we are experiencing in terms of the conflict in Georgia. It is a very dynamic set of circumstances that we have to assess. We look at it. Obviously, as you know, it is considered in the context of the overall budget, and we do the best we can without the benefit of a crystal ball and also trying to do this in the context of the larger budget. But I certainly recognize the concern and we do want to pay our bills in full, do what we can to meet our obligations.

Senator NELSON. Well, I want to continue to work with you on that because basically the next President is going to have to straighten out this inconsistency.

Senator CORKER. Because you brought it up and the currency of the issue, I was just in Georgia a couple weekends ago looking at what had happened in Gori and some of the other places that talk about the status of what we are doing in Abkhazia and with the U.N. and how you see that evolving with the present conflict.

Mr. HOOK. The U.N.'s role on this has been fairly limited so far. In Georgia, we have about 130 or so monitors that are part of the U.N. We have some police who are there, as well. They are there to monitor the cease-fire in Abkhazia. There are no U.N. officials in South Ossetia. And so to date the U.N.'s role has been limited.

I know that we have been working with the OSCE. We have 28 monitors who are in Georgia. Eight of them have been able to get into South Ossetia. We are looking to have a total of 100 OSCE monitors. The EU looks like it is going to be deploying 200 monitors into Georgia.

The real key is going to get Russia to permit the kind of access that is necessary into South Ossetia and Abkhazia. And Russia needs to meet its obligation to withdraw its forces prior to their deployment on August 7, and once the Russian forces withdraw, you then, I think, can have an opportunity for monitors or observers or peacekeepers to be in South Ossetia and Abkhazia. But for the time being, we actually have not even reached that issue because

of the difficulty of getting these monitors into South Ossetia and Abkhazia.

The 130 U.N. observers that I spoke of in Abkhazia are going to be up for renewal on October 15, and that will be, I think, an important vote because Russia has voted in favor of all of the UNOMIG resolutions, and all of those resolutions affirm the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia. And it is something that we will insist on.

And so we are in discussions up in New York looking ahead to the October 15 renewal to see whether it is possible to renew it, to see if Russia is going to vote in favor of it. We certainly hope they do. We would like to see, I think for now anyway—I know circumstances are changing daily, but we would like to see the U.N. stay in Abkhazia.

Senator CORKER. Mr. Chairman, I can tell by the body language we may be coming to a close in this hearing. I wondered if Mr. Lebedev or Mr. Reynolds wanted to say something since there is a microphone in front of them, and I just feel like there may be some family members who might have joined—

Senator NELSON. Senator Corker, I have not gotten to them.

Senator CORKER. Okay. [Laughter.]

I may have sensed incorrectly.

Senator NELSON. You have.

Senator CORKER. All right.

Senator NELSON. Mr. Reynolds, you are the acting Assistant Secretary now. One of the things that you ought to be preparing for is a swift confirmation process for the upcoming high-level appointees in the Department of State for the next President. So tell me what you are doing to set that in motion.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the key objectives that we are looking at, particularly in the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, is a very smooth and successful and professional transition, very akin to perhaps—we have all watched the Olympics recently. It is a relay race, and if confirmed, I hope to be the runner behind that is passing a baton to a new runner who will run very strong, as well. And part of that is winning that race and getting a lot of new high-level nominees confirmed, for example.

We have already started the process in the Bureau of Legislative Affairs on a couple of grounds. Number one, if confirmed, we will have a new Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary who is actually here today, Ambassador Mike Polt, who has served in the bureau before and has actually done quite a few transitions, moved the embassy in Bonn to Berlin, so is quite familiar with change and working that, as well. So we have started that process and are part of a team in the building at the Department as a whole that is working to make sure that there is a smooth transition as some individuals leave and new ones come in.

Within the bureau itself, we are also in the process of upgrading all of our databases, both hardware and software, to take us from the 20th century into the 21st century, which will very much help in that process in terms of doing not only research for the new nominees, but also perhaps answering the inquiries and the questions from the committee a bit faster as well.

Senator NELSON. Are you past this nonsense of partisanship so that no matter who the next administration is, that you are going to try to see a smooth hand-off?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Sir, our objective is to have a very smooth, successful, and professional hand-off of the baton. From my own personal experience, I have done two transitions myself here on the Hill with Members who are not returning, and it was their opponent who actually won. And I am proud to say that in both cases I was publicly acknowledged for having done a good job of making sure the constituents of those offices were not left behind and that projects and so on for those districts were handed over in a way that kept that success going, and if confirmed, I would intend to do the very same here at the Department.

Senator NELSON. Well, generally State and Defense are pretty good in the hand-off. It has been the nonsense in the White House that we have seen in going from one administration to the next that needs to stop. And that is why I asked the question.

Tell me, as you look back on lessons learned from the passport debacle in 2007, particularly with regard to the lack of communication between the Congress and the State Department—and that lack of information was coming from the State Department to the Congress because we were here crying for action in this debacle—what are the lessons learned?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Well, Mr. Chairman, there were a number of internal lessons learned by the Bureau of Consular Affairs, and I would have to defer to my colleagues there to describe to you some of the technical parts of—

Senator NELSON. I am talking about the congressional relations, your bailiwick.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But in terms of communications, we learned very quickly, sir, being at the front lines of the interaction with Congress to try and get more information to the Hill much faster and in a much more comprehensive way. While the bureau is small, we could have deployed and should and will in the future deploy more individuals in that process.

One of the things that would be very helpful that helped us very much in the House of Representatives and we would like to have here in the Senate is a liaison office right here. A lot of the work that is done, particularly with passports and consular issues, is done by our liaison office for the Hill which resides presently in the Rayburn Building. While the workload has gone up considerably—and I think that has really helped the communications—unfortunately, we have seen the percentages of Senate inquiries go way down. So 80 percent of the workload is now with the House.

We have already engaged in some very positive discussions with the Senate Rules Committee about trying to get space here. We appreciate that it is a cyclical process, so we kind of have to wait until the end of the Senate when you have the movements happening to be able to get a facility here in the Dirksen or in the Russell Building or in the Hart Building. But we think that would also be a very, very, very helpful way to keep in touch, not only with the Senators but with your staff, on a daily—hourly basis.

Senator NELSON. Why has there been one in the House and not in the Senate in the past?

Mr. REYNOLDS. When it was originally established, if I recall from my predecessors, both chambers were approached. At the time, there just physically was not space available in the Senate. In the House, the House Administration Committee actually carved out and put some new walls in part what was the VA liaison office. So we have a very small space in the Rayburn Building that was literally carved out of a liaison office.

Since that time, we have been approaching the Senate and, as I said, I personally had very good conversations with Chairwoman Feinstein's staff director about the need and the importance of having an office space here. And they have agreed with that need, and we hope when the Senate does its changes of office space and so on, that we will be accommodated.

Senator NELSON. When Congressman Dreier introduced you, he was talking about your role in the past where you served as part of the staff to the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Correct, sir. I spent 18 years here in the House and the Senate.

Senator NELSON. And what was that last position that you served in?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The last position was staff director of the House Committee on Rules.

Senator NELSON. Well, then you understand. You ought to be sensitive to the fact that we need to have this communication, and one of you all mentioned—I think it was Dreier—about what is Article I of the Constitution. At times, I do not think we have had that in the past. And we need to change that. So it sounds like that you are someone very suitable by your background to understand the sensitivities for keeping the communication going between these two branches of Government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If confirmed, I would intend to very much do that. Having been one of the back-benchers, actually right behind you, sir, at times with this committee, firing some of those same questions from the Article I perspective, I certainly appreciate that need and would like to strengthen it and build a better relationship.

Senator NELSON. Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. I will ask one last question, and my body language may indicate I am leaving.

Senator NELSON. I see that you are trying to hurry this hearing up.

Senator CORKER. I think we have three very, very qualified people that we are fortunate to have going into these positions.

Mr. Lebedev, some of the management reforms we were talking about earlier with Mr. Hook—I understand there is sort of a dynamic that exists between the developed countries and the undeveloped countries as it relates to those reforms and creates the sort of paralysis that exists regarding those. Could you enlighten us a little bit as it relates to those?

Mr. LEBEDEV. Well, Senator, I think going back to your earlier conversation with Mr. Hook on why is there inertia within the institution, what is the reluctance to change, to use Senator Robb's expression, I think you have hit upon it. There is a different set of perspectives that are held by a community of developing coun-

tries, of whom there are many, and a community of the industrialized states, of whom there are few.

The developing world tends to see the United Nations as a unique opportunity for them to exert influence, to have a voice that they do not normally have on a bilateral basis. Many are small, poor countries who, rightly or wrongly, perceive that they do not have standing in many courts. This is a large court that was, in fact, designed to give them a voice. And in exercising that voice, they see or perceive, rightly or wrongly, any number of the initiatives under the rubric of reform, as we call them, as steps taken by that industrialized community to limit their influence, to possibly silence their voice, to take away their ability to do the things that they believe they can only do within the United Nations. So at the root of much of this is that dynamic and is that perception or that misperception, but regardless, it is one that, to your earlier point, creates a context in which change is greeted cautiously.

Senator CORKER. And are there ways to bridge that so that the voices are still heard and yet the organization itself evolves to where it is far more relevant and being effective in some of the issues that it deals with?

Mr. LEBEDEV. Well, I would argue, as I suspect this committee would argue and has argued in the past, that the reforms that the United States has put forward over the last several years in the transparency area, with respect to accountability, all of the things that we regard as relatively conventional mechanisms of good governance, whether you are in the public or the private sector, we believe that, if instituted, these concepts make the institution more effective and efficient. Very simply. And we would hope that with our own nudging, our own promotion, the energies that we put into bring these into a state of activity within the U.N. will ultimately be seen as not impeding those voices, but as ultimately strengthening the institution in which they have so much faith.

So we believe that these are not just U.S. ideas that give us some advantage. We are the largest single shareholder in this company, and we have, in effect, a fiduciary duty, like any sizable shareholder, to make it the most efficient, the most effective enterprise around. When we do that, when we accomplish that set of objectives, I think these other nations who might be skeptical right now will also see that the enterprise at large is a far more effective institution for their interests as well as ours.

Senator CORKER. Mr. Chairman.

Senator NELSON. What kind of reform do you want to see in the U.N. before inauguration day, January 20?

Mr. LEBEDEV. Senator, I will borrow from Mr. Reynolds' metaphor of the relay race. Things move slowly at the U.N., but progress can be made in increments. And what I would certainly hope to address in the fall and for whatever period of time we have beyond that—several initiatives to move them down that path.

We have got a couple of things that are of serious concern in the reform arena. OIOS, which is their inspector general, terribly important in any institution where you are going to have valid and credible oversight. OIOS has been in existence since about 1994. It has, over that period of time, grown in stature and accomplishment. It is doing pretty good work. However, for whatever set of



reasons, it is not financially independent. It has never been given enough resources to give it the latitude to explore every area that needs exploration, to kick every tire that needs to be kicked, to the point that when they will identify a target investigation, in many instances they do not have the funding to permit them to do it, and they must go to the institution that, in fact, they wish to investigate to see if they will help fund this initiative. And you and I can well imagine that on many instances, the target of the investigation just is going to come up a little short on that funding. We need to continue to focus on that deficiency and see if we can create that financial independence within that enterprise.

Also in the OIOS arena, which is in my view as an old IG, if you will, a centerpiece of any sort of reform initiative in any institution, is the fact that the Secretary-General last year made a very curious proposition, and that proposition was that the investigations function, now housed in OIOS, should be removed and it should be decentralized so that everybody in the various funds and programs that Mr. Hook was referring to should have their own IG, so to speak. They do not, however, have any of the expertise. They do not have any of the separational procedures to maintain an integrity on a decentralized basis.

We worry that if you take the ability to investigate away from investigators, you have not got much left. And rather than building the stature and credibility and effectiveness of OIOS, those two conditions alone, the absence of an independent financial base and the potential loss of its investigation function, can do severe damage to its credibility and set back, very frankly, the ability of the institution to usefully oversee its own initiatives. So OIOS, Mr. Chairman, is one area where we think we can incrementally move that ball down the field.

I will also take some time to address the matter of ethics reform. As this committee knows, the U.N. Ethics Committee has been—the ethics initiatives have been decentralized so that there are ethics offices throughout the U.N., throughout the funds and programs. One of the things that is going on right now is the initiative by the U.N. Ethics Committee or the Ethics Office to create a set of uniform standards for all of these ethics operations. I think it is in our interest to continue to promote a very, very rigorous set of standards that should be commonly applied throughout the institution. Again, I see this as a short-term initiative. I see it as something that we can accomplish during the fall session.

Those are three things that are top of mind, Mr. Chairman.

Senator NELSON. You said that the Secretary-General wants to decentralize. Do I understand your answer that you do not think that that would be a good move?

Mr. LEBEDEV. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Senator NELSON. So what do we need to do to get the Secretary-General to support the increased funding, which was your first suggestion?

Mr. LEBEDEV. I think we have to continue to build those coalitions of like-minded member states to bring the point home that the world watches this institution every day, and over recent years, they have had some bad moments in terms of public standing and credibility by the events that this committee is well aware.

To take steps like this, sends a very bad signal to the other members and to the public and to large investors like us that we are not taking this institution in the right direction. And that is of concern to us because we value the institution. This is an institution in which we place great faith and great hope, and we ask it to do many, many things. And we know that because we fund it at a very severe level. So we think that we will continue to rally a community of interested parties to make the point that this is not in the long-term interests of this institution.

Senator NELSON. Do you plan personally to go talk to the staff of the Secretary-General about this?

Mr. LEBEDEV. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

Senator NELSON. I want to visit with you up there.

Tell me what you think about transparency in the peacekeeping operations.

Mr. LEBEDEV. Well, I think we have made, over the last couple of years since Secretary-General Annan in, I think, 2003 brought into the open the issues of the sexual abuse and exploitation problems that have plagued the peacekeeping apparatus—I think over time that, followed by Prince Zaid's call for reform, and the fact that the members, in fact, embraced many, many reforms, I think those sets of steps that have brought us down to today have created a transparency within and around the peacekeeping operations. As this committee knows, we have now a number of action steps that are open and are well known with respect to the training of peacekeepers, whether it is things called conduct and discipline teams and also train peacekeepers once in country and do a very good job of informing local populations of the rules and the expectations with respect to those peacekeepers.

So I think at some level, we can say that there is clearly greater transparency, and we are pleased with the progress to date under the rubric of prevention of that continuing problem of sexual abuse and exploitation. I think it is a longer conversation, Mr. Chairman, that we might have about the open question of punishment and what happens when you do have an event and what are the appropriate follow-ons that occur.

Senator NELSON. Are you a chemist?

Mr. LEBEDEV. I am not. My father was a chemist, and when I assumed the position to lead the Chemistry Council, he was both pleased and appalled. [Laughter.]

Senator NELSON. And what had you done before that?

Mr. LEBEDEV. Early in my career when I came to Washington, I worked at AID. I worked at the White House. Then I had the good fortune to be the youngest Deputy Assistant Secretary of State under Dr. Kissinger. I also served as the Assistant Inspector General for Foreign Assistance at the State Department, a post that no longer exists but had an oversight function of foreign military assistance, aid, that sort of thing. And I went into the private sector for 10 years, Senator, was a senior partner in a management consulting firm, but had a very large international portfolio and worked with a variety of multilateral institutions and the State Department as well, and then went into the trade association world where I was a COO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, also headed up international policy in that institution, CFO as the chief finan-

cial officer at the American Trucking Association, and the CEO at the American Chemistry Council. I currently am the chairman of the Center for International Private Enterprise, which is one of the four institutes of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Senator NELSON. Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. I think we have had a great hearing, and I think we have some folks that I look forward to working with when both of you and I begin our work at the United Nations this year. I hope that not only will you continue to focus on the things that you have talked about today in these hearings, and I hope that that is for a long enough time for you all to have the kind of impact you want to have. At the same time, I ask you that as we come and as we become more involved in the United Nations, that you also help us in ways that you see fit and help us to have the kind of impact I think each us want to have.

But we thank you and we thank your families. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, if they would like to introduce their families, if they are here. It typically occurs. If not, I want to thank you for your service, for offering yourself, and certainly look forward to working with you.

Senator NELSON. The record will duly note that the family members that I have already met are here.

And if there are no other questions, the meeting is adjourned.  
[Whereupon, at 10:00 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

