

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

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

# Report of Inspection

## Office of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary

Report Number ISP-I-05-42, September 2005

### ~~IMPORTANT NOTICE~~

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

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY JUDGMENTS .....	1
CONTEXT .....	3
EXECUTIVE DIRECTION .....	5
POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION .....	11
SELECTION OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER TO THE SECRETARY .....	19
RESOURCES MANAGEMENT .....	21
Table 1: STAS Resources, FY 2003-2007 .....	21
MANAGEMENT CONTROLS .....	25
FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS .....	29
INFORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS .....	33
PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS .....	37
ABBREVIATIONS .....	39
APPENDIX: CABLE ANNOUNCING NEW SCIENCE POLICY .....	41

## KEY JUDGMENTS

- The Department's decision five years ago to reinvigorate the role of science and technology in American foreign policy was warranted. In conjunction with the decision, the Department established the position of Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary (STAS) to assure that the Department is cognizant of science resources and can draw upon the American scientific community for advice and counsel.
- Reflecting its advisory function, the Department limited the office to an adviser and two support personnel and made clear that the authorizing legislation requires that STAS coordinate with, but not supplant, existing diplomatic functions.
- The re-creation of the deputy assistant secretary for science position in the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES) in 2000 signaled the Department's commitment to maintaining the authority for science programs and negotiations in that bureau.
- A lack of clarity about the respective roles and responsibilities of OES and STAS leads to competition and confusion. The Department must define the roles, responsibilities, authority, and accountability of the respective entities involved in science and technology.
- STAS has expanded some activities, such as the science fellows program, and created several innovative programs, but it is too small an office to manage so many complex initiatives. There should be a mechanism to evaluate its initiatives, manage donated funds, and eventually transfer the projects to appropriate, willing operational bureaus.
- Two respected scientists have led STAS, but there is no specific term for the job. With the arrival of a new Secretary of State, the time is right for developing a more thorough, transparent, and efficacious process for finding and appointing suitable candidates for this prestigious, visible position.

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

## CONTEXT

Science, technology, and health issues are at the forefront of America's international agenda,<sup>1</sup> and the Department's diplomatic activities address such scientific topics as nuclear nonproliferation, civilian use of outer space, population growth, adequate and safe food supply, climate change, disease, energy resources, and technological competitiveness. In 1998, the Department asked the National Research Council (NRC)<sup>2</sup> for suggestions on these matters, and the NRC issued a report recommending the establishment of a science and technology (S&T) adviser to the Secretary of State. Congress responded by directing, in the Department's FY 2000 budget authorization, that such a position be established. Then-Secretary of State Madeleine Albright created the job and appointed a distinguished scientist with Washington experience to fill it. At the same time, Secretary Albright also announced a series of new directions in science policy for the Department. (The text of the Secretary's May 15, 2000, announcement of the new policy is in the appendix of this report.)

Besides calling for appointment of a science adviser, the NRC report said that effective foreign policy must reflect a comprehensive approach within the Department to integrating science, technology, and health competence into policy and program development. The NRC report suggested that the Department increase its awareness of the science and technology considerations in foreign policy; improve its science, technology, and health resources; develop mechanisms to reach out to the American science, technology, and health communities for expertise and support; and find ways to draw on other departments and agencies to carry out the science, technology, and health activities they are best equipped to address.

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Pervasive Role of Science, Technology, and Health in Foreign Policy: Imperatives for the Department of State," Committee on Science, Technology and Health Aspects of the Foreign Policy Agenda of the United States, Office of International Affairs, National Research Council, 1999. Published by National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

<sup>2</sup>The NRC was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the S&T community with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. It is the principal operating agency of the Academy for providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities.

The report emphasized the need for the Secretary of State's leadership, a strengthened organizational structure operating under the guidance of an under secretary, and a motivated and well-informed workforce.

Department officials, many leaders of science-oriented agencies in Washington, and representatives of the science and technology community told the Office of Inspector General (OIG) that, despite the establishment of the STAS office, the Department has not made fundamental change regarding increased attention to science. These sources said the Department has ignored or poorly implemented many of the other NRC recommendations, and OIG agrees.

OIG's review of STAS, coming five years after the creation of the office, assessed the effectiveness of the office and recommended improvements. Any consideration of the science adviser to the Secretary's role must take into account the Assistant Secretary for OES's responsibility to "formulate and implement policies and proposals relating to the environmental, marine, health, scientific, and technological aspects of U.S. foreign policy."<sup>3</sup> OIG reviewed OES concurrently with STAS.

---

<sup>3</sup>See 1 FAM 541.1b.

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTION

The single most visible reaction to the science community's desire for science and technology to have a greater role in the Department was the Secretary's establishment of the adviser position.<sup>4</sup> Since 2000, two distinguished scientists have served as the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, but the Department still has not clearly defined the roles, responsibilities, accountability, and authority of STAS.

The original position description for the STAS directly overlaps with the mandate for OES. The STAS office has accumulated a talented team of a dozen or more non-direct-hire employees in addition to its three authorized staff, but their authorities and responsibilities are unclear and change frequently. The current adviser has developed a number of programs to meld science with diplomacy and says he raised over \$9 million for these programs in 15 months. The projects vary in effectiveness and in how well the Department is aware of them. Whether these programs will or should continue is uncertain since there are no objective means to evaluate them and the operational bureaus have not been convinced to take ownership.

The conflation of roles and responsibilities between OES and STAS and the adviser himself causes confusion and complaints, domestically and overseas. The adviser's position description says, among other things, that he will "represent the Department with national and international scientific communities..." However, the adviser's own core objectives, as stated in the STAS bureau performance plan (BPP) for 2006, expand this mission to include "building partnerships with the

---

<sup>4</sup>22 U.S.C. section 2651a provides that:

(a) Designation.--The Secretary of State shall designate a senior-level official of the Department of State as the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary of State (in this section referred to as the "Adviser"). The Adviser shall have substantial experience in the area of science and technology. The Adviser shall report to the Secretary of State through the appropriate Under Secretary of State.

(b) Duties.--The Adviser shall--

- (1) advise the Secretary of State, through the appropriate Under Secretary of State, on international science and technology matters affecting the foreign policy of the United States; and
- (2) perform such duties, exercise such powers, and have such rank and status as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.

outside S&T [scientific and technological] community, including the defense and intelligence communities in the U.S., but also with partners abroad and in foreign embassies in Washington." The BPP also says the adviser will be "leading directly...in international S&T cooperation and related policy developments."

Whatever the intention, when an adviser to the Secretary of State meets with foreign government officials, the subjects the adviser raises, the adviser's implicit or explicit support for concepts, and the adviser's statements are all likely to be seen as deliberate policy initiatives by the Department, if not the entire U.S. government. According to several accounts, Department principals have been surprised to learn from foreign governments of undertakings or commitments the adviser was perceived to have initiated without their knowledge. Responding to complaints from other agencies and offices, Department officials have asked the adviser to share his travel plans in advance with OES and the Under Secretary for Global Affairs (G). In OIG's view, this is only a partial solution to the crossed lines of authority that arise from STAS's direct involvement in matters with policy implications.

According to 1 FAM-541.1e, OES represents the Department in international negotiations and on interagency policy groups and committees regarding matters within OES's purview. Only one entity should negotiate and conclude bilateral and multilateral agreements in the areas of environment, science, technology, health, and the oceans.

It is equally important to preserve the Science and Technology Adviser's access to the Secretary and senior policy makers, such as the Deputy Secretary and the Under Secretary for Global Affairs. As has been done for other special advisers and Ambassadors-at-large, the Department must enable the Science and Technology Adviser to offer the Secretary original ideas and views that differ from what the Department's bureaucracy puts forward.

**Recommendation 1:** The Under Secretary for Global Affairs, in coordination with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should propose a revised position description that specifies more distinctly the role, responsibility, authority, and accountability of the adviser. The position description should specify that the adviser receives policy direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs and the Under Secretary for Global Affairs, coordinates with the bureau on all areas of activity having foreign policy implications, and obtains administrative and programmatic support from the bureau. (Action: G, in coordination with STAS and OES)

The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary says his primary objective is "getting more science into [the Department of] State." The adviser has been helpful - even tireless - in encouraging the Department's offices to find appropriate roles for short-term fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and for professional science society grantees and a new category of privately-funded senior academic advisers called Jefferson Science Fellows. Under such a win-win situation the fellows gain from being able to observe and participate in the melding of science and public policy, and the Department makes use of their scientific training, professional contacts, and distinct approaches. The engagement of STAS in the scientific community promoted these programs within that community, driving the selection and placement process and mentoring fellows while in Washington. STAS is not, however, well equipped to manage these programs administratively, especially as the fellowships grow in number.

In addition, there is no consensus on the place of science in the Department. Some say the Department does not need additional in-house scientific assistance. In fact, many federal officials, within and outside of the Department, believe that the Department and OES can gain any scientific assistance it needs from existing specialized federal agencies, such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Agriculture. This had been the traditional paradigm for the nexus of science and foreign affairs, and those who take this view believe it is foolish to imagine the Department could develop its own scientific capacity or channel even a small part of the nation's vast storehouse of scientific knowledge through a small, unique adviser's office.

Indeed, to remain an "honest broker" in assembling U.S. positions on international science issues, many in the Washington policy community see it as wrong for the Department to have its own in-house scientific expertise. In this view, the OES subject specialists should be facilitating contact between the Department and the domestic science community and STAS should follow the OES lead in this aspect of the Department's interaction with the official domestic science community, just as it must take direction in foreign policy issues.

The STAS FY 2006 BPP states that a core objective is "augmenting the S&T literacy and capacity of the Department by increasing the number of scientists both in the Foreign Service and civil service ranks..." Although there is no barrier to scientists joining the Department in the Civil or Foreign Service ranks since the Department welcomes those with S&T backgrounds, the Bureau of Human Resources (M/DGHR) has responsibility for determining the Department's personnel needs and recruiting and hiring.

Obviously the Department's effectiveness on any issue is only as good as its people and the quality of information available to them. It was clearly a goal when the STAS position was created to have the Science and Technology Adviser help the Director General of the Foreign Service and the Bureau of Human Resources ensure that the Department would have people in the right places with the right training, expertise, and information to provide strong science-related leadership. At a minimum, all Foreign and Civil Service personnel must know how science can inform our policy, where to go for this expertise, and how to make sure the expertise is incorporated in policy formulation and execution.

The S&T adviser should work closely with, but not attempt to supplant, the Director General of the Foreign Service in this effort.

**Recommendation 2:** The Director General of the Foreign Service, in consultation with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should include in the Department's overall strategic recruitment plan specific activities aimed at potential candidates having backgrounds in the sciences. (Action: M/DGHR, in coordination with STAS)

**Recommendation 3:** The Science and Technology Adviser's office should also assist the Office of Recruitment, Examination and Employment of the Bureau of Human Resources in updating recruitment documents targeting those with scientific backgrounds. (Action: STAS, in coordination with M/DGHR)

**Recommendation 4:** The Science and Technology Adviser's office should eliminate from its own bureau performance plan and other planning documents references to a role in increasing the number of scientists in the Civil and Foreign Service ranks. (Action: STAS)

There is a particularly useful role for STAS in explaining to the American science community the foreign policy environment and the Department's role in that environment. As the adviser told OIG, many in the academic and corporate science communities continually underestimate the complexity of the foreign policy, legal, and practical factors affecting issues, and do not understand how, for instance, a graduate student's visa may become caught up in diplomatic or security considerations. The adviser did an enormous service to the Department and the nation when - through his public appearances, writings, and contacts - he helped this influential audience better understand such matters as the policy process governing visa issuance for foreign scientists.

Providing S&T advice to the Secretary is, surprisingly, only the third-ranked goal in the STAS BPP, although OIG believes having a senior, respected scientist provide advice and counsel to the Secretary and to policymaking under secretaries and operational assistant secretaries is invaluable. The current adviser has helped the Department and the Department of Energy in their negotiations with European Union and Japanese partners on the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor decision. The adviser has also made his views heard on visa policy questions, and offered ideas for retraining Iraqi scientists who had been involved in weapons programs.

An adviser from the outside, however, can only win the confidence and attention of these busy officials through assiduous personal effort. It is as important to apply S&T knowledge to the Department's agenda as it is to turn the Department's attention to future S&T issues. The adviser needs to be present when foreign policy is discussed and decisions are developed, but an extensive travel schedule has kept the current adviser away from Washington for much of the past year.

Although this travel enabled him to engage foreign officials and scientists and American science organizations on behalf of the Department, such outreach came at the expense of his primary objective.

Indeed, science still does not get much attention in the Department. For a subject so interwoven in the Department's work and seen as a national core strength, science gets little mention in the Department's basic priority setting documents. There are, for example, only four references to "science" in the Department's strategic plan; one in regard to promoting agricultural development in the section on Economic Prosperity and Security, one in reference to curbing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and two on the role of science in offering "hope and answers" and promoting science and technology cooperation. There are no references to the importance of developing greater awareness of science and technology issues among foreign policy professionals. The senior science adviser to another cabinet-level federal department estimates that science generates half of America's prosperity. Science demonstrably attracts the majority of foreign graduate students to U.S. universities and generates admiration for American achievements worldwide. The question, therefore, is why does S&T not have a more prominent role in Department planning?

## POLICY AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The science and technology adviser was supposed to be a senior-level individual who would help develop U.S. foreign policy on emerging, global, science-based issues with potential impact on the international community and U.S. interests. The incumbent adviser has broad authority to consult, coordinate, and advise, but he directly supervises only a secretary and a staff officer.

### Staffing

Although the adviser directly supervises only two employees, the OES/EX Domestic Staffing Pattern shows six positions in the office and the STAS telephone list shows 14 people working there, including a Y-tour Foreign Service officer<sup>5</sup>, an over-complement Senior Executive Service employee, detailees from other agencies, AAAS fellows, and interns. As STAS' own BPP notes, this "creative staffing" has enabled the office to take on many initiatives. OIG believes this is not sustainable. STAS admits that the former Deputy Secretary and the Chief Financial Officer rebuffed repeated requests for additional full-time equivalent (FTE) positions. Furthermore, M/DGHR and the Bureau of Resource Management (RM) told OIG they foresee no enlargement of the STAS office.

Many current and previous STAS employees, as well as Department observers, believe STAS is over-committed and not well managed. As one put it, "It's like watching someone you know can safely juggle five balls at once, but you're watching him juggle ten. You hold your breath, knowing it can't last." Others might say that STAS accomplishes amazing feats against all odds. In either case, STAS is over-reaching.

---

<sup>5</sup>"Y tour" is a short-term Foreign Service position established by a bureau, usually for a specific, one-time task.

The adviser initiated, but did not follow through on, several promising projects such as an assessment of science issues facing the Department's geographic bureaus. In addition, current and previous STAS employees spoke of idiosyncratic management that distributes little responsibility, has unclear lines of authority, changes assignments frequently, undervalues employee talents, and rarely rewards achievement. Because the adviser himself is deeply involved in the conceptual and practical aspects of launching numerous initiatives, the STAS office must await his return from travel to get decisions and approvals, thus delaying activities.

The adviser's chief of staff is a career employee who has experience overseas and in the OES bureau. His broad contacts in Washington, the foreign S&T communities, and the Department make him an invaluable assistant to the adviser. Since STAS' inception he has consistently attempted to keep STAS focused on its core objectives. Nevertheless, the chief of staff cannot do it all. A hard-charging science adviser needs personal support, STAS programs need constant supervision, and a staff inexperienced in the Department needs leadership. The STAS office's efforts to make itself understood by and relevant to the geographic bureaus' core concerns would be assisted by the presence of at least one senior Foreign Service officer.

## Agenda

The current science and technology adviser has been praised for the extensive list of programs and initiatives he developed in the last 18 months. His FY 2006 BPP lists 17 accomplishments in the past year. He reports that, in less than a year and a half, he has raised a prodigious amount of money and in-kind contributions that are worth, by his estimate, at about \$9 million. The money has come from foundations, other government agencies, and the academic sector and will be used for several of these projects, enabling the projects to get off the ground without financial support from the Department. This independence from the Department also means, unfortunately, that some of the STAS projects are less well understood or appreciated by Department leadership.

**Recommendation 5:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary should develop an action agenda appropriate to the size of the office, as originally envisaged, and terminate program activities that detract from the purpose of the office as stated in the legislation authorizing the office of the Science and Technology Adviser. This agenda should intensively focus on increasing the science and technology knowledge of the regional bureaus and of Civil and Foreign Service employees, in keeping with the original concept of the office. (Action: STAS)

## Science Fellowships

There is general agreement that STAS has achieved its goal of increasing the Department's S&T knowledge by expanding the number of fellows from the AAAS and other professional society programs. This year approximately 40 science fellows are in 17 bureaus and offices of the Department. Their number is more than triple what it was in 2000, and they are dispersed to offices that never thought of employing a science fellow before.

With this expansion and dispersion, the program has lost some cohesion and comprehension. Fellows placed directly in the STAS office to support various STAS initiatives said they were not getting the professional experience they were promised in the recruitment process; indeed, a number left the STAS office early in their tenures and found new placements in the regional and functional bureaus. In other cases, fellows quit the program and left the Department.

Representatives of the Director General's office note that AAAS and similar fellowship programs have never been intended to function as Foreign Service recruiting devices or routes to Civil Service employment. Although the Department is delighted that some fellows have entered the Department's career ranks, the Director General's office said these employees should not come to Washington expecting follow-on jobs after their fellowship. Although the Department is pleased to have employees with backgrounds in science, technology, and engineering, the office said, there is no quota for scientists in the Department, nor should there be.

Science fellows serving in the bureaus generally report that they are usefully employed and believe that they are both contributing and growing professionally. Even the most successful, however, recall a difficult "settling in" period where both they and their host office had to learn how a science fellow could best contribute. Turmoil among the fellows in the STAS office, on the other hand, has affected the early positive perception of the fellows program in the science community. OIG believes the science adviser should take the lead in publicizing the program and recruiting applicants and in placing them in Department offices, coaching bureau leadership on how to use them, reenergizing the "fellows network," generating feedback, and mentoring the fellows. This is in keeping with the intent of the fellows program, and would enable the STAS to develop a cadre of fellow advisers throughout the Department. An employee in OES/STC has produced draft guidelines for managing these fellowships that would be a good starting point.

This has been the first year for the Jefferson Science Fellows - five senior scientists drawn from among outstanding academic department chairpersons, tenured professors, and accomplished researchers - who are attached to bureaus as consultants and resource persons. The Jefferson Science Fellows participate in one-year assignments at the Department and then serve as unpaid consultants for five years thereafter. Structured as a three-year pilot project, the Jefferson Fellows Program is made possible through \$4.6 million of university support and funding from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. The current adviser created and raised the money for the Jefferson Science Fellows program.

All of these fellows programs have their administrative difficulties, which would be alleviated by development and implementation of standard administrative procedures to guide the Department offices where STAS places fellows. STAS needs to continue to be involved in the selection process and, through intensive consultations with prospective bureaus, to ensure that both the fellows and bureaus appreciate what they are getting. Fellows programs such as AAAS and Jefferson will always be staff intensive, if only because they are always dealing with new-to-the-program people on both sides of the placement.

**Recommendation 6:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, should design and implement a standard personnel policy to handle programs for science fellows in the Department, provide guidance to the bureaus accepting science fellows, and direct ongoing orientation and mentoring activities for science fellows. (Action: STAS, in coordination with M/DGHR)

## Science Activities

The Science and Technology Adviser began and coordinated an effort by professional science societies and three universities (Tufts, George Washington, and Georgetown) to develop a comprehensive S&T curriculum for training and educating FSOs. The curriculum provides foundation training for all FSOs and lengthy specialization for environment, science, technology, and health officers, and includes elements that can be inserted into the existing Foreign Service Institute (FSI) courses. Although the proposal is sweeping, it seems to ignore the realities of FSI's training role and resources. Furthermore, STAS has failed to accept FSI's repeated invitations to develop a case-study teaching unit on the impact of S&T in the interagency process, something OIG believes STAS should do. In the meantime, the curriculum proposal needs to be evaluated by M/DGHR, OES, and the regional bureaus in light of the Department's needs and abilities. The proposal should move operationally from STAS to FSI, with STAS and OES retaining advisory roles. Training is one important factor in improving the Department's S&T knowledge, but is only part of the equation.

Some other STAS efforts may not have had their intended impact. For instance, STAS sees the U.S.-Canadian critical infrastructure protection and border security S&T agreement, signed by the Under Secretary for Global Affairs recently, as an unprecedented instrument that has launched cooperation between the Department of Homeland Security and other U.S. agencies and their Canadian counterparts. STAS sees the agreement as a model for similar agreements with the United Kingdom and Australia. However, the Department's Canada desk could barely recall working on the agreement and accorded it no such importance.

In February 2004, STAS held the first meeting in a transatlantic conference series called "US-EU Perspectives on the Future of Science and Technology." Held at prestigious Ditchley Park in the United Kingdom, the meeting focused on the future of genomics and vaccines and brought together senior government officials and distinguished scientists to examine the policy and societal impact of S&T advances at the ten-year horizon. STAS secured initial external funding of \$1 million for this conference series.

STAS is seeking to institutionalize the conference series through a nongovernmental organization and a variety of foundations. Many participants and observers question, however, whether the conference should be institutionalized. Despite interesting discussions and high-level participants, several sources said the first conference did not produce actionable issues for foreign affairs practitioners. One academic, when asked about the Perspectives conference series, said "Well, there are always lots of conferences."

Another conference series with a slightly different intent is the "Global Dialogue on Emerging Science and Technology (GDEST)," which seeks to strengthen collaboration between senior scientists and their younger counterparts in cutting-edge fields of research in the European Union, Japan, India, and China. External funding of \$1 million has been gained for four GDEST conferences, and discussions are underway to have the National Academies manage the program. One conference has been held in Japan, and future conferences are planned in Germany and China. OIG could not, however, find much evidence that the Department is engaged in developing or managing these conferences. This raises concern about the relevance of these conferences to the Department's agenda.

Given the comments to OIG during the inspection, OIG must question the STAS decision to launch such a broad array of staff- and resource-intensive initiatives, especially at the expense of core STAS functions. Many of these activities were conceived in the adviser's office, but did not stem from consultation with Department bureaus or true collaboration in the organizational phase. On the other hand, the adviser has admirable ability to raise money for these projects, indicating that there is an American interest in exploring these subjects in a foreign affairs context.

Although many ideas such as the proposed FSI training may be worthy, these initiatives cannot succeed without close consultation between STAS and the entities that will eventually have responsibility for implementation. The partnership is needed to ensure that resources are available, that proposals conform to the priorities of cosponsors, and that donated funds will have proper management. Without the partnership, even the best of initiatives is doomed to wither once the current adviser departs. On the other hand, the Department should not ignore the interest and possible opportunities that STAS has uncovered.

**Recommendation 7:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should develop a program review and evaluation process to ensure that all STAS proposed activities meet Department needs and priorities and that proposed activities receive cosponsorship within the Department or from other agencies for implementation. (Action: STAS, in coordination with G and OES)

**Recommendation 8:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary should propose to appropriate bureaus a plan and timetable for the transfer of program management, responsibility, and funding of each activity. (Action: STAS)



## SELECTION OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER TO THE SECRETARY

As the STAS office moves into its fifth year, the Department should focus attention on the nomination and selection of candidates to fill the adviser position. In the first change of advisers, the adviser nominated his successor, the incumbent. The Secretary will be better served by a nominating procedure that involves the U.S. scientific community and the Department to seek candidates whose leadership will assure the prestige of the office in the eyes of the Department, the executive branch, and the scientific community.

STAS is a small operation, and the selection of the correct adviser is critical to integrating it in the Department's policymaking structure and to maximizing its impact on the Department's bureaucracy. The bureaucracy has not fully embraced the potential that U.S. science and scientists can bring to the achievement of policy goals, nor has it fully recognized the impact of scientific and technological developments on political and economic issues. The appointment of a highly regarded scientist will also encourage the interest of good scientists in gaining professional experience in the Department.

Although selection of the adviser is the prerogative of the Secretary, sources inside and outside the Department suggest that an excellent list of candidates would arise from a collaborative process involving a high-level panel drawn from the scientific and diplomatic establishments. Members could include the Under Secretary for Global Affairs, the director of Human Resources, and former Ambassadors.

**Recommendation 9:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and the director of Human Resources, should develop a nominating procedure to identify appropriate candidates for the science adviser position for consideration by the Secretary. (Action: STAS, in coordination with G and DGHR)

The Secretary's February 2000 decision to reinvigorate the role of science and technology in American foreign policy was justified because science had slipped too far from view within the Department. The adviser's appointment can assure that the Department's leadership is cognizant of science issues and can draw upon the American scientific community for advice and counsel. Success requires, however, that the adviser enjoy the confidence of and access to the Department's most senior leadership and that the adviser understand, engage, and make himself relevant to the Department's agenda.

Many of NRC's other recommendations were not implemented, but this does not mean that science is unimportant to the Department or that the science community's views went unheard. The Department has re-established a science directorate in OES and, as the OIG report on OES makes clear, despite OES's lapses in the way it has used science in American diplomacy, OES is the Department entity where international science policy is made and managed operationally. Therefore, the science and technology adviser must cooperate with and receive support and guidance from the Assistant Secretary of OES.

## RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Although STAS has its own BPP, funding for the adviser's office is in the OES allotment, and STAS depends on the OES/DRL/STAS executive office for administrative support. Furthermore, RM allots funds to OES with a separate STAS earmark. Similarly, STAS staffing is included in the FTEs allotted to OES, although the Bureau of Human Resources informally provides STAS with a separate FTE ceiling. The Department provided STAS with \$142,000 and three FTEs in FY 2005, and requests for additional base funds and permanent personnel have been unsuccessfully repeated in STAS BPP presentations. The table below reflects the Department's resources for STAS, provided and requested.

**Table 1: STAS Resources, FY 2003-2007**

<b>STAS Resources</b>	<b>FY 2003</b>	<b>FY 2004</b>	<b>FY 2005</b>	<b>Request FY 2006</b>	<b>Request FY 2007</b>
Diplomatic & Consular Program					
funding (dollars in thousands)	175	337	142	400	432
Full-time equivalent staff	3	3	3	6	7

Besides these resources, STAS has obtained significant additional resources from other agencies and from within the Department. DGHR had provided STAS waivers to its FTE ceiling for two additional FTEs. Furthermore, about 10 additional personnel work in STAS through AAAS fellowships, details, internships, and contractual arrangements. STAS has also obtained additional funding from outside sources. STAS obtained funding from other agencies totaling \$718,840 in FY 2004 and \$200,000 so far in 2005.

The OES/DRL/STAS executive office is responsible for ensuring that OES and STAS personnel and funding are delineated. However, there appears to be confusion over the amount of funding STAS is authorized to spend for operations. STAS and the executive office stated that RM had approved \$337,000 FY 2004 funding, but RM provided a figure of \$242,000. The executive office contends that the \$95,000 difference was provided by other agencies to STAS, but OIG could not

identify other agency funding that constituted this \$95,000. Additionally, OIG questions whether other agencies would provide funds for routine STAS operations, including funding the STAS office management specialist and the adviser's travel. The executive office should clearly lay out funding levels for the STAS allotment to prevent the obligation of funds exceeding allotments that are prohibited by 4 FAM 084.3. This issue is addressed further in the management controls section of this report.

**Recommendation 10:** The Office of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs, the Bureau of Resource Management, and the Office of the Legal Adviser, should review FY 2004 and 2005 funding documents to determine the correct funding level and review the circumstances under which funding has been and will be provided by other agencies for science and technology adviser operations. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES, RM, and L)

## Executive Office Support

STAS receives its administrative support from the OES/DRL/STAS executive office (EX). Given the EX's responsibility for two bureaus each with over 100 FTEs and over \$45 million in funding, STAS issues and operations have not been a priority. The EX does not have regular meetings with either the science adviser or his deputy. However, STAS itself has not done much to call on or coordinate with the EX; a STAS employee said the EX is contacted when absolutely necessary or as an afterthought. It appears STAS prefers this relationship because it further separates STAS from OES. However, the standoffishness has become a problem for providing STAS with adequate support and ensuring that STAS operations are consistent with laws, regulations, and guidance.

A number of issues have fallen through the cracks as a result of the lack of engagement between the STAS and the EX. In 2004, the EX started planning for a physical relocation to another part of the building, but STAS staff and office space were left off of the contractor's early blueprints for the move. In addition, the EX staff does not know who works within STAS. For example, EX was not aware of a detailee who has worked in STAS for over a year. The EX should have a written agreement with the detailee's home office describing the arrangement, including whether the detail is reimbursable.

STAS provided its BPP to the EX at the last minute, leaving the EX very little time to review and assist with its preparation. The lack of communication between STAS, EX, and the OES front office also caused problems when STAS offered jobs to two fellows, assuming that its FTE ceiling and waivers would not be changed. Waivers for hiring the STAS fellows had not, however, been granted. STAS absorbed two FTEs that it had supplanted within regional bureaus to give the fellows jobs, but continues to protest at being excluded from OES deliberations of potential cuts to its resources.

Finally, the lack of engagement also negatively affected management controls on the oversight of a \$718,000 grant and regarding approval of travel that was not U. S. government-funded. Obviously, coordination is sorely needed. OIG informally recommended that the adviser meet monthly with the EX to discuss ongoing STAS operations. Additionally, the STAS deputy, the principal deputy assistant secretary for OES, and the principal deputy assistant secretaries for DRL should meet with the EX weekly. Combined meetings with the EX will ensure that both bureaus' priorities and the STAS office priorities with the EX are sorted out.

**Recommendation 11:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, should initiate weekly meetings with the principal deputy assistant secretaries, the deputy to the Science and Technology Adviser, the executive director, and the deputy executive director to discuss bureau and office priorities. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES and DRL)



## MANAGEMENT CONTROLS

Management controls over STAS operations and expenditures need improvement. There has not been proper oversight of a \$718,000 grant, the EX does not track STAS expenditures closely enough, STAS does not submit travel documentation to the EX in a timely fashion, and insufficient invitational travel documentation is provided to the EX. (STAS believes the OES travel office regularly loses paperwork.) The lack of engagement between the STAS and its EX has contributed to these problems. Regular meetings with the EX, as recommended, will improve coordination between the two offices and strengthen management controls. However, other changes are also necessary.

### Grant Oversight

STAS has not properly overseen a \$718,000 GDEST grant to run a series of international science and engineering conferences, and OIG found that neither STAS nor the EX financial management section ensured compliance with the grant's terms. The grant requires the grantee to submit quarterly program progress reports that discuss significant activities and their impact on achieving goals/objectives and also file quarterly financial reports detailing expenditures. The grant also states that failure to submit required reports could result in the withholding of payments. The grantee, however, has not submitted these reports to STAS. OIG found that the grantee had provided informal emails to STAS representatives and had held a conference in March 2005, as required in the grant's statement of work. However, the grantee has not provided STAS with reports of the results of the conference or of ongoing progress or expenditures. (When STAS representatives became aware of the above requirements during the inspection, they promptly requested that the grantee provide this information.)

A grant officer is responsible for monitoring grantee compliance, unless responsibility is delegated to a grant officer representative (GOR). According to the GDEST grant, two STAS representatives were delegated such monitoring responsibilities. However, one of the officers no longer works in STAS and the other was unaware that he had GOR responsibilities. Neither the STAS nor the grant officer

in the Office of Acquisitions Management of the Bureau of Administration (A/LM/AQM) could find signed GOR letters formally delegating GOR responsibilities to the STAS officers. This lack of oversight and apparent breakdown in internal controls between the STAS, EX, and A/LM/AQM is troubling. The GORs, A/LM/AQM grant officers, and OES/EX budget officers should schedule routine meetings.

**Recommendation 12:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs and the Bureau of Administration, should review all grants made by the adviser's office to ensure that grant officer representatives (GOR) have been identified, that signed GOR letters are on file, that GORs have been briefed by the grant officer on their responsibilities, and that GORs have had GOR training. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES and A/LM)

**Recommendation 13:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs and the Bureau of Administration, should meet quarterly to discuss the status of all ongoing grants. Discussions should include the status of funds on all ongoing grants, the grantees' progress toward achieving the objectives of the grants, the level of compliance with reporting requirements, whether expenditures are allowable, and any additional issues. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES and A/LM)

Despite the lack of oversight discussed above, OIG found that STAS representatives have been approving payments to the grantee. A representative of the EX said that only a designated GOR can approve grantee payments. Additionally, the designated GOR must sign an EX "Roles and Responsibilities" form before approving grantee payments. Despite the policy, the EX allowed a STAS representative that had neither been designated as a GOR nor signed the EX "Roles and Responsibilities" form to approve STAS payments. The EX could also not explain the management control oversight. OIG informally recommended improved management and attention to detail for the EX's financial management section.

**Recommendation 14:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should review all ongoing grants in the two bureaus it services and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary's office to ensure that only delegated grant officer representatives have authority to approve payments and that those individuals have signed the executive office's "Roles and Responsibilities" form. (Action: OES, in coordination with STAS and DRL)

## STAS Expenditures

The EX does not track STAS expenditures throughout the year. During the inspection, for example, the EX could not produce a list of STAS expenditures to date (June 2005). STAS expenditures are tallied in the fourth quarter of the fiscal year. This tracking method makes it impossible for EX to ensure that STAS does not exceed its earmarked funds and violate allotment regulations. The office should initiate the use of either "cuff records" or domestic organization codes, such as those found in 4 FAH-1 H-421.9, to track STAS expenditures.

**Recommendation 15:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should initiate a method of tracking Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary expenditures during the year. (Action: OES)

## Last minute requests

STAS frequently gives its requests to the EX at the last minute, leaving the EX little time for review. The EX often receives travel authorizations for approval only a few days before a trip. Similarly, STAS submits approval requests for invitational travel (travel funded by non-U.S. government entities) to EX at the last minute. OIG informally recommended that EX develop and issue travel policies and procedures addressing the number of days in advance travel authorizations should be submitted to the EX, the documentation required (such as justifications for rental cars), and the policies on outstanding travel vouchers. OIG also found, however, that EX's standard operating procedures are addressed to OES and DRL, but not STAS.

**Recommendation 16:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should add the offices of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary as an addressee to all administrative standard operating procedures. The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary may need to clear on some of the policies and procedures before they are reissued. (Action: OES, in coordination with STAS)

## Invitational Travel

STAS invitational travel requests do not contain sufficient information for the EX to ensure that the requested travel is appropriate. For example, STAS does not always attach copies of relevant invitations, letters, agendas, and arrangements. Additionally, there is no certification of the absence of conflict of interest from the employee accepting the invitation. Finally, it is difficult to decipher from some of the documentation which entity is paying for the trip and exactly what the trip's purpose is. Although the EX invitational travel policy, issued in September 2004, requires the above documentation and certification, these documents and certifications are not always present in travel files. Although the director of EX claims to verbally ask STAS for the above documentation before approving such travel, OIG could not verify this due to the lack of documentation. According to STAS, the EX frequently loses travel documentation. OIG informally recommended that the EX obtain and retain required invitational travel documents supporting the EX's approval of such travel.

## FORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation 1:** The Under Secretary for Global Affairs, in coordination with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should propose a revised position description that specifies more distinctly the role, responsibility, authority, and accountability of the adviser. The position description should specify that the adviser receives policy direction from the Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs and the Under Secretary for Global Affairs, coordinates with the bureau on all areas of activity having foreign policy implications, and obtains administrative and programmatic support from the bureau. (Action: G, in coordination with STAS and OES)

**Recommendation 2:** The Director General of the Foreign Service, in consultation with the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, should include in the Department's overall strategic recruitment plan specific activities aimed at potential candidates having backgrounds in the sciences. (Action: DGHR, in coordination with STAS)

**Recommendation 3:** The Science and Technology Adviser's office should also assist the Office of Recruitment, Examination and Employment of the Bureau of Human Resources in updating recruitment documents targeting those with scientific backgrounds. (Action: STAS, in coordination with DGHR)

**Recommendation 4:** The Science and Technology Adviser's office should eliminate from its own bureau performance plan and other planning documents references to a role in increasing the number of scientists in the Civil and Foreign Service ranks. (Action: STAS)

**Recommendation 5:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary should develop an action agenda appropriate to the size of the office, as originally envisaged, and terminate program activities that detract from the purpose of the office, as stated in the legislation authorizing the office of the Science and Technology Adviser. The agenda should intensively focus on increasing the science and technology knowledge of the regional bureaus and of Civil and Foreign Service employees, in keeping with the original concept of the office. (Action: STAS)

**Recommendation 6:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Human Resources, should design and implement a standard personnel policy to handle programs for science fellows in the Department, provide guidance to the bureaus accepting science fellows, and direct ongoing orientation and mentoring activities for science fellows. (Action: STAS, in coordination with DGHR)

**Recommendation 7:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, should develop a program review and evaluation process to ensure that all STAS proposed activities meet Department needs and priorities and that proposed activities receive cosponsorship within the Department or from other agencies for implementation. (Action: STAS, in coordination with G and OES)

**Recommendation 8:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary should propose to appropriate bureaus a plan and timetable for the transfer of program management, responsibility, and funding of each activity. (Action: STAS)

**Recommendation 9:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Global Affairs and the director of Human Resources, should develop a nominating procedure to identify appropriate candidates for the science adviser position for consideration by the Secretary. (Action: STAS, in coordination with G and DGHR)

**Recommendation 10:** The Office of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs, the Bureau of Resource Management, and the Office of the Legal Adviser, should review FY 2004 and 2005 funding documents to determine the correct funding level and review the circumstances under which funding has been and will be provided by other agencies for science and technology adviser operations. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES, RM, and L)

**Recommendation 11:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs and the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, should initiate weekly meetings with the principal deputy assistant secretaries, the deputy to the Science and Technology Adviser, the executive director, and the deputy executive director to discuss bureau and office priorities. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES and DRL)

**Recommendation 12:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs and the Bureau of Administration, should review all grants made by the adviser's office to ensure that grant officer representatives (GOR) have been identified, that signed GOR letters are on file, that GORs have been briefed by the grant officer on their responsibilities, and that GORs have had GOR training. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES and A/LM)

**Recommendation 13:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary, in coordination with the Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs and the Bureau of Administration, should meet quarterly to discuss the status of all ongoing grants. Discussions should include the status of funds on all ongoing grants, the grantees' progress toward achieving the objectives of the grants, the level of compliance with reporting requirements, whether expenditures are allowable, and any additional issues. (Action: STAS, in coordination with OES and A/LM)

**Recommendation 14:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should review all ongoing grants in the two bureaus it services and the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary's office to ensure that only delegated grant officer representatives have authority to approve payments and that those individuals have signed the executive office's "Roles and Responsibilities" form. (Action: OES, in coordination with STAS and DRL)

**Recommendation 15:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should initiate a method of tracking Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary expenditures during the year. (Action: OES)

**Recommendation 16:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should add the offices of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary as an addressee to all administrative standard operating procedures. The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary may need to clear on some of the policies and procedures before they are reissued. (Action: OES, in coordination with STAS)



## INFORMAL RECOMMENDATIONS

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

The lack of coordination between the STAS and its EX has reduced the quality and timeliness of EX support and weakened management controls over STAS operations.

**Informal Recommendation 1:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary should meet at least monthly with its executive office to discuss ongoing operations.

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

**Informal Recommendation 2:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should establish target response times for financial management requests and ensure that standards are published with other service standards on the executive office's web site.

The financial management division chief needs to exercise additional oversight over staff to ensure that requirements are met. For example, OIG found shortcomings related to the section's tracking of STAS funds, and the chief was unfamiliar with staff's method of tracking the funds. Additionally, one staff member did not have access to the Department's accounting system for months, though she was responsible for data entry into that system.

**Informal Recommendation 3:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should conduct monthly reviews of financial management staff work, including spot-checking of supporting documentation maintained for CFMS obligations, reviewing status of obligation reports, and ensuring that program managers or grant officer representatives properly certify invoices.

The financial management section's method of monitoring obligations could be more efficient, were it to use budget object codes and organization codes. Use of CFMS domestic organization codes, for example, would facilitate tracking of STAS expenditures.

**Informal Recommendation 4:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should request that the Bureau of Resource Management's accounting system help desk assist the financial management section in printing useful reports for fund monitoring, including reports by budget object class and organization code.

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

**Informal Recommendation 5:** The Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary should ensure that detailee arrangements are shared with the financial management division.

Although the travel section recently implemented several informal policies, it has not issued the policies to bureau employees or posted them on the EX web site. The EX should issue travel policies in writing, and the policies should include a deadline for submission of travel authorizations, procedures for handling outstanding travel vouchers, and requirements for justifying expenses such as rental cars, cell phones, Internet fees, and phone calls. A/LM/OPS/TTM oversees the travel program and should review the procedures before they are issued.

**Informal Recommendation 6:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental Affairs should develop and issue written travel policies and procedures, including the frequently made mistakes, and post the policies and procedures to the executive office's web site.

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

**Informal Recommendation 7:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental Affairs should develop performance standards for the timeliness and accuracy of travel vouchers and add customer service orientation to the performance plans of travel voucher clerks.

OES/EX has not maintained files containing the documentation and written certifications specified in the OES invitational travel policy. The executive director asserts that he contacts STAS and obtains the information verbally. Without written evidence, OIG could not verify that the required documentation and certifications were reviewed.

**Informal Recommendation 8:** The Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and Scientific Affairs should maintain required invitational travel documents and written certifications supporting its approval of Office of the Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary's invitational travel.

~~**SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED**~~

~~**SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED**~~

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS

	<b>Position</b>	<b>Arrival date</b>
Dr. George H. Atkinson	Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary	9/2003
Andrew W. Reynolds	Deputy Adviser	8/2000

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

~~SENSITIVE BUT UNCLASSIFIED~~

## ABBREVIATIONS

AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
A/LM/AQM	Bureau of Administration, Office of Acquisitions Management
BPP	Bureau Performance Plan
DGHR	Bureau of Human Resources
EX	Executive office
FSI	Foreign Service Institute
FTE	Full-time equivalent
G	Under Secretary for Global Affairs
GDEST	Global Dialogue on Emerging Science and Technology
GOR	Grant officer representative
M	Under Secretary for Management
OES	Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs
OIG	Office of Inspector General
NRC	National Research Council
RM	Bureau of Resource Management
S&T	Science and technology
STAS	Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary



## APPENDIX: CABLE ANNOUNCING NEW SCIENCE POLICY

SECSTATE 91353 UNCLAS

P 151518Z MAY 00

PM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO ALL DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR POSTS PRIORITY  
SPECIAL EMBASSY PROGRAM

BT

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 03 STATE 091353

FOR AMBASSADOR OR PRINCIPAL OFFICER

SUBJECT: SCIENCE AND DIPLOMACY: SECRETARY ANNOUNCES  
CHANGES, NEW POLICY

1. ON MAY 12, 2000, THE SECRETARY ISSUED THE FOLLOWING MEMORANDUM TO ALL DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE RELEASE OF HER POLICY STATEMENT (PARA 3, BELOW) AND A DEPARTMENTAL REPORT ON SCIENCE (AVAILABLE ON THE WEB AT WWW. STATE. GOV). THIS MESSAGE SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO ALL EMPLOYEES.

2 TEXT OF THE MEMORANDUM FOLLOWS:

BEGIN TEXT:

MEMORANDUM TO ALL DEPARTMENT OF STATE EMPLOYEES

THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ON EVERY ASPECT OF OUR WORK IS GREAT AND GROWING. NATIONAL SECURITY HAS INCREASINGLY BECOME GROUNDED IN TECHNOLOGY, AS HAS ARMS CONTROL; THE DEBATE OVER THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN AND THE CHEMICAL WEAPONS TREATIES AND THE CURRENT INTERNATIONAL DISCUSSION OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS IN AGRICULTURE SHOW HOW IMPORTANT TECHNICAL COMPETENCE HAS BECOME TO WORKING DIPLOMATS. WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE ROLE AND CONTRIBUTIONS THAT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PLAY IN SHAPING OUR BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL RELATIONSHIPS AROUND THE WORLD. ALL OF US MUST BECOME MORE SCIENTIFICALLY LITERATE TO MEET THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES PRESENTED BY SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS, AND WE MUST FORGE CLOSER BONDS WITH THE

SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITIES IN GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY AND ACADEMIA TO HELP INFORM OUR FOREIGN POLICY.

THE UNITED STATES MUST MAINTAIN ITS ABILITY TO LEAD EFFECTIVELY ON A RANGE OF GLOBAL SCIENCE-RELATED ISSUES. FOR THIS REASON, I AM PUTTING IN PLACE A SERIES OF MEASURES ARISING FROM THE WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT'S SENIOR TASK FORCE ON STRENGTHENING SCIENCE AT STATE, CO-CHAIRLED BY UNDER SECRETARY FOR GLOBAL AFFAIRS FRANK LOY AND SENIOR ADVISER FOR ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY JOHN HOLM. THESE MEASURES ARE DESIGNED TO STRENGTHEN OUR CAPACITY TO INTEGRATE SCIENCE CONSIDERATIONS MORE FULLY INTO THE FOREIGN POLICY PROCESS.

THE NEW STEPS ARE OUTLINED IN THE ATTACHED POLICY STATEMENT, "SCIENCE AND DIPLOMACY: STRENGTHENING STATE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY" AND IN THE DEPARTMENT'S REPORT, "SCIENCE AND FOREIGN POLICY - THE ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE", WHICH IS BEING POSTED ON OUR WEB PAGE AT WWW.STATE.GOV. THE MEASURES INVOLVE SIGNIFICANT INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES, INCLUDING APPOINTMENT OF A SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER; PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT, TRAINING AND ASSIGNMENT INNOVATIONS; AND DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACTIVE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY. I URGE YOUR THOUGHTFUL ATTENTION TO THESE DOCUMENTS.

END TEXT.

3. FOLLOWING IS THE TEXT OF THE SCIENCE POLICY STATEMENT:

BEGIN TEXT:

SCIENCE AND DIPLOMACY:

STRENGTHENING STATE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

IN A WORLD BEING TRANSFORMED BY TECHNOLOGY,  
GOOD SCIENCE IS VITAL TO GOOD DIPLOMACY.

THAT MAY SEEM OBVIOUS, BUT EVEN NOW, NOT EVERYONE IS COMFORTABLE WITH IT. FOR OFTEN -- AS WAS ONCE THE CASE WITH ECONOMICS OR HUMAN RIGHTS -- IT TAKES TIME FOR SOMETHING DIFFERENT TO BE ACCEPTED WITHIN THE MAINSTREAM OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY.

BUT TODAY THERE CAN BE NO QUESTION ABOUT THE INTEGRAL ROLE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) MUST PLAY IN OUR DIPLOMACY. WHETHER THE ISSUE IS COUNTERING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, DEALING WITH INFECTIOUS DISEASES, OR EXPANDING THE GLOBAL ECONOMY WHILE PROTECTING THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT, IF WE ARE TO GET OUR INTERNATIONAL STRATEGIES

RIGHT WE MUST GET OUR SCIENCE RIGHT.

THE DEPARTMENT'S S&T CAPABILITIES HAVE NOT ALWAYS BEEN AS SUBSTANTIAL AS THEY SHOULD BE. BECAUSE OF RESOURCE CONSTRAINTS IN RECENT YEARS, OUR PEOPLE WITH SCIENCE RESPONSIBILITIES HAVE BEEN STRETCHED THIN. BUT THEY HAVE DONE A GREAT JOB UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, AND DESERVE OUR THANKS AND SUPPORT.

CHANGES, NEW POLICY

AT MY REQUEST, THE NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES HAS COMPLETED A STUDY OF THE WAYS AND MEANS BY WHICH THE DEPARTMENT MAY BETTER FULFILL ITS S&T RESPONSIBILITIES. I AM USING THAT REPORT, RECEIVED LAST FALL, AS A GUIDE IN OUR EFFORTS.

WHAT I ENVISION IS NOT A ONE-SHOT QUICK FIX, BUT A MULTI-YEAR, MULTI-ADMINISTRATION, BIPARTISAN MISSION. TO SUCCEED, WE MUST MAKE CHANGES AFFECTING OUR ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, OUR PERSONNEL, AND OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SCIENCE COMMUNITY.

STRUCTURE: FIRST, WE WILL STRENGTHEN OUR SCIENCE LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE. SHORTLY, I SHALL APPOINT A SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER WHO WILL HAVE DIRECT ACCESS TO ME AND OTHER SENIOR DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS AND WHO WILL BE LOCATED WITHIN THE UNDER SECRETARIAT FOR GLOBAL AFFAIRS. THE ADVISER WILL LEAD A DEPARTMENT-WIDE EFFORT TO ENSURE THAT SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND HEALTH ISSUES ARE PROPERLY INTEGRATED INTO OUR FOREIGN POLICY. THE ADVISER WILL ALSO SERVE AS THE DEPARTMENT'S PRINCIPAL LIAISON WITH THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY.

OTHER STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN THE DEPARTMENT WILL ALSO REFLECT AND SUPPORT THE ENHANCED ROLE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY. BY THE END OF APRIL, I WILL RE-ESTABLISH A SCIENCE DIRECTORATE WITHIN THE BUREAU OF OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS (OES). UNDER THE LEADERSHIP OF THE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, THIS DIRECTORATE WILL BRING TOGETHER THREE SEPARATE OES OFFICES CURRENTLY FOCUSED ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND HEALTH ISSUES.

FURTHER, ALL REGIONAL AND POLICY BUREAUS IN THE DEPARTMENT WILL DESIGNATE A DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY-LEVEL PERSON TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR S&T-BASED ISSUES. THESE BUREAU REPRESENTATIVES -- ALONG WITH THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR GLOBAL AFFAIRS, THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR ARMS CONTROL AND

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, THE SCIENCE ADVISER TO THE BUREAU OF ARMS CONTROL, THE CHAIR OF THE ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION ADVISORY BOARD, AND THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER -- TOGETHER WILL FORM A STANDING SCIENCE POLICY GROUP.

PERSONNEL: THE DEPARTMENT'S EFFECTIVENESS ON ANY ISSUE IS ONLY AS GOOD AS ITS PEOPLE AND THE QUALITY OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THEM. I WANT TO ENSURE THAT WE HAVE THE RIGHT PEOPLE IN THE RIGHT PLACES WITH THE RIGHT TRAINING, EXPERTISE AND INFORMATION TO PROVIDE STRONG LEADERSHIP ON SCIENCE-RELATED ISSUES. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL AND OTHER SENIOR OFFICIALS ARE CURRENTLY REVIEWING THE DEPARTMENT'S RECRUITMENT, TRAINING, ASSIGNMENT AND PROMOTION POLICIES TO BROADEN AND DEEPEN OUR IN-HOUSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY EXPERTISE. THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER WILL WORK CLOSELY WITH THE DIRECTOR GENERAL IN THIS EFFORT.

IT SHOULD BE A PRIORITY OF THE DEPARTMENT TO ENSURE THAT, AT A MINIMUM, ALL FOREIGN SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL, AT HOME AND ABROAD, HAVE A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF SCIENCE-RELATED ISSUES. THEY SHOULD ALSO KNOW WHETHER AND WHEN SCIENCE CAN INFORM OUR POLICY, WHERE TO GO FOR THIS EXPERTISE, AND HOW TO MAKE SURE IT IS INCORPORATED IN THE FORMULATION AND EXECUTION OF OUR POLICIES. THE DEPARTMENT HAS BEGUN A SURVEY TO IDENTIFY THOSE OVERSEAS POSTS -- SUCH AS NEW DELHI -- WHERE SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND HEALTH ISSUES ARE MOST VITAL TO THE SUCCESS OF OUR BILATERAL OR REGIONAL AGENDA. BASED ON THOSE RESULTS, WE WILL EXAMINE OUR CURRENT SCIENCE POSITIONS TO DETERMINE WHETHER NEW POSITIONS ARE NEEDED, ASSESS THE UPGRADING OF EXISTING POSITIONS, AND IDENTIFY THOSE OVERSEAS LOCATIONS WHERE OUR INTERESTS WOULD ESPECIALLY BENEFIT BY ASSIGNING SCIENTISTS TO KEY POSITIONS. I EXPECT THIS WORK TO BE COMPLETED BY THIS SEPTEMBER.

PARTNERSHIP: WE MUST DO MORE THAN MARSHAL OUR RESOURCES EFFECTIVELY; WE MUST MARSHAL HELP FROM OTHER PLACES. THE DEPARTMENT WILL ESTABLISH AN ACTIVE, LONG-TERM PARTNERSHIP WITH THE SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY COMMUNITY -- IN ACADEMIA AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR AS WELL AS IN GOVERNMENT. THAT MEANS MORE AND BETTER DIALOGUE ON POLICY ISSUES; COLLABORATION IN TRAINING OUR PEOPLE; AND TEMPORARY ASSIGNMENTS IN THE DEPARTMENT AND OVERSEAS.

TO HELP US GET THE SCIENCE RIGHT, WE WILL CONTINUE THE PROGRAM OF POLICY ROUNDTABLES ON KEY ISSUES, SUCH AS THOSE WE HAVE ALREADY HELD ON BIOTECH AGRICULTURE AND CARBON CHANGES, NEW POLI (NOTE: GARBLED TEXT) SINKS. AND TO HELP US WORK FASTER AND SMARTER, WE ARE

ALSO STRIVING TO ENHANCE OUR ACCESS TO THE LATEST ADVANCES  
IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

STRENGTHENING THE DEPARTMENT'S S&T CAPABILITIES  
WILL BE A LONG-TERM EFFORT REQUIRING NEW FISCAL AND HUMAN  
RESOURCES. THIS WILL REQUIRE THE SUPPORT OF CONGRESS AS  
WELL AS THE SCIENCE COMMUNITY. AND I HAVE NO ILLUSIONS  
THAT IT WILL BE QUICK OR EASY; IT DOESN'T TAKE A  
PHYSICIST TO KNOW THAT CHANGE IS HARDER THAN INERTIA.

BUT THIS IS A MISSION WORTHY OF OUR UTMOST SHARED  
EFFORTS. FOR ENHANCING SCIENCE AT STATE IS NOT ABOUT THE  
FOREIGN SERVICE VERSUS THE CIVIL SERVICE; NOR IS ITS  
APPEAL LIMITED TO ONLY ONE END OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE OR  
ONE SIDE OF THE AISLE. TO THE CONTRARY, IT IS A GOAL THAT  
SHOULD UNITE US ALL.

IF AMERICA IS TO CONTINUE TO LEAD IN THE NEW  
CENTURY, THEN WE MUST LEAD THE WAY IN INTEGRATING SCIENCE  
IN OUR DIPLOMACY. SO WE WILL MOVE FORWARD AGGRESSIVELY.  
AS I TOLD THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF  
SCIENCE IN FEBRUARY, WHILE IT WILL TAKE TIME AND MONEY TO  
REALIZE THIS VISION, WE MUST AND WILL BEGIN NOW.

END TEXT

4. UNTIL THE OFFICE OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ADVISER  
IS STAFFED, QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS CAN BE DIRECTED TO THE  
OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION, BUREAU OF  
OCEANS AND INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC  
AFFAIRS, TEL. 202-736-7377.

ALBRIGHT

BT

#1353

NNNN