

Administration and Budget

UN Financial Situation

At the end of 2003, outstanding assessments by UN member states totaled \$1.603 billion. This represented a small decrease from the 2002 total. The largest portion of the outstanding assessments came from UN peacekeeping operations (\$1.066 billion), followed by the UN regular budget (\$442 million), the International War Crimes Tribunals (\$88 million), and the design phase of the UN Capital Master Plan (\$7 million).

Seven member states comprised 87 percent of the total outstanding assessments with the United States accounting for \$762 million and Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, China, Japan, and Ukraine accounting for \$628 million. The majority of the total sum owed by the United States related to UN peacekeeping operations (\$482 million) and the UN regular budget (\$268 million). The delay in the U.S. budget appropriation for fiscal year 2004 affected the U.S. payment for the UN regular budget, resulting in a payment shortfall of approximately \$100 million. Overall, U.S. payments in 2003 for all UN assessed activities totaled \$1.012 billion of the \$3.720 billion in payments made by all 191 UN member states.

The UN's Under Secretary-General for Management (currently Catherine Bertini, a U.S. citizen) provides a semi-annual update of the UN's financial situation to the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee. In her presentation in October 2003, she noted that the cash balance for the UN regular budget was approaching zero and that cross-borrowing from terminated peacekeeping operations would be required before the end of the calendar year to forestall a deficit. Such cross-borrowing had already been initiated in July with respect to the International War Crimes Tribunals in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Both tribunals had exhausted their available cash due to non-payment of member assessments. Japan, the UN's second largest assessed contributor, made no payment toward its 2003 dues of approximately \$41 million. The United States completed payment of its 2003 dues to the tribunals in late autumn (\$57 million total for the year).

The UN's cash balances for its various peacekeeping operations were projected to be \$1.198 billion by the end of 2003. However, most of the balance would not be available due to other financial needs, such as peacekeeping operating costs in early 2004 and reimbursements to the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund. In addition, the UN's debt obligation to troop contributing countries was estimated to be \$565 million by the end of the 2003. This was less than the previous year when the total debt was \$703 million. The UN's Under Secretary-General for Management was expected to update the debt figures and other UN financial data at her next briefing to the Fifth Committee in early spring 2004.

UN Budget

The General Assembly considered two UN budgets during its regular session in autumn 2003. It approved the final level of the UN budget for the biennium 2002–2003, and it approved the initial UN budget for the biennium 2004–2005. The resolutions for both budgets were adopted by consensus.

On December 23, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 58/267, which approved the final level of the UN program budget for the biennium 2002–2003. The approved amount of \$2,967,727,800 represented an increase of \$76,659,100 over the previous level and was based on information provided in the Secretary-General's second budget performance report for the biennium, as contained in document A/58/558. The budget increase reflected the impact of exchange rate losses due to the declining value of the U.S. dollar (\$59.1 million), higher costs for inflation (\$7.7 million), and costs related to the maintenance of peace and security, including special political missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Cote d'Ivoire (\$33.5 million). The above figures were offset partly (by \$23.7 million) as a result of higher than expected staff vacancy rates in some UN posts, which helped reduce the overall staff costs in the budget. As noted, by far the largest component of the increase—approximately \$59 million—related to exchange rate losses caused by the declining value of the U.S. dollar. The biggest dollar declines occurred with respect to the Swiss franc and the Euro—15.9 percent and 19.2 percent, respectively. The UN's Board of Auditors, in consultation with the Secretary-General, will review the mechanisms for dealing with currency fluctuations in the UN's budget methodology and provide recommendations to the General Assembly at its 59th session. The request for this review is contained in Resolution 58/270 regarding the UN budget for 2004–2005.

On December 23, the General Assembly also adopted by consensus Resolutions 58/270, 58/271, and 58/272 approving the 2004–2005 UN budget at a level of \$3,160,860,300. The approved budget was 6.5 percent higher than the final budget approved for 2002–2003, but below the level proposed by the Secretary-General and the additional proposals made by some UN member states during the budget deliberations in the Fifth Committee. The combined proposals from the Secretary-General and from member states would have raised the overall budget level to approximately \$3.2 billion. The higher budget level for 2004–2005 as approved reflects primarily the impact of non-discretionary cost increases relating to inflation and rates of exchange. It also includes funding for priority activities supported by the United States, such as counter-terrorism and special political missions in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Excluding the impact of non-discretionary costs, the level of budget growth for 2004–2005 is virtually flat in real terms.

The negotiations leading up to the consensus adoption of the 2004–2005 UN budget were contentious and difficult. Working in a so-called “extended group,” which included traditional major contributors and other like-minded nations, the U.S. delegation in the Fifth Committee was able to

mobilize support for several measures that reduced the overall budget proposal and advanced management reform in the UN Secretariat. The measures will:

- Suspend recruitment action in the UN Secretariat with respect to new vacancies in General Services (support) positions, excluding those positions relating to safety and security personnel and editorial assistants (text processors);
- Provide the Secretary-General, on an experimental basis, with greater flexibility in the re-deployment of existing staff in order to meet evolving needs;
- Delay approval of the year 2005 budget appropriation for the UN's Joint Inspection Unit, pending review of reform proposals concerning that body; and
- Achieve cost reductions in UN publications, UN information centers, temporary assistance staff, overtime and night differential expenses, common services costs, and subsistence expenses relating to middle and higher-level UN staff.

In efforts to further streamline UN operations, the General Assembly in Resolution 58/270 requested the Secretary-General to undertake a comprehensive review of the UN's regular program of technical cooperation and, together with the Office of Internal Oversight Services, "proceed as quickly as possible" to conduct a systematic evaluation of the impact, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness of all activities of the UN's Department of Public Information. The resolution also requested the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its 59th session on efforts to improve the UN's implementation of Regulation 5.6 and Rule 105.6(a) of the UN's Regulations and Rules Governing Program Planning. The two statutes relate to the requirement of UN program managers to identify for possible elimination those activities that are considered obsolete and/or of marginal value. The United States is a strong proponent of improved priority setting in the United Nations, including the elimination or sun-setting of obsolete/marginal activities.

The increase in the UN budget levels for 2002–2003 and 2004–2005 due to non-discretionary costs—particularly exchange rate losses resulting from the decline in the value of the U.S. dollar—had been a major concern of the United States and other delegations that advocated budget discipline in the United Nations. Language in Resolution 58/270 sought to address the issue by calling on the UN's Board of Auditors, in consultation with the Secretary-General, to examine the UN's current "recosting" methodology and make proposals with regard to the most appropriate mechanism for managing the currency aspect of the methodology. The findings of the Board of Auditors will be submitted to the General Assembly at its 59th session.

In accordance with UN budget procedure, the General Assembly will review the initial 2004–2005 UN budget in autumn 2004 in the context of the Secretary-General's first performance report for the biennium. The initial

level will be revised up or down based on the performance review as well as other factors that may be approved by the General Assembly in the course of this review.

Capital Master Plan

The UN Capital Master Plan (CMP) is a comprehensive proposal by the UN Secretary-General to refurbish and renovate the UN headquarters complex in New York. The overall project is expected to cost over \$1 billion and take five to six years to complete. At its 57th session in 2002, the UN General Assembly decided in Resolution 57/292 to implement the CMP on the basis of the “baseline scope of the first approach,” as contained in the Secretary-General’s August 2002 report (A/57/285). The estimated construction budget would be \$1.049 billion, with a variance of plus/minus 10 percent. The proposed starting date for construction would be October 2004. The same resolution also authorized the Secretary-General to proceed with the remaining phases of design development and construction documentation, and requested the Secretary-General to provide a progress report on this to the General Assembly at its 58th session. The UN’s Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and Board of Auditors (BOA) were requested in the resolution to provide oversight of the UN’s implementation of the CMP and to report periodically to the General Assembly.

At its 58th regular session, the General Assembly took note of the following four documents relating to the Capital Master Plan: (1) the November 2003 report of the Secretary-General on implementation of the Capital Master Plan (A/58/599); (2) the December 2003 report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) (A/58/7/Add.15) relating to the aforementioned report of the Secretary-General; (3) a September 2003 note by the Secretary-General transmitting the OIOS report on the CMP to the General Assembly (A/58/342) ; and (4) an August 2003 note by the Secretary-General transmitting the BOA progress report on its review of the CMP (A/58/321). The action by the General Assembly to note the various documents appears in Part II of Resolution 58/272, Special Subjects Relating to the Proposed Budget for the Biennium 2004–2005. The overall resolution was adopted by consensus.

The November report of the Secretary-General indicated that tangible progress had been made in all areas of implementation of the CMP. In February 2003, the Secretary-General had formally established the Capital Master Plan Office, including the appointment of an Executive Director. The Office has responsibility for the overall design work of the CMP and the related procurement actions. In 2003, the Office entered into contracts with 21 vendors totaling \$12.3 million with respect to design work relating to the CMP and to projects to strengthen the UN building structure. The Office also oversaw the drafting of six contracts relating to major design of the UN premises. This design work was expected to begin in early 2004. The report of the Secretary-General notes the uncertainty of the status of overall CMP financing, including a possible proposal to be made by the United States as the

host country for UN headquarters. The United States was expected to make a funding proposal in early 2004 in the context of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2005. The report of the Secretary-General also provided a status report on the possible construction of a new UN building to serve as "swing space" during renovation and, later, as a permanent facility that would consolidate into a single facility the other UN activities that are currently dispersed throughout Manhattan. Construction of the new building is dependent on resolution of the following two major issues: (1) the outcome of negotiations by the City of New York and the local community regarding the use of part of Robert Moses Park, a recreation facility adjacent to the United Nations, to construct the new building; and (2) the date by which the UN Development Corporation would be able to issue the bonds required to finance the construction of the new building. The UN Secretary-General will provide at a later time an updated status report to the General Assembly regarding the resolution of these issues.

The other documents considered by the General Assembly with respect to the CMP were non-controversial. The observations in the OIOS report indicated: "the design development process has advanced satisfactorily during the early stages of the Capital Master Plan project and there is reasonable assurance to indicate that the process thus far has been transparent and fair. The internal controls in place for the contract solicitation and review process also were found to be satisfactory." The view of the OIOS was endorsed by the ACABQ in its December report. The ACABQ also noted that, as the CMP is a time-limited project to be implemented on a phased basis, any request by the United Nations for additional staff should (1) be based on actual workload requirements for each phase of the project, and (2) take account of existing expertise in other Secretariat offices (e.g., facilities management, procurement, human resource management) in order to avoid replication of existing organizational structures and staff resources. The U.S. delegation concurred with the views of the ACABQ and OIOS.

The BOA report indicated that the first audit of the financial statements would be submitted to the General Assembly at its 59th session and covers the biennium ending December 31, 2003. The planned audit also would review the adequacy of the UN's internal controls and processes relating to the management of the CMP.

The Fifth Committee was expected to consider the issue of overall CMP funding in early 2004 at the resumed 58th session of the General Assembly. The U.S. funding proposal, as contained in the President's fiscal year 2005 budget request, was expected to be the primary topic of discussion by the Fifth Committee.

Scale of Assessments

At its 58th session, the UN General Assembly adopted two resolutions relating to the UN scale of assessments, one for the UN regular budget and one for UN peacekeeping operations. The resolutions prescribe UN member assessment rates for the three-year period, 2004–2006. The U.S.

assessment rate for the UN regular budget would remain at the ceiling level of 22 percent, in keeping with a methodology established by the General Assembly in 2000. The resolution for the regular scale also provided temporary exemption for 10 UN members from the loss-of-vote provision of Article 19 of the UN Charter.

The U.S. assessment rate for UN peacekeeping operations would vary between 26.48 percent and 26.69 percent over the course of the scale period, also in keeping with a system introduced in 2000, which was structured largely in accordance with defined economic criteria. The new peacekeeping rate is a decline from the 2002 U.S. rate of approximately 27.1 percent, and a significant decline from the 2000 rate of approximately 30.3 percent.

Resolution 58/1B, adopted by consensus on December 23, established the scale of assessments for the UN regular budget for the period 2004–2006. The new scale is consistent with the parameters of the UN methodology the General Assembly previously endorsed for Resolution 55/5 (2000). A key element of the scale methodology is the use of updated economic data to determine each member's "capacity to pay," as measured by its Gross National Income and Per-Capita Income over a specified base period. The UN scale for 2004–2006 uses a base period comprising the average of the periods 1996–2001 and 1999–2001, respectively. The methodology also takes into account the level of external debt for developing countries and includes provision for a minimum "floor" rate of 0.001 percent, maximum "ceiling" rate for developing countries of 0.010 percent, and a maximum "ceiling" rate for all UN members of 22 percent. The calculation of the 2004–2006 UN scale—including conversion of members' economic data into U.S. dollars—was reflected in the report of the UN's expert Committee on Contributions (CoC), as contained in document A/58/11. The report was prepared in June and submitted to the Fifth Committee for its consideration at the 58th session of the UN General Assembly. During the deliberations, the United States supported the report of the CoC, including its recommended scale for 2004–2006.

The triennial debate on the next UN scale of assessments is traditionally among the most contentious on the Fifth Committee agenda. In 2003, the focus of the debate concerned the distribution of mitigation "points" to other members as a result of the voluntary action taken by the Russian Federation to increase its assessment rate in 2004–2006 from the CoC-calculated level of 0.466 percent to 1.1 percent. (Note: one "point" is equal to 0.001 percent.) Some members, including Jamaica and Lebanon, sought to have all of the mitigation points distributed to developing countries, which would experience higher assessment rates in 2004–2006 based on the calculations in the report of the CoC. Other members, including Japan, sought a *pro rata* distribution of the points to all members, excluding those members that already were assessed at the floor and ceiling rates. Following difficult negotiations, Committee members reached a compromise solution. The outcome provided some assessment relief to the affected developing countries,

while preserving most elements of the *pro-rata* distribution sought by Japan and others.

The key issue for the United States in the scale negotiations was the preservation of the 22 percent ceiling rate, which in 2000 had been approved only for a three-year period, such as the scale for 2001–2003. The previous ceiling rate had been 25 percent. Aside from interventions by some Fifth Committee members, the Committee as a whole did not extensively debate the ceiling rate. The Committee agreed to retain the 22 percent in the UN scale for 2004–2006. Moreover, there was no explicit language in the approved scale resolution that would limit the 22 percent ceiling to just a three-year period, as was the case in 2000.

Based on the recommendation of the CoC, the General Assembly approved temporary exemption from the loss-of-vote provision of Article 19 of the UN Charter for the following nine UN members: Burundi, Central African Republic, Comoros, Georgia, Guinea-Bissau, Republic of Moldova, Sao Tome and Principe, Somalia, and Tajikistan. In addition, the General Assembly noted and approved the request of Niger for a temporary exemption, even though the CoC had not considered the request previously. In all cases, the temporary exemption was granted through June 30, 2004. The exemption was based on the determination by the General Assembly that the failure of the 10 members to pay the minimum assessment amount, as stipulated under Article 19, was due to reasons beyond the control of the respective members. The action by the General Assembly was reflected in Resolution 58/1A, as adopted by consensus on October 16.

Resolution 58/256, adopted by consensus on December 23, established the UN scale of assessments for peacekeeping operations for 2004–2006. The scale was consistent with the overall methodology approved in 2000 by the General Assembly in its Resolutions 55/235 and 55/236. The methodology established 10 assessment categories, or “levels,” for UN member states, which takes account of the following: (1) the special responsibility for UN peacekeeping operations of the five permanent members of the Security Council, and (2) economic factors relating to the remainder of the UN’s membership. The five permanent members of the Security Council are assessed a premium for peacekeeping over their respective rates for the regular budget in order to offset the discounts accorded to developing countries under the various assessment levels prescribed in the scale methodology. The peacekeeping assessment rates for developed countries, which are not Security Council members, such as Japan, members of the European Union, and others, are identical to their respective rates for the UN regular budget.

For 2004–2006, the U.S. assessment rate for peacekeeping would be as follows:

- January 2004: 26.6901 percent; July 2004: 26.6752 percent
- January 2005: 26.4987 percent; July 2005: 26.4838 percent

- January 2006: 26.6932 percent (full year)

The variance in rates reflects primarily the complexities of the scale methodology approved in 2000, which includes the phased movement of some members from one assessment level to another. The permanent members of the Security Council would feel the impact of such movement, with either higher or lower assessment rates. The reduction in the U.S. rate for 2004–2006, as compared to the previous scale period, was due in part to voluntary action taken by Russia to increase its assessment rate and thus lower the costs to other member states.

Committee for Program and Coordination

The United States is a member of the Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC), comprised of 34 members elected by the General Assembly. The CPC is the main subsidiary organ of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the General Assembly for planning, programming, and coordination. During its 43rd session June 9–July 9 in New York, the Committee focused primarily on the following three issues: review of several evaluation and coordination reports; revisions to the Medium-Term Plan (MTP); and consideration of the proposed UN budget for 2004–2005. The majority of the CPC meetings were devoted to consideration of the proposed budget. CPC members serve for periods of three years, and may serve multiple successive terms.

The evaluation and coordination reports dealt with UN activities related to global development trends, advancement of women, law of the sea, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), and the general topic of UN efficiency. The Committee agreed with the recommendations of the evaluation and coordination reports, with the notable exception of a Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) report entitled “Implementing the UN Millennium Declaration” (A/57/273). The CPC “took note” of the report but was highly critical of it and declined to endorse its recommendations because all were impractical and most were not feasible. The Committee’s consideration of the report drew attention to the need to reform the JIU, a process that continued in the Fifth Committee later in 2003.

The CPC revised sections of the MTP to incorporate the outcomes of the NEPAD meeting, the 11th session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and the Secretary-General’s reform of the Department of Public Information (DPI).

Most of the CPC members agreed with the proposed program budget for 2004–2005, although many took issue with items relating to the Secretary-General’s reform package (A/57/300), as well as the manner in which program managers implemented priority-setting rules and regulations. The United States strongly supported the Secretary-General’s reform package in its entirety. The United States and other delegations noted that in many sections of the budget, targets were often still undetermined and therefore left member states and program managers with limited ability to measure real impact. The

United States indicated that it hoped to see major improvement on this issue in the future.

During the CPC annual meeting, the United States repeatedly emphasized the need for program managers to fully implement UN priority-setting rules and regulations. These include a requirement that a list of items that can be discontinued because they are obsolete, of marginal usefulness, or ineffective shall be submitted within the proposed program budget of outputs. As submitted to the CPC, only 18 of the 33 budget sections identified activities to be discontinued. Of those, eight included only a few activities. The resources freed up by eliminating outdated programs would go toward funding of activities of higher priority. The United States indicated that it would like to see dramatic improvements in priority setting by program managers. Most budget sections embraced results-based-budgeting (RBB); however, many delegations noted there was vast room for improvement and refinement of that methodology. The United States has pressed for the adoption and full implementation of RBB.

Consideration of the budgets for human rights activities and the UN Environment Program was deferred to the 58th General Assembly as a result of the Secretariat's inability to produce revised versions of their budgets for CPC review. DPI was also deferred since the CPC could not agree on the proposed regionalization of UN Information Centers (UNICs). The Committee was clearly divided between developing countries that did not want any regionalization and major contributors who wanted to see the UNIC system overhauled in accordance with A/57/300.

The CPC submitted its report to ECOSOC in July. ECOSOC considered it, along with the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ). The Fifth Committee considered both of these reports and the proposed budget in the fall.

The Fifth Committee also considered the agenda item "Strengthening of the United Nations: an agenda for further change," which included proposals to reform UN planning, programming, budgeting, monitoring, and evaluation processes which were submitted by the Secretary-General and by member states. The Fifth Committee's recommendations to the General Assembly were adopted by consensus in Resolution 58/269 on December 23. The resolution included a proposal by the Secretary-General to combine the MTP and budget outline to create a two-part, two-year "Strategic Framework." Part I would be a revised MTP reviewed by the CPC and the Fifth Committee. Part II would consist of a more detailed budget outline to be reviewed by the ACABQ and the Fifth Committee. Another proposal from the Secretary-General was to strengthen CPC's role in monitoring and evaluation to support fuller implementation of RBB. Under the resolution, the CPC would consider the new biennial program plan for 2006–2007 in June 2004, but would no longer review the budget outline. In budget years, it would focus only on program evaluations. In 2005, its review of the 2006–2007 budget would be confined to new program activities.

Audit Reports

The Board of Auditors (BOA), based in New York, serves as the external auditor of UN accounts, its funds and programs, the International War Crimes Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, and the International Court of Justice. The General Assembly elects members to serve six-year terms. Members may not serve consecutive terms. In 2003, the Board was composed of the Auditors-General of the Philippines, South Africa, and France. Additional information about the Board is available at www.unsystem.org/auditors.

Since the Board of Auditors issues most of its reports in even-numbered years (the financial periods of most of the organizations under its oversight are biennial ending in odd-numbered years), the Fifth Committee had just four reports to consider in 2003. These reports concerned UN peacekeeping operations for the year ending June 30, 2002 [UN document A/57/5 (Vol. II)], voluntary funds administered by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees for the year ended December 31, 2002 (A/58/5/Add.5), implementation of the Board's recommendations relating to the biennium 2000–2001 (A/58/114), and the UN Capital Master Plan (A/58/321).

The Fifth Committee annually considers the peacekeeping operations report in the spring, along with other peacekeeping items such as the budget. In May 2003, the Fifth Committee considered the report on UN peacekeeping operations, the Secretary-General's report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Board of Auditors concerning UN peacekeeping operations for the financial period ending June 30, 2002 (A/57/416/Add.2), and the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) on the administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of UN peacekeeping operations (A/57/772). The ACABQ's report provides comments and recommendations on specific issues in peacekeeping operations such as budgeting, inactive trust funds, security, training, and several other items. The ACABQ also offered recommendations calling for restructuring of the Board of Auditors' reports on peacekeeping and changes to the follow-up methods for the Board's recommendations. The ACABQ also urged more attention by the Board on the efficient use of resources in peacekeeping missions, and for more to be done by the Secretariat and the Office of Internal Oversight Services "to ensure that the internal audit function and the resident audit capacity in peacekeeping missions were operating effectively and efficiently."

During Fifth Committee discussions of the Board's report on UN peacekeeping, the United States commended the Board for its excellent efforts, and highlighted that the Board's importance in making the United Nations a more efficient and effective organization. It also noted some areas of concern in peacekeeping operations, including delays in the signing of Memorandums of Understanding between the United Nations and troop-contributing countries, the need to address the treatment of "trust funds that have achieved their purpose," the surplus in the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund that had

exceeded its statutory maximum, delays in the closing of completed missions, and the need for better record-keeping for property in missions. The United States expressed its full support for the Board's recommendation that the Department of Peacekeeping Operations "promulgate and implement a code of ethics, encompassing a declaration of independence, to ensure that members of the Procurement Division are protected from untoward pressures as they perform their duties." The United States also raised the issue of safety in air services, as there had been a spike in 2001 in the number of accidents per hour of flight, potentially due in part to "deficiencies in safety." The Board's report explained that the number of accidents per hour of flight rose in 2001 (relative to 1999 and 2000), but in 2002 was significantly lower. The Board's report also noted that some beneficial changes had occurred, and outlined some safety issues that needed to be addressed. The United States called for quick action on these issues.

The Fifth Committee took note of the Board's observations in its report on peacekeeping operations and endorsed its recommendations. The Committee did the same with the related report of the ACABQ on peacekeeping, and took note of the related report by the Secretary-General. The Fifth Committee advised the General Assembly that it was endorsing the recommendations of the BOA and the ACABQ. On June 18, the General Assembly agreed, by adopting Resolution 57/278B by consensus. The rate of implementation of recommendations from the Board's annual report on peacekeeping for the year ending June 30, 2001, was 38 percent. The remaining 62 percent were still being implemented.

During its regular session in fall 2003, the Fifth Committee took up the Board's annual report on the voluntary funds administered by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for the year ended December 31, 2002; the Board's report on the implementation of its recommendations relating to the biennium 2000–2001; and a short progress report by the Board on the UN Capital Master Plan. The Committee also considered two reports by the Secretary-General—a second report on the implementation of the Board's recommendations on UN accounts for the biennium ended December 31, 2001 (A/58/97), and a similar report on the accounts of the UN funds and programs for the biennium ending December 31, 2001 (A/58/97/Add.1). The Fifth Committee also considered the ACABQ report on the Board's reports (A/58/384), which included in its annex a special Board report on staff training.

In a statement before the Fifth Committee on the Board's report on the voluntary funds administered by the UNHCR, the United States noted some improvements the UNHCR had made to enhance management oversight, such as "an improved staff rotation policy and the increased insistence that implementing partners put adequate accounting and internal control systems in place and provide timely reporting of audit certificates" (indicating when audits of projects or contracts have been certified). However, the United States also highlighted some shortcomings in financial reporting and staffing, stating that, "We are concerned that the ACABQ reported the Board of

Auditors ‘modified’ its audit opinion, citing such practices as missing audit certificates and financial reports for many 2001 and 2002 implementing partners’ projects. We are deeply concerned at the Board’s report of continuing staffing irregularities...” The United States detailed some specific problems, noting it would monitor the situation “to determine if recent and ongoing changes in UNHCR’s human resource policies serve to bring about significant improvement.” The United States welcomed the intention of the UNHCR to introduce reforms, be more transparent, and exercise stricter control of the staffing table. As of May 2003, the rate of implementation of recommendations for the Board’s previous annual report on UNHCR (for the year ending December 31, 2001) was 40 percent. A further 55 percent were still being implemented and 5 percent had not yet been initiated.

During the Fifth Committee’s consideration of the Board’s report on the implementation of its recommendations relating to the biennium 2000–2001, and the two reports of the Secretary-General on this issue, the United States noted an implementation rate of only 35 percent for recommendations relating to the 2000–2001 biennium (as of June 2003), which was “disappointing.” However, the United States noted that an additional 58 percent of recommendations were being implemented. (Note: These figures exclude the implementation rates for UNHCR and for peacekeeping operations, which are addressed in separate reports.) The United States also acknowledged the fact, which the Board itself had pointed out, that the number of recommendations issued by the Board in recent years has been going up quickly. The United States called for the implementation of outstanding recommendations.

The Board’s report on the Capital Master Plan was a brief update due to the fact that little had occurred on the plan at the time of the report. The Board was preparing a full report on the plan, which will address the 2002–2003 biennium, and will issue it to the General Assembly for its fall 2004 session. The Fifth Committee took note of the Capital Master Plan report, and the General Assembly took note of it without a vote in Resolution 58/272, on December 23.

For the Board’s report on UNHCR, the Fifth Committee endorsed its recommendations, as well as those in the related report of the ACABQ. The Committee also took note of the Board’s report on the implementation of its recommendations for the 2000–2001 biennium and the two related reports of the Secretary-General. The Fifth Committee transmitted to the General Assembly its recommendation to endorse the recommendations of the Board and those of the ACABQ on UNHCR. On December 23 the General Assembly did so by adopting Resolution 58/249 by consensus. By adopting these reports, the General Assembly requested that the Secretary-General implement the recommendations contained in them. In future reports, the Board of Auditors will review the status of these recommendations.

Joint Inspection Unit

In 2003, the United States continued to strongly urge reform of the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), an external oversight body of the entire UN system. The JIU is accountable to member states through the General Assembly and through the governing bodies of the UN specialized agencies that are participating organizations in the JIU. The JIU is funded from the UN general budget and the general budget of participating UN agencies. The JIU's purpose is to inspect, investigate, and evaluate UN programs and administrative and financial matters. It produces reports, notes, and confidential letters detailing its recommendations.

The JIU is comprised of 11 inspectors as well as research and support personnel. The General Assembly elects the inspectors who serve five-year terms, with a maximum of two terms. JIU's Statute provides that its "Inspectors shall have the broadest powers of investigation in all matters having a bearing on the efficiency of the services and the proper use of funds." It calls for JIU inspectors to "provide an independent view through inspection and evaluation aimed at improving management and methods and at achieving greater co-ordination between organizations." Inspectors are to be "chosen from among members of national supervision or inspection bodies, or from among persons of a similar competence on the basis of their special experience in national or international administrative and financial matters, including management questions. The inspectors shall serve in their personal capacity." In late 2003, Mr. Ion Gorita (Romania) was selected as JIU's Chair, and M. Deborah Wynes (United States) was selected as Vice-Chair. The JIU is based in Geneva.

The JIU produced its annual report and the following seven reports in 2003:

- Review of Management and Administration in the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (JIU/REP/2003/1);
- Review of the UN Budgetary Process (JIU/REP/2003/2);
- From the Optical Disk System to the Official Document System (ODS): Status of Implementation and Evaluation (JIU/REP/2003/3);
- Multilingualism and Access to Information: Case Studies for WHO (JIU/REP/2003/4);
- Achieving the Universal Primary Education Goal of the Millennium Declaration—New Challenges for Development Cooperation (JIU/REP/2003/5);
- Management Review of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (JIU/REP/2003/6); and
- Evaluation of the UN Volunteers Program (JIU/REP/2003/7).

During deliberations in fall 2003, the Fifth Committee discussed the JIU's annual report, its work program, its preliminary listing of reports for the coming year, and the implementation of JIU recommendations. An additional

important topic discussed was that of reform. Some member states like the United States have called for fundamental JIU reform for a number of years. As in the past, the United States again criticized the JIU for producing reports that were too broad and that did not offer practical recommendations that managers and governing bodies could employ.

In the wake of these Fifth Committee criticisms, the JIU produced a reform plan, titled “Report of the Joint Inspection Unit on the preliminary review of its statute and working methods.” Major donors, including the United States, contributed a comprehensive reform proposal. Other member states introduced their own proposals. In addition to welcoming the JIU’s reform proposals, the United States suggested the following two specific changes: a tightening of the qualifications for future inspector candidates, and a better process for the selection of topics for JIU reports. While a majority of delegations desired change in the JIU, the Fifth Committee could not agree on a reform package. Therefore, discussions were deferred to March 2004. Pending the conclusion of the discussions on reform, the Fifth Committee approved only the first year of the UN’s portion of the JIU’s biennial budget for 2004–2005.

Office of Internal Oversight Services

The UN Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) is based in New York. The OIOS chief, Under Secretary-General Dileep Nair (Singapore), reports to the UN Secretary-General. According to Resolution 48/218B (1994), the “purpose of the Office of Internal Oversight Services is to assist the Secretary-General in fulfilling his internal oversight responsibilities in respect of the resources and staff” through monitoring, internal audits, inspections, evaluations, investigations, and “implementation of recommendations and reporting procedures.” In addition to these mandated responsibilities, OIOS provides some management consulting services. Chief Nair’s five-year non-renewable term expires in 2005.

OIOS is primarily an internal oversight body; its recommendations are generally used as management tools by the Secretary-General to improve UN operations. According to its annual report covering the year ending June 30, 2003, OIOS had made 2,737 recommendations. It classified 29 percent of these recommendations as “critical,” a descriptor utilized since January 2000 to focus attention, as the annual report explains, on “areas with far-reaching consequences for the Organization’s performance.” Of all the recommendations OIOS issued, 50.6 percent had been implemented as of June 30, 2003. OIOS identified approximately \$36.9 million in potential cost savings and recoveries. In the period covered by the latest report, the United Nations had total actual savings and recoveries of \$15.4 million. This figure was substantially lower than the figure in 2002, due in large part to savings in the previous reporting period from an audit of subsistence allowance rates in selected peacekeeping missions.

In 2003, OIOS began using a risk-management framework to determine its annual work program. In its annual report, OIOS explained that

it uses this framework “to prioritize and rationalize the allocation of resources to oversight of programmatic and operational areas that have the greatest exposure to fraud, waste, abuse, inefficiencies, and mismanagement.” OIOS outlined the criteria used to determine its annual work program as follows: “risk to the Organization’s resources and reputation; requests from the General Assembly, departments, and offices for oversight coverage; large budget items; new activities with no previous oversight coverage; and priority areas for the reform program of the Secretary-General” as well as the “need for follow-up of critical recommendations in high-risk areas that have not been implemented by program managers...”

A select number of OIOS reports and an annual summary report are submitted to the General Assembly. OIOS submits to the General Assembly those reports it determines are of broad interest to member states and that would not compromise confidentiality. Generally, OIOS reports transmitted to the General Assembly are available at www.un.org/depts/oios. Examples of specific activities and investigations performed by OIOS in the period covered by its annual report include the following:

- Issued six reports on the Iraq Oil-for-Food program. In its annual report, OIOS included a summary of its work on the Office of the Iraq Program (the UN office that administered the Oil-for-Food program), noting an audit OIOS completed on its headquarters activities and reviews of the activities of the UN Office of the Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq, which reported to the Office of the Iraq Program;
- Worked with the European Anti-Fraud Office to secure \$4.2 million in funds stolen by a former senior staff member of the UN Interim Administration in Kosovo. The investigation’s findings aided in the conviction of the former staff member in his home country in June 2003; and
- Followed up on a December 2001 OIOS-led international task force investigation of refugee smuggling in the Nairobi office of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). OIOS aided Kenya in its trials of 10 people (four of whom were UNHCR staff) accused of involvement in the smuggling operation. One individual was found guilty; other cases were scheduled for later dates. Under a special arrangement, OIOS is the internal auditor for UNHCR, and has an office in Geneva devoted specifically to audit the UNHCR. OIOS issued 1,445 recommendations for UNHCR, and found \$7.5 million in potential cost savings and recoveries; \$4.4 million of this was saved or recovered as of June 30, 2003.

During Fifth Committee discussion of OIOS reports, the United States called for the implementation of all OIOS recommendations. The United States endorsed OIOS use of a risk-management framework to determine its annual work program. The United States also supported an OIOS leading role in the UN’s new organizational integrity initiative, which Chief Dileep Nair described in the introduction to the OIOS annual report as

“a three-year program aimed at strengthening integrity and professional ethics in the organization.” Referring to the OIOS annual report, the United States underscored a recurrent theme—the question of management accountability: “OIOS has urged managers to take ownership of their work, which must include holding managers accountable for results. The United Nations must also strengthen evaluation mechanisms and provide a tangible link between outcomes and resource requests.” Fifth Committee delegations were not able to reach consensus on a draft resolution on the OIOS annual report and deferred discussion of this item until March 2004.

The OIOS is funded through the UN regular budget.

International Civil Service Commission

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), a 15-member body of recognized experts, is responsible for making recommendations on salaries, allowances, benefits, and other conditions of service (the “common system”) for employees of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Lucretia Myers, a U.S. citizen, served the second year of her current four-year term as the U.S. member on the Commission.

In 2003, the Commission met in Rome and New York for its 56th and 57th sessions, respectively. The Commission focused on continuing its review of the pay and benefits system, with a view to making the compensation package of the common system more responsive to and supportive of member states’ and organizations’ needs. The ICSC worked in a number of priority areas, including linkage of pay to performance, pay banding, reform of the job evaluation system, and establishment of a senior management service.

The Commission supported a confluence of three factors—performance, competency development, and client feedback—as a basis for determining performance pay. The Commission decided to pilot broad-banded salary systems in several UN organizations that agreed to participate in the study. Under these systems, current grades are divided into broad salary groups. There are no steps within the bands, and staff move within a band according to their competency development and performance. A revised and simplified job evaluation system for professional and higher category posts was designed to work in conjunction with broad-banding and pay-for-performance systems. Work progressed on the development of a Senior Management Service with a view to validating core competencies and determining criteria for membership. The Commission also discussed contractual arrangements, mobility, mission subsistence allowance, and hazard pay for locally recruited staff. The United States supported all the ICSC’s proposals except hazard pay.

In 2002, the ICSC had made a decision to increase hazard pay for locally recruited staff (General Service, or GS) from 20 percent to 30 percent of the midpoint of the local salary scale effective January 1, 2004. This measure would reflect a 50 percent increase in the benefit. The United States believed that the ICSC’s decision to increase hazard pay for locally recruited

staff was inappropriate and inequitable in view of their decision to maintain unchanged the current level of hazard pay for international staff whose hazard pay amount effectively was only about 18 percent of the midpoint of their salary scale. This increase for locally recruited staff would result in an even wider difference between the two categories. GS staff would have to deal with many of the hazardous conditions regardless of their employment status with the United Nations. Hazard pay was intended as a symbolic gesture rather than an essential part of the compensation plan. However, because the same dollar amount of hazard pay is granted to GS staff at all grade levels, if that amount were increased to 30 percent of the midpoint of the entire salary scale, at lower grade levels the amount of hazard pay could exceed the staff member's base salary and could no longer be considered symbolic. The United States argued that increasing hazard pay was not the best approach; putting money into the pockets of staff does nothing to improve their security. A better course would be to expend available resources and efforts on improving overall security for UN personnel.

The Commission transmitted its proposals in its annual report to the Fifth Committee for action. The majority of delegations to the Fifth Committee supported the ICSC's reaffirmation of its earlier decision. After the devastating August bomb attack on UN headquarters in Baghdad, member states did not want to be seen as supporting an action to deny local staff an increase in this benefit. Furthermore, a decision to increase hazard pay falls under the purview of the ICSC, and most delegations were reluctant to infringe on the Commission's prerogative. The United States and Germany were the only vocal opponents of this increase. As a compromise, member states agreed to request that the ICSC reconsider its decision and decide on a smaller increase. The ICSC's Chair informed Fifth Committee delegates that at the ICSC's 2004 spring session, he would inform the Commission members of the views of member states.

On December 11, the Fifth Committee formally adopted without a vote Resolution 58/251 on the UN Common System. With the exception of the hazard pay issue, member states agreed to a simple procedural resolution that took note of the ICSC's decisions in its annual report concerning the review of the pay and benefits system, contractual arrangements, mobility, and mission subsistence allowance. These issues would be dealt with in greater detail at the 59th General Assembly in 2004, a personnel/human resources year in the normal biennial review cycle for such matters.

Human Resources Management

At its resumed session (March–April 2003), the UN General Assembly's Fifth Committee considered and reached consensus on a wide range of human resources management issues, including management reform, delegation of authority and accountability, monitoring capacity in the Office of Human Resources Management, consultants and individual contractors, employment of retired former staff, and mandatory age of separation.

On April 15, upon the recommendation of the Fifth Committee, the General Assembly adopted by consensus Resolution 57/305 which, among other things:

- Requested the Secretary-General to ensure that staff adhere fully to the UN's code of conduct;
- Requested the Secretary-General to provide a comprehensive report on the achievements made in human resources management reform when sufficient information becomes available on the experiences of the Secretariat with implemented reform measures;
- Called for a study and a report to the General Assembly at its 59th session by the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the impact of human resources management reform, especially on the improvement of recruitment, placement, promotion, and training. This study will include an assessment of the role of the central review bodies and mobility within the Secretariat;
- Requested that future reports by the Secretary-General on implementation of human resources management reforms focus on their results;
- Requested the Secretary-General to hold program managers accountable in the staff selection process;
- Endorsed the Secretary-General's approach to improve the Office of Human Resources Management's capacity for monitoring; and
- Endorsed a Committee for Program and Coordination recommendation that greater efforts should be made to geographically balance UN consultants and individual contractors.

Throughout the discussion and the formulation of Resolution 57/205, the United States played an instrumental role in thwarting attempts by the G-77 and China to roll back many of the initiatives contained in the landmark reform Resolution 55/258 (2001) and in the new "Staff Selection System" implemented by the Office of Human Resources Management. In particular, the G-77 and China tried to diminish the newly enhanced role of program managers in the staff selection process. They argued for ways to increase the number of senior and professional posts occupied by developing countries, disregarding Secretariat data showing that developing countries occupy two-thirds of all professional posts and an even higher percentage of senior policy positions. The United States, with other like-minded members, not only successfully challenged these efforts, but also secured agreement in reaffirming previous resolutions on equitable geographic distribution. Furthermore, the U.S. representative expressed concern over the number of member states that continued to be unrepresented and under-represented, as well as an increase in the number of over-represented states. The United States and others also successfully maintained that hiring and promotion should be based on principles of merit, demonstrated competencies, and performance, and not seniority and undue preference for internal candidates.

The G-77 and China successfully argued against the complete elimination of paper job applications (an element of human resources management reform) on the grounds that less developed countries would be technologically disadvantaged by such a change. Some member states also attempted to have the Galaxy system (a new electronic employment application system) made available in all six UN official languages. However, the United States and others derailed this costly approach and reached a compromise to provide only the application instructions in the six languages. The actual application process would be in the two working languages. The Secretariat assured the Committee that these concessions would not pose undue costs or restrain the reform process.

The Committee resolved two other contentious issues concerning mandatory age of separation and the employment of retired former staff. With regard to the former, some delegations wanted to eliminate the Secretary-General's authority to grant, in exceptional cases, the temporary extension of employment of staff members who reached the mandatory age of separation. The Committee agreed to allow staff in service to remain beyond the mandatory age of separation pursuant to the exceptions in the UN Staff Regulations. However, the Secretary-General must report biennially on exceptions made and the reasons for them.

With regard to re-employment of former staff, some delegations wanted to totally ban retired former staff from serving in certain decision-making posts as well as from representing the Secretariat before inter-governmental bodies. The Secretariat successfully argued against both measures and insisted that such actions would challenge the Secretary-General's authority. The U.S. delegation maintained that, since only a few individuals fell under this category and because such employees are subject to the same ethical scrutiny and staff rules as regular staff, new rules constraining their service were unwarranted.

Overall, Resolution 57/305 did not break new ground. Instead, it reaffirmed previously agreed language on human resources management reform. The U.S. delegation, in the face of concerted efforts by the G-77 and China to roll back some of the previously agreed upon reform measures (on the grounds that these measures proved disadvantageous to them), successfully argued that more time and additional information would be needed to fully and properly assess the impact of the implemented reform measures before modifying them. As a result, the resolution called for several comprehensive reports that will aid in the proper assessment and appraisal of reform efforts implemented so far. These reports were sought from the Secretariat, Office of Internal Oversight Services, and the UN Joint Inspection Unit for consideration at the 59th General Assembly.

Employment of Americans

The Department of State assists qualified U.S. citizens in competing for professional positions in the United Nations and other international organizations. The Department's UN Employment Information and Assistance

Unit, along with numerous other federal agencies, supports this effort by disseminating announcements of vacancies in international organizations to Americans worldwide. In a typical year, the Department provides direct assistance to hundreds of Americans and general information about employment opportunities in international organizations to thousands of others. U.S. missions to the United Nations and other international organizations in New York, Geneva, Montreal, Nairobi, Paris, Rome, and Vienna, as well as some embassies support for this function through regular contacts with UN agency officials. The U.S. Government places special emphasis on recruiting and promoting Americans for key, senior-level positions throughout the UN system.

Total Employment Numbers

The following chart shows the total number of Americans in professional and senior positions as of December 31, in the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). It does not include the international financial institutions, tribunals, the International Court of Justice, and the UN Industrial Development Organization, the latter of which the United States is not a member.

Table 1
U.S. Representation in the UN System
Professional and Senior Staff

	Total	Americans	Percent
UN Secretariat	6,043	659	10.9%
UN Peacekeeping Operations	1,604	175	10.9%
UN Subsidiary Bodies	8,262	670	8.1%
UN Specialized Agencies and IAEA	<u>7,963</u>	<u>724</u>	<u>9.1%</u>
Total	23,872	2,228	9.3%

Agencies with Geographic Targets

The UN Secretariat and several of the specialized agencies have established systems of “desirable ranges” reflecting each organization’s targeted geographic representation for member states. Generally, these ranges are driven by formulas that weight variables—typically membership, individual member country assessment level, and population. Each agency’s governing body establishes these formulas and the number and type of positions subject to geographic consideration. The following chart includes those UN agencies that had such ranges in 2003—the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Labor Organization (ILO), the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the World Health Organization (WHO)—and the number and status of Americans on board as of December 31. (Note: These figures represent only those

professional posts “subject to geographic distribution” that were funded from the UN agencies’ assessed budgets.)

In 2003, the percentage of U.S. citizens in the UN, ICAO, ILO, and WHO declined, while it increased in FAO. The United States rejoined UNESCO in 2003. During the U.S. 19-year absence from UNESCO, American citizens were not eligible to apply for positions there. The information below forms the basis of comparison for future reports.

Table 2
UN-Related Agencies with Geographic Ranges for Employment

UN Agency	U.S. 2003 Assessment	Total Filled	Desirable Range or Quota for Americans	Filled by Americans	
			Range	Number	Percent
UN	22%	2,487	285–385	315	12.7%
FAO	22%	1,057	174–233	136	12.9%
ICAO	25%	208	31	11	5.3%
ILO	22%	674	93–125	97	14.4%
UNESCO	22%	728	46–76	20	2.7%
WHO	22%	1,369	142–193	160	11.7%

Agencies Seeking Geographic Balance

Other UN specialized agencies and IAEA do not have official geographic ranges but are required to give due consideration to geographic balance when making appointments. The following chart lists those UN agencies, the level of U.S. contribution, total professional posts filled that are subject to geographic consideration (i.e., not necessarily all professional posts), and the number of Americans in such posts as of December 31. These agencies are the IAEA, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the Universal Postal Union (UPU), the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

Table 3
UN-Related Agencies without Geographic Ranges for Employment

UN Agency	U.S. 2003 Assessment	Professional Posts Filled		
		Total	U.S. Number	U.S. Percent
IAEA	25.7%	746	92	12.3%
IMO	3.6%	88	4	4.5%
ITU	8.9%	292	17	5.8%
UPU	5.7%	58	3	5.2%
WIPO	6.6%	361	22	6.1%
WMO	21.6%	118	6	5.1%

Following is a chart of staffing levels in other major UN bodies funded through voluntary contributions to which official geographic ranges do not apply. These bodies include the UN Development Program (UNDP), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF), the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), and the World Food Program (WFP).

Table 4
UN Programs and Funds Receiving Voluntary Contributions with No Geographic Employment Ranges

UN Agency	International Professional Posts Filled		
	Total	U.S. Number	U.S. Percent
UNDP	974	113	11.6%
UNHCR	1,349	116	8.6%
UNICEF	1,813	228	12.6%
UNRWA	126	17	13.5%
WFP	979	97	9.9%

In 2003, Americans held the top position in three UN agencies: UNICEF (Carol Bellamy, Executive Director), UPU (Thomas Leavey, Director General), and WFP (James Morris, Executive Director). Americans also held one of the second-most senior posts in the FAO (Deputy Director General), IAEA (Deputy Director General), ILO (Executive Director, Social Dialogue Sector), UNHCR (Deputy High Commissioner), and WIPO (Deputy Director General). Three Americans held the rank of Under Secretary-General (USG) at the UN Secretariat, including the USG for Management, the Special Representative of the Secretary General for the UN Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the President of the Staff-Management Coordination Committee. Two other Americans held UN Secretariat positions at the Assistant Secretary-General level.

Representation of U.S. Women

Throughout the year, UN agencies continued to give special attention to recruiting qualified women. In 2003, American women represented almost 47 percent of all Americans in professional and senior positions in the UN Secretariat, and nearly 46 percent of Americans in such positions in the United Nations, its subsidiary bodies and specialized agencies, and the IAEA.

U.S. Government Secondments

The United States has a long-standing policy of supporting UN agencies by assigning federal employees to them either on “transfer” (in which the employee is paid by the UN agency but retains reemployment rights with the U.S. agency), or on “detail” (in which the employee typically remains on the U.S. payroll, but serves at the UN agency). These assignments may last as long as eight years. During fiscal year 2003, a total of 120 federal employees from 13 federal agencies were on detail or transfer to UN system agencies, representing about 5.4 percent of the Americans who worked in professional positions in UN agencies during that year. Of the 64 employees on “detail” to UN agencies, the vast majority came from the Department of Health and Human Services—primarily from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—on assignment to the WHO. Of the 56 employees on “transfer” to UN agencies the largest number were from the Department of Transportation who went to work for ICAO.

Junior Professional Officers

The United States also continued to fund a number of Junior Professional Officer positions including some at UNHCR (16), FAO (3), and WFP (2).

United States Participation in the United Nations—2003