AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE REDESIGN

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 26, 2017

Serial No. 115–74

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/ or http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

27–010PDF WASHINGTON : 2017

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EDWARD R. ROYCE, California, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
MO BROOKS, Alabama
PAUL COOK, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
RON DeSANTIS, Florida
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
TED S. YOHO, Florida
ADAM KINZINGER, Illinois
LEE M. ZELDIN, New York
DANIEL M. DONOVAN, Jr., New York
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, Jr., Wisconsin
ANN WAGNER, Missouri
BRIAN J. MAST, Florida
FRANCIS ROONEY, Florida
BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania
THOMAS A. GARRETT, Jr., Virginia

ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
BRAD SHERMAN, California
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
KAREN BASS, California
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
DAVID N. CICILLINE, Rhode Island
AMI BERA, California
LOIS FRANKEL, Florida
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois
BRENDAN F. BOYLE, Pennsylvania
DINA TITUS, Nevada
NORMA J. TORRES, California
BRADLEY SCOTT SCHNEIDER, Illinois
THOMAS R. SUOZZI, New York
ADRIANO ESPAILLAT, New York
TED LIEU, California

AMY PORTER, *Chief of Staff* THOMAS SHEEHY, *Staff Director*
JASON STEINBAUM, *Democratic Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESS

The Honorable John J. Sullivan, Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of State 5

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

The Honorable John J. Sullivan: Prepared statement 7

APPENDIX

Hearing notice 60
Hearing minutes 61
The Honorable Eliot L. Engel, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York: Material submitted for the record 63
The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia: Prepared statement 71
Written responses from the Honorable John J. Sullivan to questions submitted for the record by:
- The Honorable Edward R. Royce, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, and chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs 73
- The Honorable Eliot L. Engel 75
- The Honorable Steve Chabot, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 95
- The Honorable Brad Sherman, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 96
- The Honorable Brian K. Fitzpatrick, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 98
- The Honorable Gregory W. Meeks, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York 99
- The Honorable David Cicilline, a Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island 102
- The Honorable Ami Bera, a Representative in Congress from the State of California 103
- The Honorable Robin L. Kelly, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois 106

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE REDESIGN

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2017

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:04 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ed Royce (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ROYCE. The hearing will come to order. I will ask the members all to take their seats, if you will.

Today we hear from Deputy Secretary of State John Sullivan on the proposed reforms that he and Secretary Tillerson are working on for the State Department and for the Agency for International Development.

I don't think there are many that question the need to improve the operation of both agencies. A more efficient and effective State Department and USAID would better promote our national security and our many other interests around the world. So I have welcomed the administration's undertaking.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson has started a process here, as those at State will tell you, where he is focusing on listening to the diplomats and listening to the employees, our foreign service officers. I think this very commendable. He has sought feedback here from the bottom up. Many employees, he reports, have asked, and I think this speaks volumes, for more responsibility and, in turn, more accountability for their performance. They also want better training throughout their careers and a modern IT infrastructure. And I think they deserve these tools, and we would be all better off if they had them.

So I welcome Secretary Tillerson's efforts to address the Department's aging technology infrastructure, and to strengthen the diversity of the Department's workforce, including increased recruitment.

He has focused specifically on veterans and minority candidates, and this is a goal the committee here has long supported. But as a country with global challenges and opportunities, I do have continued concerns about whether our diplomats and development specialists will have the resources they need. Yes, there is room for savings. We need savings. But we should not and cannot lose sight of the fact that our diplomacy and assistance improves our national security, improves our economic well-being for a relatively small amount of money.

Consider this committee's work to sanction rogue regimes like Iran over their missile program, or like North Korea. It takes skilled, properly resourced diplomacy to build international support for sanctions enforcement. And the same is true when it comes to convincing nations to turn away cheap labor from North Korea, for example. It takes our diplomats going out and explaining, when you are doing an arrangement where you are not paying those workers from North Korea, you are only feeding them, and you are sending the check, the foreign currency, to the regime. That money is going into the nuclear weapons program and that has to end because of our sanctions. That has to be explained by our foreign service officers; or working with us to counter Hezbollah; or granting our health specialists access to halt an emerging pandemic in its tracks, as was done in West Africa with the Ebola virus.

Robust diplomacy is also needed in conflict zones to defeat ISIS and defeat other threats. And that is what we hear from our generals who understand the critical need for our country to have successful political, and not just military, strategies.

But this leadership requires us being present. And I am concerned about reports of closing Embassies and consulates. Where we depart, we create a void for unfriendly actors to step in and promote interest hostile to our interests. Where there is a diplomatic void, we have no eyes, we have no ears, to detect the next threat or the next opportunity.

And so I want to thank the Department. I want to thank the Department specifically for starting a dialogue with Congress on these reforms, and on its policies, and on its management, more broadly. And some of the proposed reforms that we see here will require legislation, while others can be undertaken administratively. But in both cases, the committee has a significant oversight role to play, as we are doing today.

And after our successful work last Congress to get the first State Authorities bill signed into law, in well over a decade, the committee continues to have some reform ideas of its own, which we look forward to sharing.

And I will now turn to our ranking member for Mr. Engel's opening remarks.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for calling this hearing, and Mr. Deputy Secretary, welcome to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Thank you for your service and for your time this morning. I was grateful that you hosted the chairman and myself at the State Department yesterday to discuss your reorganization effort. I am going to raise some of the concerns this morning that I mentioned to you yesterday.

There is no doubt that the State Department and all our Federal agencies should be as effective as possible to address the challenges and to seize the opportunities we are facing.

This committee has taken some steps to modernize our foreign affairs agencies, including last year's State Department Authorities bill. There are plenty of good ideas that could bring the State Department, USAID, and our foreign policy into the 21st century. With the Department and Congress working in a bipartisan way, I believe we could get there. But I was troubled that the apparent first step in a reorganization process was the announcement of a

32 percent cut to our international affairs budget. I know we discussed it yesterday and I will try to ask you to repeat some of the things you said.

In my view, I worry about starting with the budget and then finding the reforms is doing things in reverse. To me, it makes more sense to lay out a vision for what modernization looks like, to set clear priorities, to bring in our diplomats, development professionals, and other experts, and then to determine the right budget to get the job done. So I hope in your testimony, and afterwards, you will mention some of the things that you mentioned to us yesterday, you will clarify why the decision was made to start with the dollar figure and work backwards from there.

I worry about the reorganization process. I want it to be more transparent and collaborative. I don't think that goes against anything you told us yesterday. The Department has called this an employee-driven process, and I have no doubt that the career employees involved in the exercise have totally honorable intentions.

But I understand that those involved are not allowed to discuss the plans with their colleagues, and that the private sector consultants brought on have kept tight control over documents related to the plan. The administration committed to this committee that there would be consultation with Congress every step of the way, and obviously we still have more questions. So I hope we can talk about some of that today.

And, overall, I must ask, what is the goal of the process? What is the administration's vision for American foreign policy? For America's role in the world? For how the State Department fits into that vision? And for how this process will make the State Department more effective?

The only consistent answer that we have gotten is the Department is finding efficiencies; and I worry when the administration talks about efficiency that it is just not a codeword for budget cuts. Cost savings that undermine effectiveness certainly aren't efficient, in the long run they make America less safe.

And as the Department focuses on redesign, I worry the critical day-to-day work of diplomacy is suffering. Far to many senior positions, and we talked about this again yesterday, remain vacant, depriving the Department of leadership. And making it harder for allies and adversaries alike to know who to call, and who is calling the shots in Washington. So I wish you could explain some of that today.

Overseas, our diplomats' jobs are getting harder because they can't know if established American foreign policy will be reversed. Morale at the Department continues to suffer, as senior career officials flock to the exits. Reports continue to surface of an insular group surrounding the Secretary, uninterested in the expertise of our most seasoned professionals. Taken together, America's credibility around the world is wobbling. Our leadership on the global stage seems to be waning.

And, most importantly, without a strong, functional State Department with a clear foreign policy vision, our interest, values, and security are increasingly at risk. And let me be clear, I do support modernizing the State Department. I want to see it leading and directing American foreign policy. Civilian leadership at the

center of national security policy is integral to our democracy at home, and to our leadership abroad.

For years, Congress has sat on the sidelines when it comes to the State Department, and what do we have to show for it? Antiquated IT systems, personnel shortages that make it harder to address crises or allow for professional development. Traditional responsibilities of the Department moving to other agencies, like the Pentagon, distracting from its core diplomatic mission. I am glad that the President sees the necessity for more funds for DoD, but we don't want it at the expense of the State Department, the expense of diplomacy, the expense of making sure our Embassies are safe.

In 2020, the Foreign Service Act will be 40 years old. It was written during the Cold War and the world has changed. We do need to modernize the Department. That is why I have instructed my staff to consult with former diplomats, civil servants, and other experts to begin thinking about what State should look like for the next 40 years. I would value the input of any member of this committee as we move forward. And, again, Mr. Deputy Secretary, I look forward to your testimony, and I hope you shed some additional light on this process.

Mr. Chairman, before I yield back, I ask unanimous consent to place in the record the following documents dealing with the reorganization of the State Department and USAID. The first is a report by Modernizing Foreign Assistance and New Foreign Aid Architecture Fit for Purpose. Second is a report from the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, entitled Opportunities for Reforming and Strengthening Diplomacy and Development. The third is a report from The Center for Global Development, A Practical Vision for U.S. Development Reform.

Next is a report from Refugees International called Honoring a Distinguished Tradition, Crisis Response in U.S. Government Reorganization. And, finally, a submission from Amnesty International USA, calling on the State Department to preserve the structure, staffing, and resources for the Refugee Bureau War Crimes Office and Global Women's Issue Office. So I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Subject to the length limitations in our rules, without objection, we will put those reports and include them.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We now go to our introduction here of Deputy Secretary John Sullivan.

Prior to this position, Mr. Sullivan was a partner at the Mayer Brown law firm. He co-chaired its national security practice, and previous to that, Mr. Sullivan served in senior positions at the Justice Department, then at the Defense Department, and the Commerce Department.

Without objection, the witness's full prepared statements will be made part of the record. Members are going to have 5 calendar days to submit any statements or any questions or any other extraneous materials that they want to submit for the record here.

And we would ask, Deputy Secretary Sullivan, if you would please summarize your remarks, and then we will go to questions. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN J. SULLIVAN, DEPUTY SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Chairman Royce, Ranking Member Engel, members of the committee. Thank you all for inviting me here to discuss the——

Chairman ROYCE. Secretary Sullivan, let's make sure you pushed that and then get it very close. Right there. And everyone will be able to hear you. Perfect.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Engel, members of the committee. I am honored to be here today to discuss the redesign of the State Department and USAID.

We appreciate the interest the committee has shown in the Department's efforts to become better equipped and more effective in serving the American people. On Secretary Tillerson's first day, he promised to deploy the talent and resources of the State Department in the most efficient ways possible. He also committed to harnessing all the institutional knowledge of our workforce to do that. So he went straight to those who know best, our State Department and USAID colleagues, to determine where reform was most needed. From the very beginning, our reform effort has been employee-led.

We commissioned a listening survey that produced feedback for more than 35,000 employees, nearly half of our entire global workforce. Hundreds more took part in in-person interviews. We also set up State and USAID web portals for staff to provide regular input and to continue to guide our planning. We have received more than 1,400 submissions to those portals.

After hearing from so many of our own colleagues, we convened a cross-section of almost 300 rising leaders and seasoned professionals to create a reform plan. I want to stress that the employee-led nature of the redesign is not an empty slogan. The Secretary wanted employees to drive this process from the beginning so that the Department and USAID can better serve them, even as they serve our country.

The Redesign Executive Steering Committee, which I chair, is composed of a balance of USAID and State Department leaders. Similarly, the five work streams, the groups that drafted the proposals that fed into the reform plan, were comprised almost entirely of career staff, posted both in the U.S. and abroad. Seventy-two percent of work stream members were working-level employees, those who deal with the day-to-day business of diplomacy and development. Their presence and contributions proved to be invaluable.

The resulting Agency Reform Plan incorporates the suggestions and feedback from thousands of our public servants serving all over the world. We submitted this plan to OMB earlier this month, consistent with the President's Executive Order 13781, which calls for improvements in efficiencies, effectiveness, and accountability for each Federal agency.

Let me share with you a few key features of our proposed plan. First, we need to streamline the policy creation process and optimize and realign our global footprint. The world is changing quickly and State and USAID need to be nimble, that means taking inputs from the field, turning them into evidence-based recommenda-

tions, and executing them as quickly as possible. We will use the same approach to assess our physical footprint around the world to ensure that our missions abroad align with our foreign policy priorities.

Second, we must maximize the impact and accountability of U.S. foreign assistance. We need to strengthen planning among the 20-plus agencies that provide some type of foreign assistance, to make sure our foreign policy goals are focused, integrated, and supported.

Third, we need to implement a more effective global service delivery framework to reduce operational costs and redundancies, increase efficiency, and improve service quality for our personnel around the globe. We want to reduce red tape and bureaucratic hurdles by making management and administrative functions do what they were intended to do, support our professionals as they change posts, develop their skills, and serve our country all over the world.

Fourth, we need to empower and retain a 21st century workforce by optimizing our HR support. Too often employees are bogged down trying to navigate broken processes or redundant systems. We envision HR shifting to a more strategic role to help State and USAID attract a more diverse workforce and to invest more in our most valuable assets, our people.

Finally, we need to improve our IT platforms, modernize legacy systems, and upgrade our technology infrastructure so that our employees can work anywhere, anytime, and as effectively as possible. We urgently need to integrate our IT systems and cybersecurity platforms. By upgrading our systems and modernizing our technology, we can save money in the long-run, reduce overall risks, and facilitate better decisionmaking in the future.

The redesign provides a new foundation for our diplomacy and development professionals. It will also generate significant savings as we streamline processes and increase efficiencies across the Department. The proposals we are pursuing will save the American taxpayer a minimum of $5 billion over the next 5 years, with an aspirational whole of government target of up to $10 billion.

Some of these changes will require further guidance and approval from OMB, others will require close coordination with other agencies. Still, others will require a change in law by Congress. And, be assured, that for all aspects of the redesign, whether or not a change in law is required, we will consult with this committee and Congress before any actions are taken.

We are working to move quickly on the redesign. The reforms that the Department can implement internally will be rolled out as soon as possible, after consultation with Congress. For example, in the coming months, we hope to move the State Department toward a cloud computing platform, and increase the number of foreign service family members we employ abroad.

Let me emphasize that, throughout this process, I commit to consulting closely with this committee. Your input, as always, is most important as we move forward. Therefore, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you this morning about our reform plan and hear your feedback. And I would be happy to take your questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Sullivan follows:]

DEPUTY SECRETARY JOHN SULLIVAN
TESTIMONY BEFORE THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
"THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE REDESIGN"
SEPTEMBER 26, 2017

Chairman Royce, Ranking Member Engel, Members of the Committee –

Thank you for inviting me here to discuss the Redesign of the State Department and USAID.

We appreciate the interest the Committee has shown to the Department's efforts to become more effective and ultimately, better equipped to serve the American people.

On Secretary Tillerson's first day, he promised to deploy the talent and resources of the State Department in the most efficient ways possible. He also committed to harnessing all the institutional knowledge of our workforce to do that. So he went straight to those who know best – our State Department and USAID colleagues – to determine where reform was most needed.

From the very beginning, this Redesign has been an **employee-led** effort.

We commissioned a listening survey that produced feedback from more than 35,000 employees – **nearly half** of our entire global workforce. Hundreds more took part in in-person interviews. We also set up State and USAID web portals where staff could regularly provide input and continue to guide our conclusions, and received more than 1400 submissions.

As we reviewed the comments and feedback, some themes became apparent. **Forty-one percent** of respondents to the survey said that there are tools they require to do their work that are not readily available to them. **Seventy-five percent** of employees reported that they apply workarounds to duplicative, complicated bureaucratic processes at least a few times a year. Employees frequently noted that the seemingly endless layers of approvals required to accomplish a simple task slowed them down. We also received many comments about how outdated technologies at the State Department hinder our employees' ability to coordinate with others and finish even a minor task.

After hearing from so many of our own State and USAID colleagues, we convened a cross-section of **almost three hundred** rising leaders and seasoned professionals to create a reform plan. I want to stress that the employee-led nature of the Redesign is not an empty slogan. The Secretary wanted employees to drive this process from beginning to end, so that the Department and USAID can serve them better, even as they serve our country. An in-depth, bottom-up redesign effort of this nature has taken time – but it has generated strong proposals for reform that will meaningfully improve our ability to implement our mission.

For example, the Redesign Executive Steering Committee, or ESC, which I chair, is comprised of a balance of USAID and State Department leaders. Similarly, the five work streams – the groups that drafted the proposals that fed into the Reform Plan – were comprised **almost entirely** of career staff, posted both in the U.S. and abroad. **Seventy-two percent** of work stream members were working-level employees – those who deal with the day-to-day business of diplomacy and development.

Their presence and contribution proved to be invaluable.

The resulting Agency Reform Plan incorporates the suggestions and feedback from thousands of our public servants living all over the world.

We submitted it to OMB earlier this month, consistent with the President's Executive Order 13781, which calls for improvements in efficiencies, effectiveness, and accountability for each federal agency.

But the Redesign effort at State and USAID is even broader and more transformational. It is a distinctly employee driven process to determine how we can maximize our diplomatic **and** development tools to be more effective, agile, and resilient in the face of a changing and unpredictable world over the long-term.

To that end, let me share the key features of our proposed plan:

- **First, we need to streamline the policy creation process and optimize and realign our global footprint.** The world is changing quickly, and State and USAID need to be nimble. That means taking inputs from the field, turning them into evidence-based recommendations, and

executing them as quickly as possible. We will use the same approach to assess our physical footprint around the world, to ensure our missions abroad align with our foreign policy priorities.

- **Second, we must maximize the impact and accountability of foreign assistance**. We need to strengthen planning among the 20-plus agencies that provide some type of foreign assistance, to make sure our foreign policy goals are focused, integrated, and supported. For example, Embassy Bangkok includes representatives from the CDC, DOJ, DHS, and DEA – in addition to State and USAID staff. Coordination among all agencies is essential. Strengthening our monitoring mechanisms is also crucial so we can measure outcomes and success.

- **Third, we need to implement a more effective global service delivery framework** to reduce operational costs and redundancies, increase efficiency, and improve service quality for our personnel around the world. We want to reduce red tape and bureaucratic hurdles by

making management and administrative functions do what they were intended to do – *support* our professionals as they change posts, develop their skills, and serve our country all over the world.

- **Fourth, we need to empower and retain a 21st century workforce by optimizing our HR support**. Too often employees are bogged down trying to navigate broken processes or redundant systems. We envision HR shifting to a more strategic role to help State and USAID attract a more diverse workforce and to invest more in our most valuable asset — our people.

- **Finally, we need to improve our IT platforms, modernize legacy systems, and upgrade our technology infrastructure so that our employees can work anywhere, anytime, and as effectively as possible.** We urgently need to integrate our IT systems and cybersecurity platforms. Maintenance costs for outdated systems continue to rise. And a decentralized risk management system hinders fast, forceful incident responses. By upgrading our systems and modernizing

> our technology, we can save money in the long-run, reduce overall risks, and facilitate better decision making in the future.

The Redesign provides a new foundation for our diplomacy and development professionals to define America's leadership in the world for generations to come.

It will also generate significant savings as we streamline processes and increase efficiencies across the government. The proposals we are pursuing will save the American taxpayer a minimum of **$5 billion** over the next five years, with an aspirational whole of government target of up to **$10 billion**.

We know this will take time. But we are committed to doing it right.

Some changes will need further guidance from the OMB. Others will require close coordination with other agencies. Still others will require a change in law by Congress. And, be assured, that all aspects of the redesign – whether or not a change in law is

required – we will consult with this Committee and Congress before any actions are taken.

We are working to move quickly on the Redesign. Those reforms that the Department can implement internally will be rolled out as soon as possible. For example, in the coming months, we hope to move the State Department toward a cloud-computing platform and increase the number of Foreign Service family members we employ abroad.

Let me emphasize that, throughout the process, I commit to consulting closely with this Committee. Your input, as always, is important as we move forward. I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you about this and hear your feedback. I am happy to take your questions.

Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Sullivan. Let me start, as you know, the State Department Authorities Act requires the Department to notify this committee no less than 45 days before closing a diplomatic post. Will the Department commit to a robust engagement with the committee before you seek to close a diplomatic post, because our members have decades of experience and strong views on this?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. I appreciate that. And let me emphasize here why I think this is key. Just to follow through on the legislation that we pass in this committee, for example, the legislation we passed on sanctions on North Korea, I explained a little bit of this, but our response to that threat is to have our diplomats make it clear to every country on Earth that they have got to cut ties with that rogue regime or suffer the consequences of it.

It is our diplomats who have the relationships in these countries throughout the world, who follow up and explain directly how seriously the United States takes this. And, as I mentioned also in my opening remarks, they are our eyes and ears. In northern Nigeria, for example, Boko Haram emerged seemingly out of nowhere. We have no diplomatic presence in all of northern Nigeria. The Muslim population in Africa is the most populated country, over 140 million people. And because we closed our consulate in Kaduna in the 1990s, the previous administration looked at reopening a consulate in the region, but once closed, posts are very difficult, very expensive to reopen.

China certainly isn't trimming back its diplomatic presence there, as you know. Nor, in the case of the conversations I had with the governor of that state, where now Boko Haram holds sway, told me, money was flooding into the area from the Gulf states, setting up at that time madrasas to recruit. He told me about one across the street from the madrasa where he got his education. But the new one, young boys were wearing Bin Laden tee shirts. And he explained what the consequences were going to be, and he was right. But we have to have that presence on the ground to see these kinds of things coming, and it has to be our foreign service that is engaged there.

Let me ask you another question, and this goes to this issue of hiring veterans and increasing diversity. The foreign service will be the most effective that it can be when it draws on the strengths of the American people. However, it is my understanding that the interview is only offered in Washington, DC, and in San Francisco. Will the Department consider offering the interviews in more places such as on military bases? If I could ask you that question.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I met, in fact, last week with all of our employee affinity groups, including our veterans group at the State Department, to discuss better ways to recruit for the Department to increase our diversity, which is a key goal of the Secretary, as you know.

Chairman ROYCE. Yes. And I just, in my opinion, think, that if you were to deploy a strategy, and if it was well understood that we were going to do this at military bases, and that those interested in serving the foreign service would have that option, I think in terms of the Secretary's commitment to increase efforts to hire

veterans, and this focus on diversity, this would be a very helpful way to make that happen. And I appreciate your willingness.

With that said, let me go to Mr. Engel for his questions.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I wanted to, again, thank you for taking the time to meet the chairman and myself for lunch yesterday. It is very important for this committee and the State Department to have a good working relationship. And I believe the commitments you made yesterday go a long way in advancing a constructive working relationship. We won't always agree, but I think the constructive working relationship is very important.

So one thing we discussed, and I would be grateful if you would reaffirm it here today, is your commitment that the State Department will respond in a timely fashion to the requests for documents and information that come from myself or the chairman or our staff?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely, Congressman Engel.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you. I wonder if you would also clarify, as you did yesterday, the Department's policy regarding the necessity of a chairman's letter for certain types of information, so we are clear about that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Certainly. Subject to legal restrictions imposed because of executive privilege, my policy and the Department's policy will be to be as responsive as we can be, both in responding to phone calls, to request for documents, and a call from any member of this committee, or a request from any member of this committee is a high priority for the State Department. You have my commitment on that. And if we fall down on the job, please let me know and I will remedy that situation.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you. I appreciate that. And Secretary Tillerson made the same commitment, and when it wasn't being fulfilled, I went to him again and he reaffirmed the commitment. So I am pleased that you are reaffirming that as well.

I would like to read something to you: "We will eliminate overlap, set priorities, and fund only the work that supports those priorities. We will empower our people to make decisions, and hold them accountable for the results. This begins with the Chiefs of Mission in our Embassies around the world. We will give our Chiefs of Mission the tools they need to oversee the work of all U.S. Government agencies, empower them, and engage them more fully in policy-making in Washington. It sounds basic, but it is the kind of change that will help us tap the full potential of our civilian power." That is the end of the quote.

Does this sound like it aligns with Secretary Tillerson's vision for improving the Department? There is a 2010 QDDR report, and I am quoting from the 2010 QDDR: "Secretary Tillerson recognizes the need for modernization of the State Department, and both of his immediate predecessors saw it as well. But one of the criticisms the QDDR report, including from our committee, is that it failed to realize many of its goals."

So, in my opinion, I would like to hear your opinion, one of the reasons we failed was the lack of funding. This document is full of important and insightful ideas, but because these ideas were not

linked with resources, they didn't lead to the transformation of the Department in the ways we had hoped they would.

Would the Secretary's reorganization make the State Department more effective? You will find enthusiastic support from this committee on both sides of the aisle. But how can the administration carry out real or lasting reforms, including an IT modernization, that is currently dramatically underresourced when you have tied your hands with respect to the budget?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, as we discussed yesterday, Congressman Engel, one of the key goals of the redesign is to empower our men and women, our Ambassadors, in particular, the Chiefs of Mission, who are in the field implementing U.S. foreign policies. That is one of our overriding goals that has been clear from the Secretary's first day on the job.

As we also discussed yesterday, the budget process to which you refer started before Secretary Tillerson was confirmed and took office. So he came onboard, I followed several months later. We had a budget process that was already underway. The redesign effort, as I have said in other context, the Secretary would have been taking this redesign effort even if we had had a budget increase.

It is important for us to find efficiencies in the Department, to be good stewards of the taxpayer money. But there will also be areas, as you have noted, where as we go forward, particularly with respect to IT infrastructure, where we will in the future need investments. And the Secretary has made a commitment to the Department, and I will repeat it here to this committee, where we need more resources to do our jobs more effectively, we will seek them. IT is one area where I predict we will need assistance in the future in reforming our IT infrastructure.

Mr. ENGEL. All right. Well, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We go to Mr. Dana Rohrabacher of California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. How many people do you have working at the State Department? What is your payroll like?

Mr. SULLIVAN. At the State Department, Congressman Rohrabacher, we have approximately 75,000 employees worldwide.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. How many again?

Mr. SULLIVAN. 75,000.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. 75,000?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. Worldwide.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Worldwide. What is the number of people that a new President, political appointees, but brought in by the new President, how many spaces are there for those? There are 75,000 regular employees, how many political appointees are there?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, there are a couple of different categories. There are all the Ambassadors, so there are approximately 190. Of those, roughly 30 percent are political appointees, in other words, they are not career foreign service officers.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN. So that is one category. Then there are positions at the State Department itself, Under Secretaries, myself, Deputy Secretary, Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN. There would be fewer than 100 of those.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. There is only 100?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Approximately.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. And of those 100, how many of those are now filled? How many of those political appointees are sitting now and have their authority?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Those who are now in office, actually at the State Department or in their ambassadorial post, it would be fewer than 20. That is a rough guess on my part. We have 30 nominees that are pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thirty nominees?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thirty nominees pending.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And that is for——

Mr. SULLIVAN. For both appointments at the State Department, for example, Under Secretary for Management.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Legal adviser.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Assistant Secretary for European Affairs. And then we have another category of individuals who have been selected by the administration, but who are undergoing their background investigation and filling out their financial disclosure forms and being reviewed by the Foreign Relations Committee. That would probably be another 20 or 30, I would say, of those.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. So you are saying that about 50 people that could have been appointed by the President are not now——

Mr. SULLIVAN. Correct.

Mr. ROHRABACHER [continuing]. In their positions. So when we say that elections count in this democracy, that we have 50 people now whose slots are either being taken by career people until they get there, or actually—are there any appointees from the last administration still in those positions?

Mr. SULLIVAN. To my knowledge there are no political appointees who are filling those positions. There are, however, career foreign service officers who are filling those positions.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that across the board we have seen—we are already into October, you know, and the President of the United States, if our elections, the democratic process means anything, the President has to have his people in there to help direct policy because that is who the people voted for. And I think that we are seeing something that I haven't seen for a long time, I have never seen, is that throughout our Government, not just State Department but elsewhere, we have these seats that are vacant that should be Presidential appointees.

Let me ask you about NGOs and their relationship to the State Department. Do we actually provide services for nongovernmental organizations that are active in different countries?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I believe, among other things, we provide financial assistance to NGOs that, in turn, provide assistance, whether

it be life-sustaining food, water, medical assistance. So we will contract with, among others, NGOs for those types of services.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. And are NGOs—obviously we have our beliefs and we want—we have certain standards, but when NGOs go into another country, are they required to respect the culture of that country?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That would certainly be expected Congressman, yes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Okay. So NGOs—we get complaints—I have gotten complaints, as I have traveled around, from people that the NGOs are actually out trying to change the country. And, of course, we want a certain amount of change, but at some point it becomes a disrespect for the culture of those countries. Good luck in trying to find that line. And good luck in your new position. Thank you very much.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you, sir.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Brad Sherman, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Deputy Secretary, I want to thank you for your comments about wanting to get information to Congress and answer our questions. Rex Tillerson, the Secretary, was here on June 14—and, of course, we only get 5 minutes, and a lot of us have a lot more questions, and that is why we have questions for the record. But the questions for the record for the June 14 hearing haven't been answered yet. I wonder if you could commit to having the June 14 questions answered—the vast majority of them by October 15 and all of them by October 31?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I think I can do better than that, Congressman Sherman. I believe I heard this morning on my way up, and it is strictly a coincidence, I assure you, that those questions—those responses were provided this morning. So if there are any that are outstanding, I will make sure that they are——

Mr. SHERMAN. I am eagerly awaiting one of those, and that is, I asked—you are submitting a budget that involves drastic cuts. And the Secretary agreed to say how he would propose spending 10 or 20 or 30 percent more money than the administration was asking for. Because that would give Congress the expert view or the, at least, executive branch view of not only how to spend the amount of money you are talking about, but if we decide—how we would allocate more. And I hope that you can commit to answering the QFRs for this hearing within 30 days. Can you do that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely.

Mr. SHERMAN. This reorganization plan, I hope, is not a cover for cuts or a reason to delay filling posts. Others have asked you about that delay. The administration has a muscular tone in its foreign policy. Sanctions are an important part of that, sanctions are very labor intensive. It is not a matter of just giving a speech at a rally. It is a matter of convincing a Danish or a Dutch bank or government on this deal or that deal. And I would hope that you and the Secretary would convince the President that a muscular foreign policy requires a fully staffed State Department.

Tom Lantos was our chairman here. He pushed forward legislation that created the special envoy on Global Anti-Semitism. I

know your department has committed to filling that post. Can we count on that being filled fairly soon?

Mr. SULLIVAN. You have my word on that, Congressman. If I don't, it is my fault, and I assure you it will be filled promptly.

Mr. SHERMAN. Okay. Now, there has been a report of a plan to transfer the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migrations and Consular Affairs to the Department of Homeland Security. Can you put those rumors to rest?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I can.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is not under consideration?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is not under consideration.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is a great answer. We have, all around the world, consulates. The consulates report to the Embassy, and the Embassy reports to Washington. The one exception to that is our consulate in East Jerusalem. And I wonder whether part of your reorganization could be to have the same policy there as everywhere else, and have the consulate in East Jerusalem report to the Embassy?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, the issue of our Embassy in Israel, as you know, is——

Mr. SHERMAN. I am not asking the bigger question about moving to Embassy to Jerusalem. Assuming we keep the facilities that we have now, would the consulate in East Jerusalem report to the Embassy, which is currently located the Tel Aviv?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would certainly take that under advisement, Congressman.

Mr. SHERMAN. Not everything that relates to foreign policy can be in the State Department. I would hope that you would provide guidance, as you have a process of doing, to the BBG, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, about the importance of broadcasting in the regional language of Pakistan. I don't have to tell you that this is one of—while North Korea has one language, Pakistan has several. And if you are trying to reach the population of this important country with over 100 nuclear weapons, you can't just broadcast in Urdu and Pashto.

And, finally, I am going to ask you to convey to the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, the importance in—they have to allocate their time and where to negotiate a tax treaty, and they have been doing it on kind of a paint-by-numbers basis. How big is the GDP of this country, or whatever, ignoring the geopolitics. And there are places in the world where having a tax treaty furthers the objectives of the State Department, and your Assistant Secretary of Europe testified in a smaller hearing that having a tax treaty with Armenia is important geopolitically. And I hope we can get that influence over to the Treasury Department.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will do so.

Chairman ROYCE. Okay. We will go to Joe Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you Mr. Secretary, for being here today. I was very fortunate in August, I was with Congressman Paul Cook on a delegation. We visited Romania, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Republic of Georgia, and Poland. And I can report firsthand that all of the State Department personnel who were with us were first class. They were very competent, capa-

ble. They connected with the very important new allies of the United States. And so it was just a very uplifting experience in each of those countries. And I was so proud of the dedication of your personnel on behalf of the American people.

But I do know that the Foreign Service attracts thousands of applicants each year, however the Department struggles to effectively recruit Foreign Service Officers with a greater diversity of experience, including veterans, and those from under-represented portions of the country. Successive administrations have pledged to increase veteran recruitment with limited success.

Does the Department intend to target veterans for recruitment? If so, what reforms to the recruitment process are being considered to reach this goal?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, thank you, Congresswoman Wilson. Yes, recruitment of veterans is a priority for the Department. As I discussed earlier with the chairman, one issue that we have discussed is recruitment at military posts. I have met with Retired General David Petraeus who came to speak to our veterans affinity group about this issue. And I have met with our group leader as well.

Mr. WILSON. And many veterans have language skills that could be so helpful, too. Currently, the Department only interviews candidates for the Foreign Service in Washington and San Francisco, not exactly the most representative of U.S. cities. Is the Department considering conducting the oral assessment exam at military bases across the county to encourage veteran hiring?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, we are.

Mr. WILSON. Super. Please. That is good. And what other reforms is the Department considering to recruit Foreign Service Officers with more diverse backgrounds and skill-sets like veterans?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, a commitment to diversity is a priority for Secretary Tillerson, and not just with respect to veterans, but with respect to all aspects of American society. The State Department should reflect America, and we are committed to that. Veteran hiring is a priority for us, as I have said, and I have discussed this with Chairman Royce. And we are doing all we can for outreach to veterans, but also to other groups as well who are under-represented in the State Department.

Mr. WILSON. Well, thank you very much. And I look forward to working with you on that, too. Given the prominent role assigned to the Department by the President's executive order on cybersecurity, I am concerned about plans to downgrade the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues and merge it with an existing office within the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. At a time when the U.S. is increasingly under attack online, shouldn't the State Department continue to have high level leadership focused on the whole range of cyber issues not relegated to economics?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, Congressman Wilson, it is a priority for the Secretary. The move that you discussed for that special envoy is only the first step in our approach to cybersecurity. I have discussed this with the Secretary. We are committed to raising this to a high level within the Department, and working with the White House on that issue.

Mr. WILSON. And in fact, the House passed legislation, H.R. 600, the Digital Gap Act, expressing the sense to Congress that there should be an Assistant Secretary for Cyberspace to lead the Department's Diplomatic Cyberspace Policy, the Department take into consideration that provision, which effectively calls on the Secretary to elevate the rule of cyber diplomacy before there was the provision of downgrading?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I can commit to you that cybersecurity, our whole cyber effort, will be elevated at the Department beyond the level it is now.

Mr. WILSON. And with that understanding—and we are pleased to learn that the Department cyberspace functions will continue to focus on a full range of activities beyond just economic issues, doesn't that call into question your plans to house the office within the Economic and Business Affairs Bureau?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The final decision about where and at what level we will place the cybersecurity responsibility hasn't been decided. The initial decision that was made was that for this special envoy office, which exists, we have moved that into that bureau, but that is only the first step in addressing the larger cyber issue that the Department needs to—and we will consult with this committee on where the appropriate level is and what bureau it is in before that decision is——

Mr. WILSON. Thank you. And I hope you all will be pushing hard on the 30 pending ambassadorships, that they be secured as soon as possible. Thank you.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. And we go now to Greg Meeks, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Europe.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, first let me just congratulate and thank you. It seems as though any time that you have been called to come and serve our great country in various administrations, you have done that, and I think that is something to be thankful for.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Mr. MEEKS. And, likewise, when I look at our individuals in the State Department, and I think that we have said it just about unanimously, that no matter where we travel, when we look at the men and women that are in our State Department and how they serve our country, it is just miraculous. And so, you know, a number of us are very concerned when we hear the drastic cuts—and I don't know, sometimes I get nervous when I hear the word modernization because I don't know what that means. Does that mean that we are going to get the equipment and make sure we have the new technology that is necessary so that our State Department has all of the tools that it needs to continue to do the great job—the job that it often does with its hands tied. Or does it mean that we are going to have to cut personnel and make their jobs even more difficult than it already is, because they have tough jobs.

And I think as General Mattis has said, the more that we take away from the State Department, the more we have to put into DoD. So we are nervous. And as I travel, I think that a number of the employees in the State Department are nervous. I listened to your opening statement where you said that—and I see that 66

percent of the individuals responded, but they still don't know what the final plan is, and the information flow has not gotten down.

So there seems to be a lot of morale problems now because they don't know the uncertainty of whether or not what they have recommended would be heard. And then when we have what took place, for example, what concerned me at the U.N., this past week in New York, where I believe there was some 140 officials that were there, and it was down from twice that number the year prior. And what I looked at before was consistent because here was an opportunity to have our diplomats in the State Department working with all of these heads of State at various levels. That is how this works. So when I see that kind of reduction, that to me means that there is difficulty in getting our diplomacy out and talking and working with these other governments.

So can you tell me, is that going to be the trend? Are we going to see less numbers of diplomats and people from the State Department that are going out to promote our diplomacy, as we just saw exhibited at the U.N. last week?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely not, Congressman. I approached this job—when I interviewed with Secretary Tillerson, I spoke to him of my enormous respect and regard for the Foreign Service, and it comes from my family. My family—my uncle served in the Foreign Service, my father's brother, 32 years in the Foreign Service. He was actually our last U.S. Ambassador to Iran. It was his staff that was taken hostage on November 4.

So I understand the burdens that Foreign Service and our Civil Service face when they are posted abroad. I committed to Secretary Tillerson, Secretary Tillerson is committed to the Department, that our goal is to empower those women and men in the Foreign Service and the Civil Service who serve the United States abroad in dangerous places on our behalf with little thanks. And our men and women in uniform are absolutely deserving of our respect and admiration, and thanked for their service. But our Foreign Service and Civil Service offices are equally deserving of that respect and thanks because they serve, just as our military does, in dangerous places.

Mr. MEEKS. Absolutely. And, again, thank you. Then the other decision that kind of puzzled me a little bit, that it has been reported that after initially turning down funding for the Global Engagement Center that focuses on anti-propaganda efforts, Secretary Tillerson approved the request for the transfer of $40 million from DoD. The State Department deserves to have its own funding. Can you tell me why the State Department is relying on DoD funding for its own civilian efforts to combat terrorism and propaganda from our Government?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Certainly, Congressman Meeks. Let me clarify that. There is an appropriation for our Global Engagement Center that is State Department money, and we are spending that money. A separate statute authorized the Department to seek from the Department of Defense an additional amount of money, which Defense could transfer to us. That is the $40 million that we sought. So we have our own money, we sought an additional $40 million from the Defense Department, and that is because the way Con-

gress wrote the law, we had to ask the Defense Department for the money, we did, and it has been transferred to us.

Mr. MEEKS. Thank you for your service.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Mr. Mark Meadows of North Carolina—I don't think he is with us at the moment. Adam Kinzinger from Illinois.

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, sir, for being here. Thank you for your service to your country, and it is very much appreciated. I think State and USAID are sometimes the unsung heroes of conflict mitigation, and in many ways we never see some of the success they provide because it is in a lack of a war, for instance, you know, which is hard to quantify.

My colleague mentioned the Global Engagement Center. I just want to drill a little deeper on that, if you don't mind, sir. You mentioned the $40 million coming from DoD. So I just want to clarify. You are accepting the $80 million then that was written in the statue now, and so that would be a total of $120 million in essence, is that what you are saying?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have requested and received from the Defense Department $40 million. We have our own appropriated funds, which we are also applying to the Global Engagement Center's mission.

Mr. KINZINGER. Okay. So that is happening then?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Mr. KINZINGER. So if you look at kind of your overall idea of redesign or fixing the State Department, how does the Global Engagement Center figure into your redesign plans? Where do you guys see this going? What are some of the benefits you see in terms of pushing back against the propaganda from our eastern friends, I guess, or nonfriends, competitors?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The Global Engagement Center figures prominently in our public diplomacy in countering the malign activities of terrorist organizations, whether it is ISIS, al-Qaeda or their affiliates. That has been the mission traditionally of the Global Engagement Center since it was created by Congress.

The new aspect of our mission and the $40 million which we have gotten from the Defense Department is to counter State efforts at propaganda, so Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, which is a different form of mission, the GEC was initially focused on terrorist organizations, it is now also focused on State efforts at propaganda. Both are important, both are being funded properly, and both will figure prominently in our public diplomacy going forward.

Mr. KINZINGER. Good. And maybe you can respond to this or maybe I will just state it for the record. I think the intention of Congress and the $80 million was to really focus on the counter-propaganda efforts of Russia, because as we have seen and our various friends in Eastern Europe, they are the victims of a lot of this, and we have seen the victim of that, in fact, here on our own shores. So I think that is essential.

And I also firmly believe that the State Department, as I mentioned, and USAID, are unsung heroes in conflict mitigation. And I think rather than hindering our diplomats and USAID professionals, we need to provide them with greater flexibility and capac-

ity to operate in conflict zones so we can work to provide hope and opportunity to the 7- and 8-year-olds that we see right now in refugee camps, which I would call it the next generational war on terror. And it could either lead to guns and bombs or it can lead to, frankly, a generation that rises up to reject terror within their own communities.

And I think that's frankly how you are going to actually win this. I think bombs and guns are important in the current fight, but I think we have to look at that next generation, because this could be a war that we are engaged in for the rest of my life, and something I think that is essential.

So how does the redesign in your mind offer solutions for increasing State and USAID's flexibility and capacity to operate in conflict zones like Syria or elsewhere?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I think you are absolutely right, Congressman, about the challenge we face with refugees, whether it is refugee camps in Jordan, from the conflict in Syria, the refugee crisis we see now on the border of Burma and Bangladesh. Those enormous refugee populations are a global problem and will continue to be unless it is properly addressed. We have at the State Department modest means, not the complete means, to address them. It is a global problem. So, for example, in Burma, we have spent $32 million now to start to address the refugee crisis there. Our Ambassador in Burma is looking to go up to the Iraqi state to get to the border within the next 2 days. We are doing all we can to address that problem there.

We have spent large sums of money to address the refugee crisis that has been generated by the rise of ISIS in Iraq and Syria, and with partners and allies, with the help of the Jordanian Government, which has done a heroic amount of work. We are trying to do all we can to address that problem, because, as you know, this is a generational problem, and this is going to be a problem that will face us for years to come.

Mr. KINZINGER. Thank you. And since my time is running out, I won't ask the question, but I will make this statement. As you guys are looking at diplomatic outposts maybe to consolidate or shut down, I think it is important to remember, we didn't have a diplomatic post in Afghanistan pre-9/11. And so a lot of the areas, when we look at around the world where to do this, we need to be thinking—and I know you are thinking of this, Mr. Secretary, not in terms of the conflict today but what could potentially be a conflict tomorrow, and the benefit of having a presence there, again, for conflict mitigation, which we can't quantify how many conflicts we have stopped with State or USAID.

But, again, I want to thank you and the people that work for you for your hard work to the American people. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Albio Sires of New Jersey is the ranking member on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding this hearing today.

And thank you for being here and the work that you do to serve this country and all the people that work for you. I get a chance to travel quite a bit, and they are professional, they are working

hard every day. And, quite frankly, some of them are in real dangerous situations, and I am concerned. And I also want to thank you for the coincidence of answering our questions that happened this morning. We submitted about 3 months ago the questions. And I get concerned—go ahead, sir.

Mr. SULLIVAN. There is nothing like a congressional hearing to focus the concentration.

Mr. SIRES. What a coincidence, right?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is just an observation.

Mr. SIRES. I get concerned when we throw out numbers like 30 percent, that we are going to have this kind of cut in the State Department. You can imagine what it does to the people that work for you, and you can imagine what it does for the countries that we deal with.

And one of the things that really concerns me is this hiring freeze and how it impacts the family members that work for these people. Some of these people are not going to be able to work. And it is hard enough already for some of the employees, you know, with the salary that they get, to make ends meet in some of these places, but now you have a situation where even the family members cannot be employed if we implement this 30 percent. So can you talk a little bit about that? Even schooling of the children.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Sure.

Mr. SIRES. I mean, that is all part of it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely. The employment of family members at U.S. Embassies abroad is vitally important, not just for the support, the monetary support, it provides for those families, but for the services that those family members provide to our Embassy.

So we have had a hiring freeze in place. There was an administration-wide hiring freeze. The Department has continued that hiring freeze until we get a better handle on our redesign. There are a lot of exceptions, though, to that hiring freeze. Among them has been an exception for the employment of family members. I believe the numbers are we have employed—since the hiring freeze went into effect, we have brought on somewhere between 800 and 900 authorized family members to work at our Embassies.

It is a consistent concern. I hear from our Ambassadors when they come back from post to Washington and I meet with them. Employment of family members at Embassies is always a topic they raise.

Mr. SIRES. And schooling too.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Schooling as well.

Mr. SIRES. You know, that is what we hear also when we travel.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Mr. SIRES. Okay. I hate to bring this into this Cuban foreign affairs situation, but I know that Tillerson is meeting with some of the Cuban diplomats in Havana? Is that correct? When is that happening?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have had regular contact with the Government of Cuba. If you are referring to the acoustic incidents——

Mr. SIRES. Yes.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. That have been happening——

Mr. SIRES. I was coming to that.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. In Havana, we have had regular contact to register our deep concern with what has happened in Havana and to remind the Cuban Government of its obligation under the Geneva Convention to protect our Embassy employees and their families down there.

Mr. SIRES. Yeah. We have been trying to get a briefing schedule, and we can't seem to get it, on where we are with this acoustic situation from the State Department.

Mr. SULLIVAN. If you need a briefing, Congressman, I will guarantee you, this committee, whoever wants a briefing will get one. And our staff can perhaps speak with the chairman after this hearing, and we will arrange to get the information you need to understand what is happening in Havana at our Embassy.

Mr. SIRES. I am also concerned about the crisis in Venezuela and our role with the OAS. How involved are we with the OAS?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I actually had the honor to represent the United States at the OAS General Assembly in Cancun in late June. There was a diplomatic accomplishment by the United States and our allies at that meeting, where we got over 20 countries in the region to back a resolution on Venezuela. Unfortunately, we didn't reach the two-thirds threshold to get that resolution passed——

Mr. SIRES. Sorry. My time is running out. I am just wondering if some of these cuts are going to impact our ability to do something like this in the future.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely not. We will not——

Mr. SIRES. Because this country is all—I don't want to interrupt. I mean, they are all frightened that all these cuts are going to take place and we are not going to be as active as we have been in the Western Hemisphere, which I work with.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. No, Venezuela, in particular, is a priority for this administration, and we will continue to work hard on that topic and bring pressure to bear on the Maduro government, which, as you know as well as anyone, has really driven the Venezuelan country, its economy into dire straits.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Might I suggest—you are the ranking member on Western Hem—that we formalize the request right now to the State Department concerning a private briefing for the members here with respect to the concerns our Foreign Service Officers have who were stationed in Havana with respect to some of the health issues that they have raised so that we can learn about the ongoing discussions here.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We will undertake to have that briefing for you.

Chairman ROYCE. We appreciate that.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for making that suggestion.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Mr. Sullivan, for your testimony and being with us today. And thank you, Mr. Sires.

We now go to Dan Donovan of New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, let me add my sincere gratitude to your service to our Nation as well.

Recognizing we are not appropriators, in your efforts to redesign the State Department to better serve our Nation's interests

throughout the globe, is there anything that this committee can do, legislatively or anything, to help in those efforts?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, we will have a number of requests that we will come to this committee on with respect to our redesign effort. Just to give you an example, we have shared with the committee a letter from the Secretary that sets forth proposals for all of the special envoys that we have. It is almost 70. Some of those offices were created by statute, and what we propose to do with them, in consultation with the committee, may require legislation to effect change.

So we will be coming to this committee with changes that we seek to help us with our redesign, and we very much want to, A, cooperate with you and consult with you on these proposed changes, but we will need legislation for some of them as well.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you. Recognizing that a stable globe is very much in the interest of the United States' national security, our homeland security—and that is the other committee that I serve on besides Foreign Affairs—is there any redesign efforts that you are contemplating now involving USAID?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, there are substantial redesign proposals that are under consideration. However, I should state up front, one of them is not merging USAID into the State Department. So we have a number of proposals that we are considering with input from senior USAID officials to make USAID more efficient, to align our development policy with our foreign policy as we go forward, but we are not considering, at this point, merging USAID into the State Department.

Mr. DONOVAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Mr. Ted Deutch of Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Deputy Secretary Sullivan, thanks for being here, and thank you for your service.

Secretary Tillerson told our committee in June that throughout this redesign process, he said, "we will work as a team and with Congress." And with all due respect, this has not felt like a team effort.

Modernizing the State Department so that it can be as effective as possible in advancing national security and promoting U.S. interests abroad is a shared goal, but many of us, as you have heard today, are worried that this whole process is simply a downgrading of our diplomacy by another name. President Trump's proposed 30-percent cut of the State Department is particularly dangerous at a time when we need deft diplomacy and skilled statesmen to address the threats from Iran and North Korea, to promote peace in the Middle East, and to push back against Russian aggression both in the Ukraine and, frankly, here at home.

In a time when foreign diplomats speak openly about how they look to the White House because the State Department is so understaffed, I would like to ask you, the State Department, about a few specific foreign policy topics to get an understanding of the administration's position.

First, in the Middle East, we saw a brutal reminder of the challenges that Israel faces in its search for peace today when a terrorist killed three Israelis and seriously wounded others near Jerusalem. Meanwhile, in Gaza, Hamas continues to hold the bodies of slain IDF soldiers and Israeli civilians as bargaining chips. Earlier this month, I met with the parents of Lieutenant Hadar Goldin, who was killed by Hamas terrorists using an underground terror tunnel during a ceasefire in 2014. I have also met with the family of Sergeant Oron Shaul, who was also killed by Hamas in 2014. Hamas's refusal to return the bodies of these soldiers to their families for burial is an obvious violation of international law and basic human values.

So, to where we are today. Jason Greenblatt is currently in Israel continuing the administration's push toward peace, but, for many of us, we are still in the dark about what that looks like. Mr. Greenblatt said last week that "it is no secret our approach to these discussions departs from some of the usual orthodoxy, for, after years of well-meaning attempts to negotiate an end to the conflict, we have all learned some valuable lessons." So what I would ask you, Deputy Secretary Sullivan, is, what are those lessons that have been learned? What are the unorthodox approaches that you are pursuing? And is it this administration's intention to present its own peace plan?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Congressman. Yes, as you note, the White House, Jason Greenblatt, the President's Special Representative, and the senior adviser to the President, Jared Kushner, have been very deeply involved in negotiations between this administration and the Israeli Government and the Palestinian Authority. The President met with Prime Minister Netanyahu, with the leadership of the Palestinian Authority that last week. The President, himself, is personally committed to this process, as other Presidents have been.

I think the commitment of this administration is clear to the peace process. I would have to defer to Mr. Greenblatt on what he specifically meant with those comments. I would say that Secretary Tillerson, though, has been involved as well. He was with President Trump when the President visited Israel in June.

Mr. DEUTCH. Right, all of which we are aware of. Can you tell us whether it is the President's intention, the administration's intention to present its own peace plan?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would have to defer to White House on that, sir.

Mr. DEUTCH. Okay. Next, moving on to Iran, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs said in July that it appears Iran is in compliance with the rules that were laid out in the JCPOA. Now, there are very real flaws in the JCPOA, including the problematic sunset provisions. However, in order to lead an international effort against Iran's ongoing support for terrorism, their support of the Hezbollah militias in Syria, the development of their missile program, all of which are outside the terms of the JCPOA, we are going to need the support of the international committee and our allies and partners in Europe. Wouldn't a decision not to certify compliance because of factors that are outside the JCPOA risk isolating us from our allies and making the job of combating Iran's malign activities in the region even more difficult?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, the Secretary has said as late as last week that Iran is in technical compliance with the JCPOA. He said, as well, however, that Iran is in violation of the spirit of the JCPOA for all the malign activities that you have just described.

We have been in close consultation with our allies to address both those malign activities and the flaws in the JCPOA, including the sunset provision. So the President will have a decision in October on whether to certify or not, but our work on Iran's malign activities and trying to improve the terms of the JCPOA will continue.

Mr. DEUTCH. And, finally, Mr. Chairman, just if I may, my last question. As you know, Deputy Secretary Sullivan, Bob Levinson has now been held by Iran for more than the 10 years. The Levinsons were told that the U.N. General Assembly would be used as an opportunity to push forward Bob's case. Are you seeing any progress? And can you commit to us here that bringing Bob and the other Americans being unjustly and cruelly held by Iran will remain a priority for this administration?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The Levinson case is a priority for this administration, as are all the other American hostages held worldwide. Just as a note, I have met and spoken with the Levinson family on multiple occasions. I have a picture on my desk of Bob Levinson, who reminds me every day that he is our longest-held hostage in Iran. And I have personal family experience with Americans being held hostage in Iran. This administration has no higher priority than bringing home all of those Americans, including Mr. Levinson. You have my word on that.

Mr. DEUTCH. And I am profoundly grateful for that. Thank you.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We go to Lee Zeldin of New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Secretary, for being here today and for your service to our country.

The rising tide of anti-Semitism, both here in the United States and abroad, is of great concern for myself, for many of my constituents, for many Americans. The U.S. State Department's office responsible for monitoring and combating anti-Semitism has how many active members currently?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would have to get you that answer after this hearing. I can't tell you off the top of my head, Congressman. I apologize.

Mr. ZELDIN. And, previously, in responding to a question from one of my colleagues, you mentioned filling the Special Envoy position as a top priority for the State Department. Are there potential candidates being vetted? Where are we in that process? How imminent is this?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, there are candidates being vetted. Unfortunately, because a final decision hasn't been made, I can't disclose those names or where things stand. But you have my commitment that that position will be filled promptly.

Mr. ZELDIN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. How many Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary positions are there at the State Department? Is it about 30?

Mr. SULLIVAN. There are six Under Secretaries. Assistant Secretaries, there are more than 30, I believe.

Mr. ZELDIN. Yeah. Do you know how many of those positions are filled as of right now?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Filled with confirmed officeholders? I can't give you a precise number. It is well below 50 percent and far fewer than it should be, and that is not a good—we are not pleased with that situation.

Mr. ZELDIN. And I want to see you be successful, I want to see Secretary Tillerson be successful. And I believe very strongly that it is very important for those positions to all get filled. We are here now at the end of September, and this first year for Secretary Tillerson is pretty close to an end. As you know better than I do, a lot of these positions get filled up with acting heads of these different offices, and I think that you all would be much more successful to fill those as quickly as possible. What is the timeline and goal for getting the remainder of these positions filled?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, as I mentioned earlier in the hearing, we have 30 nominees that are pending now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We have in the pipeline, so to speak, individuals who are undergoing vetting for many more positions. My hope is, subject to the Senate calendar, that we will get the vast majority of these positions filled by the end of November or beginning of December. But we are behind the curve. We should be ahead of the curve. And we are doing all we can to catch up.

Mr. ZELDIN. Thank you for that. I very much appreciate the administration's efforts, the State Department's efforts, Ambassador Haley's efforts at the United Nations as it relates to North Korea. I know that it is a very challenging situation. The timeline keeps shrinking of how quickly North Korea can get to that point where they have the capability to deliver a nuclear warhead to the United States, and that the State Department is working hard on getting multilateral diplomacy, ramping up economic pressure, the information effort within North Korea so that they understand that it is their own regime responsible for many of their struggles.

And it is no small feat, what the administration has pulled off at the United Nations in getting a unanimous vote, including Russia and China, on a massive sanctions package, bringing China to the table more than ever before. And because the military option is absolutely the last possible option that anyone should want to consider, because there really is no good military option, I greatly appreciate everything that you are working on to increase that pressure and try to deal with North Korea situation.

And while it may not get covered as much in the news, all those victories with regards to bringing China and Russia on board, I just want to let you know, on behalf of myself and my constituents, I am very grateful for your achievement so far, and I wish you much success, because it is certainly far from over. I yield back.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We go to Mr. Gerry Connolly of Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Mr. Sullivan.

You said that this is an employee-led effort, a visionary document with no predetermined outcomes. How can you say that when the President's budget already recommended a 32-percent cut to

our State Department budget and USAID budget, estimated to slash $5 billion to $10 billion over the next 5 years?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I distinguish——

Mr. CONNOLLY. I mean, was that a bottom-up recommendation?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No, that is the President's budget——

Mr. CONNOLLY. You need to speak into the mike.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is the President's budget——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. Which we have to live with. And it is also a budget that is passed by Congress, ultimately. So we deal with the budget that we have, with the amounts that have been appropriated for this year and going forward. Apart from that, as I said earlier, whether or not we were going to have a budget decrease or increase——

Mr. CONNOLLY. I must—I am sorry. I only have 5 minutes. I take your point. But, candidly, if you are going to have a bottom-up, you know, re-org for the State Department and USAID and they already know there is going to be a third cut, you know, leading to the attrition or the layoff of somewhere probably north of 2,000 employees, I would say that puts a little damper on my enthusiasm on the bottom-up effort to reorganize State Department because I am worried about my own job security. And I wonder how sincere the effort is if, in advance, I have already been told what the parameters are.

Mr. SULLIVAN. The budget parameters are only one aspect of the redesign——

Mr. CONNOLLY. A pretty big, important one, though, isn't it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. It is an important one——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yeah.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. As is our——

Mr. CONNOLLY. And it sends a message, doesn't it? I mean, what kind of——

Mr. SULLIVAN. The budget——

Mr. CONNOLLY [continuing]. Message does that send to these——

Mr. SULLIVAN. The budget is——

Mr. CONNOLLY [continuing]. The bottom-up process, to those employees in terms of the value of their work?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The message——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yeah.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. That the Secretary has sent to those employees, the 75,000 men and women of the Department of State, is they are enormously valued by him, by us, and their service is recognized every day.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, I am sure he means it, but to some employees, especially many I represent in my district, that sounds like empty rhetoric, frankly, Mr. Sullivan. Because the fact is we have a President and a budget that would cut a third of their budget, and that doesn't seem like a real high value being put on their work. Would you argue that, in the course of this process, morale is high at the State Department and the USAID?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Why not?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think there is uncertainty. We are doing our best to reduce that uncertainty. This testimony by me today is part

of that process. I have had a townhall meeting with employees. I have had small-group meetings with employees. The Secretary has initiated a regular outreach, both by email and in person, with employees. We are doing all we can now to reassure them that this process is employee-led, they are valued, and diplomacy is valued by this Government and by this Secretary.

Mr. CONNOLLY. So let me—okay. Good to hear. I hope they believe it. And I hope the actions corroborate what you have just said. Do you believe that USAID should be folded into the Department of State, or is that still an open question?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No. No.

Mr. CONNOLLY. No, it is an open question?

Mr. SULLIVAN. It is not—no, it is not an open question. As I testified earlier today, there is no intention to merge USAID into the State Department.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Do you believe that USAID should be, in fact, enhanced, the role of the USAID Administrator enhanced, as the lead development office of the United States Government?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I believe that the role of USAID should be enhanced, made more effective and more efficient.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, good. I am glad to hear that, actually. I have a bill maybe you want to take a look at that would do just that.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would be happy to.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Because part of the problem I am concerned about is that, over the years, we have seen sort of a diffusion of things—all with good purpose—whether it be, you know, HIV/AIDS, whether it be Africa, whether it be other special programs to help certain mid- to advanced countries, and what it has done is disperse the focus of U.S. development assistance. And it seems to me that that is not a very good management model. So I would be glad to work with you and hope you will work with us in trying to take a fresh look at that.

Do you believe that—well, let me ask this question. We have a famine going on in Africa right now. Do you believe that USAID and the State Department are currently well-equipped to respond to that famine? And then my time is up.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We are not doing as much as we should be to respond to that famine. We should do and will do more.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. And thanks for your refreshing testimony. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. Ann Wagner of Missouri.

Mrs. WAGNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing. And I thank you, Deputy Secretary Sullivan, for making the time to be with us today.

I appreciate your leadership and am keen to watch the State Department redesign process unfold. As a former United States Ambassador who spent 4 years at State, I am well aware that the State Department is a bloated bureaucracy, and reassessing everything, from hiring, to diplomatic programming, to cutting unnecessary departments, is critical to advancing U.S. diplomacy into the 21st century. I believe that we can balance the State Department's checkbook while promoting American leadership and strength, and I trust you and Secretary Tillerson to make those difficult calls.

One of my longtime concerns is that State Department deployments are not well-balanced to reflect the importance of American leadership in the Asia-Pacific, in particular. Despite the U.S. rebalance to Asia, it appears that we still have very large Embassies in Western nations, where I served, and, relative to the conflict that we are facing, insufficient staff at our Asia postings. Are you considering rebalancing the number of Foreign Service Officers who are posted in China, South Korea, India, and the ASEAN nations to account for our interests in the Asia-Pacific?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, absolutely, Congresswoman Wagner. That is one of the priorities of the redesign, is to rebalance our footprint. The chairman raised the issue of closing posts. It is not so much closing posts as rebalancing——

Mrs. WAGNER. Rebalancing. Correct.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Exactly.

Mrs. WAGNER. What is our timeframe, sir?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The redesign we are looking at implementing—subject to consultations with this committee and others in Congress over the next several months, the rebalancing will be a process that is ongoing and should start immediately and continue through our tenure in office. I think it will be an ongoing process as challenges rise and we find the need to have more Foreign Service Officers, Civil Service Officers at particular posts.

Mrs. WAGNER. Let me shift gears here a little bit, Mr. Secretary. The last administration fought to lift sanctions against Burma and give the country GSP status, but violence has raged on. And we are going to be having, thanks to the leadership of Chairman Yoho, a hearing on that this week. How is the State Department actively responding to the ethnic cleansing of Rohingya Muslims in Burma, and how will the U.S. protect this persecuted community?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, our outreach has started at the top with Secretary Tillerson. And our Ambassador is working very hard and looking to go up to the region this week. We have committed already $32 million to address the crisis. More to follow, and a lot more intensive effort for our department, because this is, as I testified earlier, it is not a Burma problem, it is not a problem for Bangladesh or the United States, it is a global problem. The scale is tragic.

Mrs. WAGNER. I agree, and timely also, as we have seen 400,000 refugees in the last week move on to Bangladesh.

Syria Civil Defence rescue workers have reported that they have been directly targeted by Russian forces, even though they are in a ceasefire zone and should be protected by medical neutrality. What is State Department doing to address violence committed by Russia in Syria?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have established a military-to-military chain of communication. The U.S. Department of Defense, from the chairman on down, has been in contact with their equivalents in the Russian Defense Ministry. That coordination and deconfliction has, for the most part, over the course of this summer, worked well. But there have been breakdowns, including recent breakdowns, that we are addressing immediately, in person, with our military's Russian counterparts.

Mrs. WAGNER. Good. Well, I thank you on that. And I will yield back my time——

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentlelady yield for just a minute?

Mrs. WAGNER. Yes, I will. I just wanted to say that if you are interested in input from a Member of Congress who served at the State Department in your rebalancing efforts, I have a lot of ideas. So I yield back my time.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Look forward to hearing them.

Mrs. WAGNER. Thank you.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. I appreciate the Ambassador, Mrs. Wagner, yielding.

The question she brought up about the Rohingya issue is one that I raised with you yesterday and raised with the Secretary of State. And that is, we have to figure out a way to get across to the military government in Burma that they have to pull the militia and the military out that are engaged right now in burning those villages.

There are 400,000 Rohingya people who have fled over the border, as you know, into Bangladesh. They need to be welcomed back in. It is not enough to have statements from the Counselor. She is not Commander-in-Chief. Their system reserves that for their military in Burma. And this requires not just international pressure but a very focused amount of pressure on the Burmese Government to get USAID, get the U.N. in, in terms of being able to assist those in Rakhine State who have faced this ethnic cleansing, and also requires the press being on the ground. So, again, I just reiterate the important role that we must play in achieving this. We have a hearing coming up, I think later this week, on this subject.

I also just wanted to raise an issue. Yesterday, Karen Bass and I were with the Liberian President. Now, that election is a month away, and so let me just put this question to you. I understand one of the things you are trying to do is get the versatility to be able to transfer or get the reforms in place where you can quickly do a deployment. So if we have more people in the Embassy in Switzerland than we do in Liberia, and Liberia has an election next month, can you deploy right now from Europe—because we have been a decade late in making these realignments—can you deploy to the ground to make sure that fair and free elections, which is what is trying to be engineered here by Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, the President of Liberia, takes place?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We can, but it is a huge challenge for us. I will give you an example: The recent elections in Kenya—a huge logistical undertaking by the Department of State. We are going to have to go through this again when the new elections occur. We are going to have to do this in Liberia. It is logistical challenge for us. We need more flexibility and authorities to do that. And it is part of—when we talk about——

Chairman ROYCE. Let us know precisely now. We understand how long the wait is going to be here, and then the OMB is going to review. Let us know this aspect of it now so that I and the ranking member and Congresswoman Bass and Mr. Smith can work on legislation to specifically rectify this situation immediately. And I appreciate that.

We go to Congresswoman Karen Bass of California.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Mr. Chair, especially for your leadership on these issues. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask you three quick questions.

One, I wanted to ask you about the diversity fellowships. And let me begin by saying that I really appreciated Secretary Tillerson's statement—and I appreciate the timing that he made the statement as well—the State Department's commitment to diversity. So, specifically, I wanted to ask you about the Rangel Fellows and the Payne Fellows. And I wanted to ask, and I don't want to assume, but that those fellowships will be continued?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, Congresswoman Bass, those fellowships will be continued and are very important to our efforts in bringing in new talent to the Department.

Ms. BASS. Thank you very much. In August, Secretary Tillerson sent a letter to several Members of Congress effectively stating that the Acting Assistant Secretary for the Africa Bureau already fulfills the responsibilities that have previously been performed by the U.S. Special Envoy to Sudan and South Sudan. And I know one of my colleagues asked you a question about special envoys earlier, but I wanted to specifically ask if that is going to be the case, if the Special Envoy will be eliminated for Sudan and, in particular, South Sudan, considering the instability in that nation?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, thank you, Congresswoman Bass. I believe that is one of the special envoy positions for which we would need a statutory change.

Ms. BASS. Oh.

Mr. SULLIVAN. So we will need to come to this—I could be wrong about that, and I will have to get back to you to confirm, because I am just relying——

Ms. BASS. So that means, as of now, you can't change it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have to seek—if we were to make changes to that office——

Ms. BASS. Okay.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. I believe we would require a change to the statute.

Ms. BASS. Good. We will follow up on that as well. And then a few moments ago, when my colleague was asking you about the famine, you said that we could be doing more.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Ms. BASS. And I was wondering what your opinions were. We did authorize in the CR a couple of months ago close to $1 billion. And I went to the region with Mr. Smith, and I was wondering, one, has all of that money been allocated, and is it on the ground? We were concerned that some of it would be used as carryover, and we didn't want to see that happen.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will get you the precise figures, Congresswoman Bass. I would be disappointed in the extreme if it is not.

Ms. BASS. Okay.

Mr. SULLIVAN. But I will confirm that for you.

Ms. BASS. I would appreciate that. I would like the figures, and I would like to know where——

Mr. SULLIVAN. Of course.

Ms. BASS [continuing]. Considering it was spread over four countries. And then also, a minute ago, you were referencing the special—or the election, rather, in Kenya.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Ms. BASS. I was there as an observer. And you mentioned that we had to deploy a lot. What did we do? Because I didn't see that.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Diplomatic security, among other things, for election monitors. So there were a number of groups that came to monitor the elections, and we——

Ms. BASS. Right. I was part of that.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Ms. BASS. We provided diplomatic security?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yeah, diplomatic——

Ms. BASS. I know you did for me.

Mr. SULLIVAN. The diplomatic security—in fact, I met with Diplomatic Security about their needs. The requirements for diplomatic security made by the Embassy in advance of the election went well beyond what we would have otherwise anticipated for that Embassy. So there was a substantial commitment of security resources to make sure that Americans would be protected in the event that there had been violence, as there had been in the two elections prior.

Ms. BASS. I see. So then the diplomatic security you were referring to was housed at the Embassy?

Mr. SULLIVAN. And there were also posts around the country where we had other Americans that we needed to protect.

Ms. BASS. And, Mr. Chair, if you don't mind, when you were referring to support needed in Liberia, were you referring to diplomatic security, or were you referring—what were you referring to?

Chairman ROYCE. Well, because the election on the ground is going to require all kinds of monitoring, it is a good opportunity to have the full comportment of security in place but also engagement on the part of the United States. I imagine we are going to try to have NDI and IRI——

Ms. BASS. Right.

Chairman ROYCE [continuing]. On the ground. All of that requires a tremendous amount of—you and I have both been involved, I think, in the past. I have been involved in these elections, where you come in, you spend, you know, a week, and you try to engage in making certain that everything is in place for what is going to be a tremendously complicated undertaking. And to the extent that you have the staff there from the U.S. Embassy to assist, it is very important.

So what is at risk here is being able to get the ability, the discretion, on the part of the Secretary of State to move personnel. And, unfortunately, we are sort of locked in. And that is something that I think we could all agree would be a necessary change. You might not like the transfer momentarily, temporarily from Switzerland to a situation where you had the war-torn results, where we are trying post-conflict to have another successful election there, but that should be the decision of those of us in Congress with oversight responsibility and our Secretary of State. And that is where I am trying to drive the policy.

Ms. BASS. All right. Well, thank you very much, and I will await your responses about the famine.

Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Francis Rooney of Florida. Ambassador Rooney is here.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I am glad to read that you are going to upgrade IT. I think when I was serving in Rome we had, like, Windows minus 1. Well, just one quick question. There has been some discussion about the consular activities maybe going to Homeland Security. And we have 40 percent of the people in this country illegally overstayed visas. And 700,000 people overstayed their visas last year. So the question I have is, can the State Department adequately deal with the overstay problem in the United States, or should that part go to Homeland Security?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think the overstay problem here in the United States is something that should be and is being addressed by the Department of Homeland Security. I think consular affairs and the role of the consular officer at the Embassy in screening visa applicants and so forth is an important function of the Department of State. So there is no plan to transfer consular affairs to DHS. But there is definitely an overstay problem.

Mr. ROONEY. Okay. Thank you. That is all I was going to ask about.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Mr. Bill Keating of Massachusetts.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I want to thank the Deputy Secretary. I enjoyed our conversation before.

The second of the proposals that you had was maximizing the impact of foreign assistance or aligning foreign assistance with foreign policy goals. And here is a question I have: We had a question earlier on by one of our members about respecting culture. And we have also had President Trump signal maybe some changes in terms of how we approach autocratic regimes, sort of giving them—just leaving them alone or not being as involved as we were. Could you comment? Is this a change in our foreign policy? Because my understanding has always been that our foreign policy goals reinforce our basic American values, values like rule of law, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, human rights, civil rights, gender equality, respect for minorities in those cultures. Now, is that a change, frankly, the President's remarks?

As well as maybe the thoughts behind the question of respecting culture. When we are dealing with these autocratic regimes that act at odds with basic American values, are we going to still reinforce those values? And, indeed, is that going to be something that is factored in when we are aligning foreign assistance to these countries?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, Congressman Keating, our American values are, for us at the State Department and for me as an American, they are immutable, and we are committed to them. And it is a difficult line we walk in dealing with foreign governments that have different institutions and cultures, and we walk a fine line. But let me give you an example to support my contention that we don't

have a change in policy. With, for example, our foreign military—FMF program with Egypt, the Secretary has withheld $195 million. It has been notified, it has been obligated to be spent, but it is being withheld until the Egyptians show some progress on issues related to human rights with, for example, the treatment of NGOs.

It is an issue we confront every day, and we have to walk a fine line, but we never deviate from our values. We protect Americans' national security, promote our prosperity, but never undermine our values.

Mr. KEATING. Well, thank you for reaffirming that. And in terms of NGOs and working with them, the State Department when they are reducing some of the budget items they have, is that going to affect the collaboration with NGOs, the nongovernmental organizations, on the ground because of the hiring freeze or reorganization? Will we still be able to support a very robust engagement with these NGOs when they reflect these American values? Do you see these changes in budget cuts or reorganization affecting that arrangement?

Mr. SULLIVAN. There wouldn't be any policy to change our relationship with NGOs. There may be, incident to changes in our budget, where our relationship with a particular NGO might change. But we will continue to implement U.N.'s foreign policy, particularly development assistance, as necessary through NGOs.

Mr. KEATING. And the Women, Peace, and Security Act passed the Senate and just passed the House, and it is on its way to the President's desk right now. And that makes sure that women are meaningful participants at all levels of foreign policymaking and implementation, and it requires commitment and resources to do that. With that reaching the President's desk, is that something, again, that we are going to reaffirm? Because that policy change is something that was in place in the last administration. Is that going to carry forward?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think the senior adviser to the President, Ivanka Trump, would strongly reaffirm that that is the policy of this administration, as the President would. We are committed to that at the Department of State.

One thing I would note for you, Congressman, is that one thing that has astounded me is, in talking about diversity at the State Department, the number of women we have in the Foreign Service and the Civil Service has actually decreased, particularly at the senior levels, over the last 8 years or so. We have to do a better job on promoting women in the State Department, in our Foreign Service, and we are committed to it.

Mr. KEATING. Great. Thank you for making sure that is clear and for reaffirming that. And thank you for your presence, and I look forward to working with you in the future.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Representative Ted Yoho of Florida, chairman of the Asian-Pacific subcommittee.

Mr. YOHO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate you being here, Deputy Secretary Sullivan.

I was at a meeting, probably a year ago, and there was a lot of the current and retired generals in there talking about a major

world tectonic shift in world powers that we haven't seen since 1942. And the State Department being around since 1789 as the first Cabinet agency, with you in the position you are in now, you are able to step back, look at the State Department as a whole, probably that it has never looked at before, in reform. And I would have to ask, when was the last time there has been a major transformation or reform of the State Department?

Mr. SULLIVAN. There have been efforts at reform that have not been as successful as they should have been——

Mr. YOHO. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. Including in the mid-1990s. I would contrast that with efforts at reform at the Department of Defense, where I have also served, that have been more successful in about the same time period. So I think the Defense Department has done a better job of reorganizing——

Mr. YOHO. So this is an unprecedented moment in time. And I look forward to working through this to reform it and find out what works well and what doesn't work well and get rid of those things that don't, and let's make those things that are working well more efficient so that we can get more bang for the buck, especially in these times of economic constraint.

With that being said, what places do you think we need to redirect—and keep in mind—and this builds on what Gregory Meeks brought up about the geopolitical knowledge. We have seen how it failed in Robert Gates' book "Duty," how we didn't take the geopolitical, the customs of the area, the tribal culture in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we didn't get the results we wanted, obviously, and how we can take that knowledge as we move into different areas as there are these different conflicts starting to develop and use that more to our advantage to create policies so that we get more favorable results in a timely manner. Where do you see we need to focus more on that we haven't?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I think as a starting point, I would want to see a more diverse State Department, that we have more diverse viewpoints contributing to the formulation of policy, whether it is veterans, women, minorities, language, culture, expertise. Bringing all of that to bear, all of the strengths that our country has, bringing those strengths to bear on these diplomatic challenges, combined with working with our intelligence agencies and our experts at the State Department to address all of those issues that you have raised, whether we are dealing with a conflict in Syria, in South Asia, in Mindanao in the Philippines.

Mr. YOHO. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Very different areas.

Mr. YOHO. It really is. And we are seeing the escalation in radical groups showing up. You had brought up—and I want to, just for the record, reiterate this. The amount of people—you said you are 50-percent staffed, or understaffed, I guess. But yet the amount of people that have nominated that haven't been confirmed by the Senate—that is where the holdup is, the way I understand it, correct?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I want to be fair to the Senate. A number of those—we have 30 nominees pending.

Mr. YOHO. That is all right. This is the House.

Mr. SULLIVAN. They haven't been pending for 6 months. Some of them have been pending for only a relatively short period of time. But they have all come out of the pipeline, and they are now sitting before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. YOHO. Okay. And then Burma had come up, and you talked about the $32 million to start to address the Rohingya situation in Burma. I would hope, as we move forward, as you are redirecting this, that—we have known about this escalating over probably the last 5 years, and we have seen it build up. So, instead of investing the $32 million now—which we have to, but I would hope that we would have the foresight, as we see this arising and starting to become inflamed, that we do a better job on the front end so that maybe we can deescalate this. What are your thoughts on that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yeah, you are absolutely right. This is not a problem that just arose over the summer——

Mr. YOHO. Right.

Mr. SULLIVAN [continuing]. Or this month.

Mr. YOHO. And that is so true on so many of the conflicts we have around the world. That is where I hope that, with your leadership and Secretary Tillerson's, we can look at that and say, "These are hotspots. We need to get in here now," so we don't have 400,000 refugees in the last couple months and over 1 million displaced that will be the next hotspot, that we need to do now. What are your thoughts, where we need to really focus?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, right now, even though we should have anticipated this, we are now stuck with the problem we have, with the hundreds of thousands of refugees. So we have got to work with allies, partners, others, the U.N. We can't—it is not a United States problem. Thirty-two million from us is a drop in the bucket. We have to get other countries and the U.N. involved as well.

Mr. YOHO. And I would hope—I am going to offer this through our committee, and the chairman, I think, would probably be okay with this. Use this committee as a tool to get the legislation or direction that you need to direct the policies that we need, okay? And I thank you for your time. And I yield back.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. And I concur with the gentleman. We go to Mr. David Cicilline of Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I think as you outlined the purposes of the redesign plan in terms of streamlining and maximizing efficiencies and avoiding duplication, I think we all agree with that. In fact, every agency of the Federal Government should be engaged in that work on an ongoing basis.

But I think one of the things that sort of troubles me a little bit about this process is that the Secretary of State sent out a memorandum and an email indicating that this redesign would generate, and I quote, "a minimum deliverable of 10 percent ($5B) in efficiencies relative to current spending over the next 5 years, with an aspirational general interest target of up to 20 percent ($10B)." So my first question is, where do those figures come from——

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Mr. CICILLINE [continuing]. The $10 billion? What data did you rely on to come up with them?

And isn't it sort of a perversion of the process that you have—unless it is just about cost-cutting—that you have as really the only stated goal cost-cutting in these amounts before the process has even begun?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Sure. Well, very good questions, Congressman.

First, on the budget numbers, to give you an example, the amount of money we spend now for legacy IT systems, just to keep them running, is staggering. So we spend for outdated systems, to keep them patched and running, huge amounts of money. So——

Mr. CICILLINE. No, no—I don't want to interrupt, but I do have a limited time. But I guess my question is, where did those amounts come from at the beginning of the process? You are talking about IT as one of the strategies, but——

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Mr. CICILLINE [continuing]. Who came up with the $10 billion and $5 billion cuts? They were just pulled out of the air?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Those aren't cuts. Those are efficiencies that we expect from the process that will result—we are not saying up front we are going to cut $5 billion. What the Secretary said is, when we implement these new processes, procedures, and efficiencies, we expect $5 billion in savings.

If we don't get that, we don't get that. We will be disappointed; we will have not accomplished what we hoped to achieve. But we are not setting out with a $5 billion cut.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Secretary, members of this administration have given mixed messages when it comes to the role of democracy and human rights in our foreign policy.

My colleague Brendan Boyle and I sent a letter to Secretary Tillerson on August 11 raising our concerns about reports that democracy promotion was possibly going to be taken out of the State Department's mission statement. We received a reply from the State Department saying that the Department agrees that democracy promotion has been and should be a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy. However, this response doesn't actually answer the question of whether democracy promotion will remain in the State Department's mission statement. So my first question is, will it remain in the mission statement?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. CICILLINE. My second question is, the expression of support for democracy and human rights matters, but you also have to view it in the context in which we are currently operating: The President of the United States who continues to express admiration for the thug Vladimir Putin; a President who called to congratulate President Erdogan when a referendum passed that undermined a basic rule of law; a President who invited President Duterte from the Philippines to come to the White House; and Secretary Tillerson, who says Americans should not impose their values on others.

So, in that context, is somebody in the State Department speaking to the President about the consequences of that kind of mixed message, that you have a State Department where it is recognizing

democracy and human rights as an important value that we are going to promote around the world, and the President of the country is doing things to undermine that important message?

I mean, it is important to recognize it is not just promotion of democracy and human rights for the sake of it. It is because it is also important to the stability of the world, to the ability of our American businesses to invest, and all the, kind of, other consequences that democracy brings.

Mr. SULLIVAN. For all the reasons you state, Congressman, it is exceptionally important to us that we be committed to promoting democracy. It is necessary for our own national security that other countries are secure and stable and, as you point out, for example, that our businesses have stable, open markets with democratic governments in which to do business.

Mr. CICILLINE. But how do we manage that objective with the declarations of the President of the United States which directly undermine that message?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, the President has to deal with—as I discussed earlier, we have to deal with governments that are undemocratic, whether they are——

Mr. CICILLINE. Well, dealing with them and praising them are two different things.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I will defer to the President on how he deals with particular world leaders, but our commitment to democracy at the State Department on behalf of the Secretary is unwavering.

Mr. CICILLINE. If I can just get in one last question. As you know, U.S. foreign assistance programs are really critical to advancing the stability and growing economies of developing countries, which are vital to U.S. national security interests, and it can help us avoid costlier conflicts. As former Defense Secretary Robert Gates noted, "Development contributes to stability. It contributes to better governance. And if you're able to do those things and you're able to do them in a focused and sustainable way, then it may be unnecessary for us to send soldiers."

Do you share the view of Secretary Gates and many of our military leaders that robust investments and civilian foreign assistance and diplomacy budgets are necessary for effective U.S. leadership in the world? And if you do, how do you square that with the proposal to cut 32 percent of the State Department budget by President Trump?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The answer to your first question is emphatically "yes."

The answer to your second question is it is on us to manage the State Department in a more efficient and effective way and spend the money that the President has asked for, but Congress appropriates and spends the budget we have in an effective and in an efficient way and promote and implement that diplomacy to promote our national security and our economy.

Mr. CICILLINE. But you don't think you can——

Chairman ROYCE. Ron—Ron——

Mr. CICILLINE [continuing]. Do that with a 32-percent cut in your budget, do you, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am sorry?

Mr. CICILLINE. You don't think you can do that successfully with a 32-percent cut in your budget, do you?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I believe we can. I believe we can.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the courtesy. I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We go to Mr. Ron DeSantis of Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Good morning—or afternoon.

In May, when the President signed the waiver under the Jerusalem Embassy Act forestalling moving our Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, he said we will in fact move it, it is just a matter of time. So will we move it? And when are we going to move it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Two questions. The first, yes, the President is committed to moving it. The decision on when to move it is a strategic and tactical decision that the President himself, in consultation with the Secretary, will have to make. But the President has been quite clear in his commitment on that.

Mr. DESANTIS. So the State Department's view is that is the President's policy. Obviously, he has to pull the trigger, but your agency is going to facilitate that move when it happens, correct?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We work for the President.

Mr. DESANTIS. Okay. Number two, we are talking about the Palestinian Authority. They will take money—some of it comes from the United States—and they will fund families of terrorists who murdered Jews. They will name stadiums after terrorists. And we have a bill in the Congress, the Taylor Force Act, that is trying to address at least some of that. Does the administration support the Taylor Force Act?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am aware of the bill. I don't know whether we have issued an administration policy on that bill. But I will say that we at the State Department are certainly opposed to all of those things that you have just said that the Palestinian Authority does.

Mr. DESANTIS. Great. For the Iran deal, this idea of technical compliance. I mean, is it true that Iran has exceeded on numerous occasions the amount of heavy water stocks that they are permitted under the JCPOA?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am venturing into an area that I don't have sufficient expertise in, but I will offer the following. My understanding is that there have been instances, such as you cite, where the Iranians may have gone over the line, but they came back down.

Mr. DESANTIS. Well—and they have buried that. What about operating more advanced nuclear centrifuges than were allowed under the JCPOA? That has happened as well.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yeah. I am going to have to defer to the experts on that, but——

Mr. DESANTIS. So here is the issue, I think, in terms of the advice that the State Department has given to the President. The President does not like this deal. He campaigned saying it was bad. His U.N. speech was very clear that this was not a good deal. We see what is happening in North Korea right now—very difficult decision. Five, 10 years into the future, if this deal continues as is, it is going to be the same thing, maybe even more intractable at

that point. And so to simply recertify it as being within our national security interest, you know, I think would be a mistake.

The Muslim Brotherhood, there is a lot of nefarious influence that they have. The President has said that, other members of the administration. But yet, they have not been designated as a foreign terrorist organization by the State Department. Why not? And is there a possibility that State will designate them as such?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I understand that that issue has been under review, not just now but in the past. I don't have a——

Mr. DESANTIS. Is it currently still under review?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will have to get back to you on that, Congressman, but——

Mr. DESANTIS. I know it was earlier. We haven't heard as much about it. And so, if a decision has been made that you guys don't want to identify them, then we would like to know that. So if you can get back to me, I would appreciate it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will get back to you on that.

Mr. DESANTIS. Cuba. You know, we see these attacks on your personnel. You acknowledge, I mean, Cuba is a totalitarian country. There is not much that goes on on that island that the government doesn't know about.

So isn't it reasonable to say either Cuba was directly responsible for this or they at least knew and know who is responsible for it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is certainly a reasonable suspicion. I don't know that, but it is reasonable suspicion.

I say that on the basis of the fact that my family—my wife is a Cuban American. Her uncle was a political prisoner for 27 years in——

Mr. DESANTIS. Then I can only imagine what she would infer about the regime.

Mr. SULLIVAN. She told me last night, "They know."

Mr. DESANTIS. Okay.

Mr. SULLIVAN. As a United States Government official, I don't know that.

Mr. DESANTIS. Well, the question is, though, what are we going to do? Obviously, we just can't let this happen and not do anything.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have two issues. We have, first and foremost, the health and safety of our employees and their families who are down there, to make sure that they are protected and cared for. And then, second, we have our policy with respect to the Government of Cuba. Our expectation is for them to comply with the Geneva Convention and, if they are not, to do something about it.

Mr. DESANTIS. I hope you guys do. I mean, I think we need a response to this. Obviously get the facts and don't do anything rash, but this is unacceptable.

My final question is, as we look at the North Korea situation, how does the State Department view Kim Jong-un in terms of his rationality? Does he appreciate a response if he were to do some of the things they are talking about? I mean, he is a young, plump, immature kid. And we don't have as much information, it seems, on him, because of the nature of regime. How does the State Department view Kim Jong-un?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would defer to the intelligence agencies on their assessment of the leader of North Korea. We are approaching this

as we are dealing with a government, and assuming that they are rational, and that the pressure campaign that the Secretary of State has led, the significant pressure campaign, will influence them through the pressure that is being brought to bear by—not just by the United States, but by China, Russia, and other members of the U.N. who are applying the U.N. Security Council resolutions. We are going to do all we can to give diplomacy a chance to resolve this problem.

Chairman ROYCE. Okay. We have got a meeting with the South Korean Foreign Minister at 12:30. So we are going to get to everyone here, but we will keep it to 5 minutes. We go to Dr. Ami Bera.

Mr. BERA. Great. Thank you, Secretary Sullivan. I appreciate your candor, actually. And, thinking about where we are right now and thinking about some of the comments of some of my colleagues, one of the responses in response to Mr. Connolly from Virginia, again, I think I heard you correctly that in your own understanding, morale right now within the Department is not high, is that correct?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Correct.

Mr. BERA. So that is obviously a challenge. In the results of your own survey, which you have referenced a number of times, those findings also suggested that many of the employees don't feel the support of the President and the Secretary. Am I interpreting those findings correctly?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am sorry. Could you say that again?

Mr. BERA. So in response to your own survey and published reports, many of the employees of the State Department themselves don't feel the support of the President or the Secretary?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't know that that was specifically addressed in the survey. I would say that—when I say that morale is not high, I think there is uncertainly and that causes—uncertainty leaves people unsettled and we need to address that.

Mr. BERA. But we could surmise, if you work for a department, and you are told that we are going to cut your budget 30 percent, that you don't feel support. That you feel—and I'm not discounting—there were also—you have referenced outdated IT, redundancies, duplicative processes. So we are all for trying to improve efficiency. But, again, widely reported surveys, the Wall Street Journal, others, suggest that many of the employees of the Department don't feel that support from the White House.

Mr. Kinzinger asked a question and, again, I want to make sure I heard this correctly. Less than 50 percent of the Assistant Under Secretary positions are currently filled?

Mr. SULLIVAN. By confirmed, Presidential appointees, yes.

Mr. BERA. Okay. Mr. Rohrabacher asked a question and suggested that nearly 50 countries currently don't have an appointed or confirmed Ambassador?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am not certain about that statistic, I would have to get back to you on that. But if they don't have a confirmed Ambassador, they have a charge who is performing the duties and functions.

Mr. BERA. But, again, there is an urgency to get those Ambassadors to——

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely. I would be the first to acknowledge that we need to fill these positions as quickly as possible.

Mr. BERA. Do we currently have a South Korean Ambassador?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We do not.

Mr. BERA. Do we have one that we are going to put forth for nomination?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have an individual who is in the vetting process, but the nomination hasn't been announced yet.

Mr. BERA. Do we have an Ambassador to Jordan?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I don't know where that person stands in the process.

Mr. BERA. My understanding is currently we don't have an——

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, we don't have an Ambassador now, but I thought the question as——

Mr. BERA. Now, this is one of our country's closest allies to a country that is stressed by 1½ to 2 million refugees, and they are struggling. And we have to do everything we can to support Jordan. Do would have an Ambassador to Qatar?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No, we have a charge.

Mr. BERA. Do we have an Ambassador to Saudi Arabia?

Mr. SULLIVAN. For all these reasons you suggest, Congressman, we need to have those positions filled.

Mr. BERA. Absolutely. Right. There is a lot going on in the Middle East right now.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Mr. BERA. We need those folks on the ground representing us.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do want to say, if I may, though, that the career people who are in some of these positions will be filled by career people. But the State Department, through its Foreign Service Officers, who are standing up and doing their jobs are filling in either as acting or as charges, so our work is getting it done. It would it better done if we had those positions filled.

Mr. BERA. Absolutely. And I don't want to disparage our State Department employees all around the world, I think they are doing a phenomenal job under trying circumstances. They are stepping up. They are representing the values of the United States, and they are true patriots, but we have got to get these positions filled. Would you say the hold-up currently is within the State Department or at the White House?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Both. And the Senate.

Mr. BERA. What can we do as the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to speed up this process? Because I think many of us travel and visit with folks, you know, we are also sensing that we need these positions filled. What can we do to push the urgency of now?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, for this committee, I am not sure what I would recommend other than your support for our nominees that we have going forward. We can get the nominees through the pipeline up to the Foreign Relations Committee, but to the extent that there could be support for those nominees and to get them confirmed as quickly as possible, that would be much——

Mr. BERA. Let's get these positions filled.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Chairman ROYCE. The chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, Mr. Mike McCaul of Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Sullivan, Secretary, congratulations on your confirmation.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Mr. MCCAUL. And welcome to your first hearing. I wanted to touch on cybersecurity. I deal a lot with that on Homeland Security issues. And I think the State Department is going to be more and more involved in this area. As I see the espionage coming out of foreign adversary, nation states, cyber warfare, and I think right now there are no rules of the road. There are really no treaties or other things agreed to by nation states, would NATO apply in the event of a cyber attack. And so there are a lot of issues that—or questions raised about cyber that I think the State Department—as cyber becomes a bigger and bigger issue, the State Department is going to have quite a role in this arena.

So I want to ask you about what you envision the future at State to be on that issue. I know there is an Office of Coordination for Cyber Issues that is being sort of down-played with another office. I want to thank Chairman Royce and Engel, ranking member, for introducing the Cyber Diplomacy Act of 2017, which would essentially codify into law an Office of Cyber Issues headed by an Ambassador reporting directly to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs.

I'm not sure I want to put you quite on the spot with the bill itself, but can you give me your thoughts on the direction moving forward?

Mr. SULLIVAN. And I have spoken to the Secretary about this, and we have had a number of conversations about the need to elevate this issue within the State Department. Cyber, broadly defined, not only our cyber defense, but our cyber diplomacy in our interaction with the Department of Defense on cyber issues. And my expectation is that part of our redesign, we will elevate to a Senate confirmed level, the role, and we will have to figure out what the title is and where it figures in the bureaucracy. But our commitment is to elevate and provide the appropriate resources for leadership on this essential issue.

Mr. MCCAUL. I think this is excellent because this is no longer just an FBI, Homeland, NSA issue, it is really a State Department issue. So I am very pleased to hear that.

Secondly, as I look at hot spots, particularly in Africa, with these fragile states out of destabilization, rises insurgencies and terrorist safe havens and vacuums, can you tell me what the State Department will be doing with USAID to help with foreign assistance programs to help stabilize this destabilization? It seems to me it would be a very good use of our money rather than to have to deal with the terrorism insurgencies after the fact.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, I will give you a current example about our planning for a post-ISIS Syria. As we defeat ISIS in Raqqa, as we move further east in Syria. The State Department, USAID, the U.S. Government, our allies and partners need to fill in, provide the basic services, water, food, hygiene, to get refugees back into their homes to try to rehabilitate these communities. This isn't nation building, this is just basic human necessities to try to address

the calamity that has been visited on these cities and these regions by occupation by ISIS. And that is a role—that is where the State Department, USAID and our allies and partners need to step up. The Defense Department and our allies and partners are defeating ISIS. We have got to be prepared to step in after that battle is won and take the ball from there.

Mr. MCCAUL. That is very good to hear that. I think that is an excellent approach. I will just make a quick statement because my time is running out.

The Global Development Lab, I have been a strong supporter of that in the past, and I ask that you take a look at that in terms of State Department support.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would be happy to. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, sir.

Chairman ROYCE. Brad Schneider of Illinois.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Thank you. And, Deputy Secretary, thank you for your long service to our Nation and in indulging us here today in this hearing, and for your candor in your answers.

We are here talking about this restructuring. And restructuring, I think everyone agrees, any time we can find efficiencies, we should pursue those and pursue those aggressively. But a restructuring, whether it is in business or, in this case, in the State Department, should follow a strategic structure, and that strategy should follow from our mission and vision. Broadly stated, what would you define is the mission of the State Department right now?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The mission of the State Department is to—in promotion of American democratic values, to implement U.S. foreign policy through active diplomacy.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. And within the Secretary's vision or your vision of how we go about doing that, in the context of the world we face in 2017 and looking forward?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Wow, that is a big question. We have got several layers of challenges. We have countries, regions, where there are imminent national security threats to the United States, whether it is ISIS in Syria, al-Qaeda, the Taliban, the Haqqani network in South Asia, which are obvious priorities to protect the United States, to protect our national security.

But beyond that, throughout the globe, there are areas where, as has been raised elsewhere in the hearing, where we want to be active to make sure that we are on the look-out for that next Iraq and Syria, or that next Mindanao in the Philippines, so that we are being proactive. We have people on the ground who are able to spot issues, spot problems before they become national security threats to the United States. That is one of our key jobs at the State Department.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. That is a goal promoting U.S. interests—around the world has to be a goal. I think it was my colleague from Illinois, Mr. Kinzinger, pointed out that we didn't have those feet on the ground, those eyes in the community in Afghanistan, and paid some dire consequences because of that. And yet, as we talk about this reorganization, it seems that the emphasis is on cost-cutting, the emphasis is on the efficiencies. How does the reorganization specifically fit within the goals underlying the strategy that you just laid out?

Mr. SULLIVAN. So a lot of—when we talk about efficiencies and effectiveness, part of it is the budget and the cost savings, but part of it is also empowering our men and women in the Foreign Service and the Civil Service for redundant bureaucratic processes or bureaucratic processes that don't serve our people well.

I have heard complaints since the day I arrived on the bureaucracy that manages how our women and men and their families transfer from post to post, how their bills are processed, how they do it. Making their lives easier, as they should be, in how they—in their service to our country, is one of the things we talk—when we talk about effectiveness and cost savings and eliminating redundancies.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Absolutely. And what you describe is having a diplomatic corps, development officers around the world who feel empowered. There was a business book, and clearly from this organization plan, there are many lessons taken from business here, but one of my best—one of my favorite examples of how to have a good workforce is you empower them, you give them autonomy, you allow them to master their skills, and you let them operate with a clear purpose. I'm not sure I see this from here. So that is one of my concerns. And we the touched on the morale issue.

I think if we can present a narrative to the people at the State Department and the American people, of what we are trying to achieve and how this better achieves it, that would be great. What I am seeing is, this is much more of an emphasis on cost reduction and slashing than it is on pursuing and protecting and promoting our interests around the world.

Let me take, in the limited time I have, take you to some other questions. One of the concerns many of us have are the President's tweets, specifically as it relates to foreign affairs, I think specifically as it relates to a recent moment regarding North Korea. How is the State Department managing that? What can we do to make sure we don't get ourselves into an unintended situation with North Korea?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, both Secretary Tillerson and Secretary Mattis have made it clear that diplomacy is our prime objective in addressing the North Korean problem and denuclearizing the North Korean peninsula. The Secretary has made it clear that we are not looking for regime change in North Korea. We are not looking to cross the 38th parallel. Diplomacy is our principal means of addressing this problem.

General McMaster and Secretary Mattis, for that matter, have also said that this is a regime that has weapons that can threaten the United States, so we need to be prepared with a military response, but that is not our first resort. Our first and principal objective is to use American diplomacy, American pressure through our allies, our partners, and in countries like China and Russia, to bring this situation to a rational conclusion and denuclearize the Korean peninsula, which is everyone's goal, and the purpose of those U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Ms. SCHNEIDER. Thank you, and I agree with you, diplomacy has to be the front of that to make sure we have a good solution to this crisis. And I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. We thank Mr. Schneider for going on our delegation to South Korea last month. We go to Mr. Tom Garrett of Virginia.

Mr. GARRETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask if diplomacy is as effective a mechanism to effect change where other options are publicly and clearly not on the table? And by other options I mean kinetic options?

Mr. SULLIVAN. With respect to North Korea?

Mr. GARRETT. Sure. I guess the suggestion that I would submit for your comment quickly is that diplomatic efforts have a greater likelihood of success if there are some teeth to the possibility that there might be efforts that are more kinetic in nature?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Correct. And General McMaster and Secretary Mattis have made that clear.

Mr. GARRETT. Right. And I want to make sure that that is clear to anyone who is watching at home or maybe perhaps in Pyongyang or anywhere else in the world, that we want a peaceful and diplomatic solution, but while the lives of Americans and our allies are threatened, all options are on the table, and that needs to be clear. Sorry for the soliloquy.

I have done a little bit of research on you, and I find that you, like myself, made the mistake of pursuing a legal education. The only thing that you might do that would be looked upon in less esteem is being a member of this body—I am kidding, maybe. But I wonder if you are familiar with the U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929 from 2010 with regards to Iranian ballistic missiles and nuclear activity?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am.

Mr. GARRETT. And so then you are undoubtedly aware that the wording of that resolution was that Iran shall not undertake—and I stress shall not because that has meaning to lawyers and diplomats, et cetera, the testing of ballistics missiles that might be married to a nuclear problem. Is that correct?

Mr. SULLIVAN. It is phrased in the imperative, they shall not.

Mr. GARRETT. And so, too, in 2015, the Security Council Resolution 2231 with the regards to Iran, formed after the JCPOA, which I have repeatedly referred to, not to be cute, but based on wholehearted opinion, the JCPOS, which says, Iran is called upon not to undertake these activities. Are you familiar with that wording?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I believe so, yes.

Mr. GARRETT. Okay. So, in 2010, the wording was, Iran shall not. In 2015, the wording was, Iran is called upon not to. And you said earlier that the U.N. had said that Iran was in technical compliance with the JCPOA, but it violated the spirit of the JCPOA. When the wording hammered out is, Iran is called upon not to, as opposed to, shall not, does that make your job more difficult as it relates to creating a circumstance where Iran doesn't enhance its nuclear capability and the ability to deliver such weapons?

Mr. SULLIVAN. It certainly undercuts the arguments that Iran is prescribed from the ballistic missile activity that it is engaged in.

Mr. GARRETT. So I wonder—and this is rhetorical—what sort of attorneys and diplomats hammered out language that was far more permissive than the precedent language, and what the intent was, or if it was complete incompetence? That was rhetorical.

I want to take a moment to draw attention, Mr. Chairman, if you will grant me the leave to the gentlemen and ladies in this room in yellow coats and those not wearing yellow coats, which are emblazoned with Free Iran, and the perpetual presence of these individuals in this committee to stand for a free Iranian nation, where individuals are empowered to make decisions for themselves without fear of the retribution of a regime through the IRGC and the Quds Force thereof, that is willing to take the lives of their very brothers and sisters. And I want to applaud them and ask them to continue in these efforts that one day, perhaps, we will see the fruit of your diligence and your persistence.

So I apologize for the aside, but I think it is important to recognize that you all are always here, that it matters, and that it matters to Chairman Royce, to Ranking Member Engel, and the members of this committee. And I get frustrated, as a member of this body, that sometimes I feel like things don't move quickly enough, but we will achieve an outcome that is just and fair for good people across the planet, and that flies in the face of the totalitarian and radical objectives of those who seek to oppress human beings. And so thank you.

Finally, I would submit that I believe that the application of appropriately spent funds on foreign aid might, if properly done, save money on things like bullets and bombs and rockets. I would ask if you would concur that foreign aid has a role in peace and stability throughout the world?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would join Secretary Mattis in agreeing with that whole-heartedly.

Mr. GARRETT. And so I appreciate that because I think some of the rhetoric and questioning heretofore has indicated that money is the sole arbiter of our commitment to diplomacy and peaceful outcomes. And I would ask you, is the intent of the reorganization simply to perform our job more efficiently and as better stewards of tax dollars, and not to gut our foreign aid efforts, which would I think meet with bipartisan resistance from this committee and others?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That is exactly the purpose, Congressman, it is not to gut our foreign aid.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank you for your efforts and applaud you and look forward to working with you.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Lois Frankel of Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL. Good morning and thank you for being here. I thank you for your service. And I have great admiration for those who serve in the State Department, and I think it is a very important function of our Government.

My colleagues have done a good job in covering a lot of issues, and I will start by saying, I think reorganization is part of the bureaucracy. Every bureaucracy reorganizes, that is part of bureaucracy. It doesn't make sense to me that before you reorganize or go through this process that there would be a suggestion of a one-third cut in the budget. But I will put that aside for now because I want to talk about the women of the world. And here is what I am very concerned about. I am not going to—I won't be accusatory, I am going to try to be diplomatic—that is rare. I am going to try

to be diplomatic. But, listen, I believe that the actions that this administration has taken is systematically going to add great suffering to women and families around the globe.

And I want to mention a couple of them. I think, right off the bat, of course, is the elimination for funding for global family planning and reproductive health, eliminating funding for international organizations and programs which support voluntary contributions to several programs in the U.N. system. Prohibiting contributions to the UNFPA, which works not only with women's health, but obviously child marriage. And expanding the global gag rule, the old one wasn't good enough. You know, I could go on and on. The proposed $1 billion decrease in the global health programs, which will disproportionately harm women and girls. Now, I do have a question out of this. I know you are waiting for that. There is an Office of Global Women's Issues, and there is a proposal to downgrade it—I think it is a downgrade, but you will have to tell me if it is—which is to downgrade the Office of Global Women's Issues from the Secretary's office to one that instead reports to the Under Secretary for Civilian Democracy and Human Rights.

So can you explain the difference that will be? Is there plans to name an Ambassador-at-Large to lead the office? Those are my first two questions. Why don't you answer those first?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Sure. Yes. In fact, I have interviewed candidates for that position. It will be filled promptly. And it is the proposal that was sent up to this committee and to Congress on moving the office. The office is going to remain as is with the same structure and budget. It is moving it from the Office of the Secretary to a bureau under the Under Secretary, as you mentioned. We believe that that actually strengthens the office. What has happened with all of the special envoys, there are almost 70 of them, they all report to the Secretary.

For the Secretary to have 70 individuals—or 70 offices reporting to him, he doesn't have the time to dedicate to each and every one of them. All of them are important. With this office, which is important not just to the Secretary but to the President, if it's got the support of the State Department bureaucracy, the bureau which it will be located. And I think the most important feature of this office is the person we nominate. The office is going to be as good as the person we nominate, and that really is the key issue.

Ms. FRANKEL. Thank you. I am glad to hear that. I want to say this has emphatically as I can. There is no reorganization in the State Department that is a substitute for enabling women around this world to be in control of their own bodies and to have reproductive health. So that is the message I want to say. And I think this administration is on the wrong path, and it caused a lot of harm, not only to the health of women and their families, but to the economic security of their countries, because when women cannot be in control of their own bodies, they don't work, and they don't produce for the economy. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman ROYCE. Will the gentlelady yield for one question?

Ms. FRANKEL. I am yielding back.

Chairman ROYCE. I have a question I have to ask just on behalf of the committee. We need to hear about the redesign timeline.

When will you be coming back to the committee with the legislative reform proposals?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, we have started that process, Mr. Chairman, with the proposals on special envoys. My expectation is that as the redesign goes forward, we would be coming, as they are ready, with proposals to this committee. My hope and expectation is that all of the major reforms that we are going to propose will be done by the end of this calendar year.

Chairman ROYCE. At the end of the calendar year. Thank you. And Mr. Tom Garrett will be presiding as chairman, and Mr. Espaillat as ranking member from here on out. Thank you.

Mr. GARRETT [presiding]. Thank you. We now recognize Representative Norma Torres of California for 5 minutes.

Mrs. TORRES. Thank you. Deputy Secretary, congratulations, you are now 4 months and 2 days into your position. Congratulations. Modernization is a good thing for any government agency bureaucracy, or whatever you want to call it. And I fully support giving the State Department the technology it need to keep our nation abroad safe. At a time when we are facing serious threats from North Korea, Russia, and elsewhere, I firmly believe that we need a State Department that is fully equipped to keep us safe. Unfortunately, this administration has followed a path, huge budget cuts, leaving senior positions unfilled, that has weakened the State Department, and has put our national security at risk. So I am looking forward, as my colleagues, to seeing that redesign timeline and how specifically and knowledgeably these cuts are going to be implemented.

One of the most significant threats to our national security is the prevalence of corruption across the globe. Threats to our homeland, including terrorism and drug trafficking often arise in countries where corruption thrives. Corrupt actors also pose a real danger to our political and economic system when they seek to launder their funds in U.S. banks, lobby our Government to advance their own interests, and even seek to interfere in our elections.

This past week I traveled to Guatemala as part of the House democracy partnership delegation. Guatemala is currently in the middle of a crisis that is the result of political elites trying to protect themselves from a U.S. supported anti-corruption drive. I am very worried if the progress that we have made in Guatemala is turned back, it could have very significant impact once again at our border. How will the reorganization process help State become more effective in combatting corruption? And what steps are you taking to ensure that State coordinates more effectively with other agencies, including the Department of Justice, to ensure that we are protected from the influence of foreign corruption?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, you are absolutely right, Congresswoman, corruption is a serious problem. It is a serious problem—a national security problem for us in Afghanistan. Corruption in Afghanistan is an enormous problem. The Afghan Government acknowledges it. The issue you raised in Guatemala, that is a very serious problem. The ray of hope I see in Guatemala is that judicial decision that reversed the President's decision on removing the head of that commission. There is some hope that the rule of law will triumph there.

Mrs. TORRES. Well, I cannot hang my hat, if I wore one, on hope, sir. So I specifically want to know what steps we are taking to ensure that the State Department is more effectively coordinating with other agencies to ensure that we know what is happening, and that we take steps to prevent these governments from influencing our Government.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, we are working closely with the Justice Department and with other government agencies in Guatemala, in particular, to address this problem. We have made our position clear that the United States does not support the actions that the President took and there will be consequences.

Mrs. TORRES. I am going to be a little bit critical of our folks down there, because I think that they were not fully informed or were being very evasive with our members at disclosing everything that has been happening in the region. We are in a place where there is no going back. Either we move forward—there were 200,000 people demonstrating in the streets of Guatemala when we landed. 200,000 people that could be seen from the air.

If we don't continue to advance and support the people there at ensuring that this government in Guatemala, the current government, understands that we will not stand for their elitist corruption behavior. We are going to be in serious trouble, sir, when we are going to see more children come to the U.S.

And I have spent the last 3 years working to ensure that that doesn't happen. That they can see a future for themselves. I understand that you have only been at this position for 4 months, but the first hour on your job, I expect everybody to know what is going on and be prepared for the job.

Recent years, USAID has made significant progress in monitoring and evaluating its programming. As you work to more closely align our development efforts with our foreign policies goals, how would you ensure that the gains of USAID has made in this area are not diluted back, and maybe you can write back, or maybe answer some of the letters that I have written in response to what is happening in the region.

My time is up, so I am going to yield back.

Mr. GARRETT. Thank you, ma'am. And I would now recognize Adriano Espaillat of New York for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you, Congressman Garrett. Deputy Secretary, thank you so much for your patience. A long time in answering our questions. We are really thankful for your patience.

I want to find out what is the—given the current storms that have hit the Caribbean hard, what is the extent that USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, what are they doing and what is currently in place in these small nations that have been—Barbuda, the Dominican Republic, that have been hard hit by Hurricane Irma and Maria, in some cases.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, the DART teams at USAID are very important tools for the U.S. Government, both with respect to the hurricanes that have hit the Caribbean and the earthquakes in Mexico.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. That is correct.

Mr. SULLIVAN. USAID is really stretched to the limit at this point in its capacity in dealing with all of these horrible natural disasters that have occurred simultaneously. So it is a big chal-

lenge for us, and of course we have got in our own—in our own Puerto Rico, enormous problems that we have got to, as a U.S. Government, address. So USAID is working on this with all of its available resources, but it is a big challenge.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. In terms of funding, how much money has been allocated to respond to these natural disasters so far?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I will have to get you the exact figure. I will undertake to do that right after this hearing, sir.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Now, you mentioned Puerto Rico—and obviously, probably the island that has been hard hit the most is Puerto Rico, it has been termed Caribbean Katrina. And I wanted to see—and FEMA has been also, just as you have, asking for help, their resources have been depleted. Is there any way that you can team up with FEMA to help Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. We have actually sent teams down over the weekend both to assist the U.S. Government effort and to assist our State Department colleagues who work in Puerto Rico. So for Puerto Rico though, unlike foreign countries, this is a U.S.—these are U.S. citizens who are in trouble. This is a U.S. Government problem, not just a State Department problem. So we are doing all we can to support our colleagues and FEMA at DHS, it is coordinated by the White House. But it is an enormous challenge, Congressman, as you know, as well as anyone.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Now, having heard that from you, I know that we often assist U.S. citizens for being evacuated from Caribbean countries. But there are right now currently 20,000 Puerto Ricans that are on a waiting list to be evacuated or to leave the Commonwealth. Is there anything that could be done to help them? They are U.S. citizens, although they are in a U.S. territory.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. They are waiting to come either to the United States or other places in the world where they may have families or they may seek the help that they need right now.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Or people with medical emergencies, for example, to get off the island.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Correct.

Mr. SULLIVAN. There have been problems, as I understand it, with the airports. And I am not as familiar because it is U.S. domestic territory, but we are doing all we can at the State Department to support our colleagues at DHS as coordinated by the White House in trying to address these problems.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Will you be able to help them to evacuate them from the island to wherever they——

Mr. SULLIVAN. We will do all we can to assist.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you. And, finally, with regard to the medical needs in Puerto Rico, do you have Spanish speaking personnel, and is there an assistant from the Pan American Health Organization to Puerto Rico going there? I mean, the second phase usually of these disasters is health issues.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Right.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Seek other kinds of diseases that may spurt up because of stagnated water and the flooding. Do you have any plans for medical assistance with the help of DHS?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. Just as we did with the original hurricane that hit Houston, State Department people went down, were mobilized as part of the response by DHS and FEMA. My expectation is that we will do the same in Puerto Rico as soon as we are able to get people on the island, and do not expose them to danger, but to do all we can to help.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. My time is up. Thank you.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman from New York for adhering to the time limits. And I thank the Deputy Secretary for his time, and the Department for engaging with this committee in this process. I would ask that upon your return you provide information focusing on how we are not slashing foreign aid, but instead, trying to be more efficient and more effective and better stewards. I think that that is something you have heard a repeated call for. With that, we stand adjourned.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:42 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Material Submitted for the Record

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

Edward R. Royce (R-CA), Chairman

September 26, 2017

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be held in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live on the Committee website at http://www.ForeignAffairs.house.gov):

DATE:	Tuesday, September 26, 2017
TIME:	10:00 a.m.
SUBJECT:	The Department of State Redesign
WITNESS:	The Honorable John J. Sullivan Deputy Secretary U.S. Department of State

By Direction of the Chairman

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

Day *Tuesday* Date *09/26/2017* Room *2172*

Starting Time *10:04AM* Ending Time *12:42PM*

Recesses [*0*] (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____) (____to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Chairman Edward R. Royce
Representative Thomas Garrett

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session [✓]
Executive (closed) Session [ ]
Televised [✓]

Electronically Recorded (taped) [✓]
Stenographic Record [✓]

TITLE OF HEARING:

The Department of State Redesign

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

See attached.

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

N/A

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes [✓] No [ ]
(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

IFR - Ranking Member Engel
SFR - Representative Connolly
QFR - Chairman Edward Royce, Ranking Member Engel and Representatives Bera, Chabot, Cicilline, Fitzpatrick, Kelly, Meeks, and Sherman

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____
or
TIME ADJOURNED *12:42PM*

Full Committee Hearing Coordinator

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

PRESENT	*MEMBER*
X	Edward R. Royce, CA
X	Christopher H. Smith, NJ
	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, FL
X	Dana Rohrabacher, CA
X	Steve Chabot, OH
X	Joe Wilson, SC
X	Michael T. McCaul, TX
X	Ted Poe, TX
	Darrell Issa, CA
	Tom Marino, PA
X	Jeff Duncan, SC
X	Mo Brooks, AL
X	Paul Cook, CA
X	Scott Perry, PA
X	Ron DeSantis, FL
X	Mark Meadows, NC
X	Ted Yoho, FL
X	Adam Kinzinger,IL
X	Lee Zeldin, NY
X	Dan Donovan, NY
	James F. Sensenbrenner, Jr., WI
X	Ann Wagner, MO
	Brian J. Mast, FL
X	Brian K. Fitzpatrick, PA
X	Francis Rooney, FL
X	Thomas A. Garrett, Jr., VA

PRESENT	*MEMBER*
X	Eliot L. Engel, NY
X	Brad Sherman, CA
X	Gregory W. Meeks, NY
X	Albio Sires, NJ
X	Gerald E. Connolly, VA
X	Theodore E. Deutch, FL
X	Karen Bass, CA
X	William Keating, MA
X	David Cicilline, RI
X	Ami Bera, CA
X	Lois Frankel, FL
X	Tulsi Gabbard, HI
	Joaquin Castro, TX
X	Robin Kelly, IL
X	Brendan Boyle, PA
	Dina Titus, NV
X	Norma Torres, CA
X	Brad Schneider, IL
X	Tom Suozzi, NY
X	Adriano Espaillat, NY
X	Ted Lieu, CA

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY THE HONORABLE ELIOT L. ENGEL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Center for Global Development – ***A Practical Vision for US Development Reform***
Full report here

Summary
The lack of well-defined core priorities has enabled structural fragmentation across the more than 20 agencies that together constitute the US development architecture, making resource optimization and policy coordination nearly impossible. To maintain its relevance in a changing global development landscape, US foreign assistance should focus on four core development priorities: state fragility, inclusive growth, global health, and humanitarian assistance. Within these priority areas, 14 immediately actionable reforms would increase US development effectiveness and efficiency while paving the way for more significant reforms in the future:

1. Expand the use of USAID competition waivers to enable speedy and responsive programming in fragile environments.
2. Build a USAID recovery/transition surge capacity.
3. Permit earmark relief in post-disaster and transitional settings.
4. Increase complementarity between USAID and MCC.
5. Embrace subsequent compacts in MCC countries.
6. Expand OPIC into a full-fledged development finance institution.
7. Better align PEPFAR funding streams with agency core capacities.
8. Consolidate and elevate USAID's humanitarian offices.
9. Get food aid reform over the goal line (and take USDA out of the game).
10. Streamline reporting requirements and create a standardized rating system for program effectiveness.
11. Conduct a multilateral assistance review.
12. Harmonize country-level development engagement strategies.
13. Rationalize USAID hiring mechanisms.
14. Review the rationale for the African Development Foundation and the Inter-American Foundation.

As the Trump administration undertakes a review of potential efficiencies and structural improvements across the US government, the global development architecture is a clear candidate for improvement. US development and humanitarian assistance does a great deal of good, at modest cost: it saves and improves millions of lives each year while accounting for just 0.7 percent of annual government outlays. And as over 120 retired generals and admirals recently affirmed, investments in development contribute to "preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in harm's way." But the efficiency and effectiveness of that assistance is compromised by fragmentation of goals, authorities, and funding streams across more than 20 agencies.
This fragmentation is not a new problem—congressional leaders and previous presidential administrations of both parties have proposed ways of rationalizing the system. But little significant progress has been made. The US global development architecture remains overly complex, and must adapt to confront present and future

challenges.

In today's budget environment—where cuts appear likely—reforms that increase effectiveness and efficiency are even more important. To be clear, such cuts are ill-advised: the US development enterprise already lacks the resources to adequately protect Americans and promote greater peace and prosperity. US development spending falls well short of comparable spending by peer countries relative to the size of their economies. In 2016, OECD countries spent an average of 0.32 percent of their gross national incomes on official development assistance, while the United States spent 0.18 percent. Nonetheless, by implementing changes that enable greater value for money, the United States can maximize impact within a flat or declining resource envelope.
Earlier this year, we laid out six criteria for evaluating the seriousness and motives of any major reform proposals:

• **Does it address the changing global context**? Two big shifts will define development engagement in the next decade: the increasing concentration of extreme poverty in fragile states, and the shift of development financing in stable states away from aid and toward private and domestic financial flows.
• **Does it roll back aid fragmentation**? A serious review must take a hard look at whether agencies and offices have clear and distinct roles, tied to clear capacities and comparative advantages, with an efficient system for coordinating efforts among them.
• **Does it engage the full State/USAID team?** Deep involvement of the career teams at State and USAID is important both for ensuring that reform ideas are meaningful and feasible, and for ensuring the buy-in of staff who will ultimately be the frontline implementers of any changes.
• **Does it set clear targets and emphasize cost-effectiveness?** Major reforms need measurable objectives, targets, and data in order to drive change: any proposals must emphasize evidence of results and cost-effectiveness over simple cost-cutting.
• **Does it have buy-in beyond the administration?** Major structural changes to US foreign assistance need buy-in from Capitol Hill and key external constituencies, or they will be vulnerable to reversal under a future administration.
• **Does it seek reasonable efficiencies or debilitating cuts?** There may be plausible, if ill-advised, arguments for cutting budget and staffing levels, but a reorganization plan that proposes such changes should have an equally robust strategic rationale to reconcile those cuts with how they affect US foreign policy objectives.

With these criteria in mind, we propose a path forward on US development reform, starting with a set of core priorities for US foreign assistance. We outline 14 immediately actionable reforms centered around these priorities that would constructively (if modestly) begin to increase the coherence and impact of US assistance without requiring the time and effort of a wholesale reorganization. Finally, we explore the pros and cons of different options for a more fundamental streamlining of the US government's aid architecture.

Modernizing Foreign Assistance Network – ***A New Foreign Aid Architecture Fit for Purpose***
Full report here

Proposal
To build on the legacy of decades of U.S. investment in global health, humanitarian relief, and economic development and to meet the new global challenges of the 21st century, the United States must sharpen its development assistance tools with an aid architecture that is fit for purpose, efficient, and accountable
This organizational architecture would allow the diplomatic and development functions to separately apply their expertise to their respective mandates but operate in close coordination. It would streamline government through:

- Consolidating four aid agencies and several major State Department units into two new focused agencies – the Global Development Agency and the Development Finance Corporation;
- Reducing the current 12 USAID bureaus to 5 in the new development agency;
- Eliminating the vast majority of special ambassadors and envoys; and
- Streamlining and incorporating cost savings measures into U.S. food aid programs.

Objective
Mission alignment of U.S. global humanitarian and development assistance programs by restructuring the U.S. aid architecture for more effective, efficient, coherent, and agile implementation of U.S. assistance programs.

Why Aid
It is in our national security interest to prevent conflict and disease from spreading across borders to U.S. shores. It is more cost effective to help build peace, advance human rights, and address the drivers of conflict than it is to respond with costly military interventions. It is more cost effective to halt a disease through surveillance and strong health systems before it gets out of control. It is more humane and efficient to improve the resilience of farmers to weather and market disruptions rather than rush emergency supplies to starving people. It is in our economic interest to help other countries advance economically and become partners for U.S. trade and investment. Aid creates good will and projects U.S. leadership globally.

Problem
While U.S. assistance is used constructively and accomplishes many valuable outcomes, it is not structured to reach its maximum potential. The effectiveness of U.S. assistance is hamstrung by too many overlapping programs – over 20 government agencies provide some type of foreign assistance. The multiplicity of actors results in a lack of coherence and strategic focus, duplication and even conflicting policies, and constraining budgetary and regulatory procedures, all of which hinders effectiveness and creates inefficiencies.

Solution
To accomplish the goals laid out above and overcome inefficiencies, the effectiveness and coherence of U.S. assistance can be enhanced through consolidation and streamlining of

functions. The architecture proposed here joins related programs and agencies into two entities, one that operates economic assistance programs and one that employs market instruments to advance economic growth. The consolidation permits focused, evidence-based, and results-oriented programs that are driven by clear goals and mandates and are empowered by strong technical expertise and adequate resources.

Global Development Agency (GDA) – to relieve human suffering and build resilience and economic growth, the GDA would consolidate responsibility and accountability for all U.S. agencies and programs that provide humanitarian relief, alleviate poverty, strengthen country stability, and advance prosperity. GDA would be led by a director who reports to the President, has Cabinet rank, and has a permanent seat on the National Security Council. The best, most rigorous and effective procedures of all programs – USAID, MCC, PEPFAR, and the President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) – would be adapted as appropriate to GDA programs. MCC and PEPFAR would retain their brands and operating procedures. GDA strategies and programs would be informed by country national development plans.

Development Finance Corporation (DFC) – to engage the private sector in promoting economic development and prosperity. The DFC would consolidate and expand the use of market-based financial instruments (Overseas Private Investment Corporation; U.S. Trade and Development Agency; USAID's Development Credit Authority; enterprise funds). The DFC would be led by a CEO who reports to a public/private board, chaired by the director of the GDA.

Purpose

- Make policy making and implementation more flexible and responsive to better drive achievement of U.S. objectives with respect to global poverty reduction, economic development, humanitarian relief, human rights, and stabilization in fragile and conflict states.
- Maximize effectiveness of development and diplomacy so each can focus on its core mission and expertise.
- Align priorities, structures, and coordination with goals and objectives and clear lines of authority and accountability.
- Achieve efficiencies through removing redundancies and outdated regulations that hinder effectiveness

Refugees International – ***Honoring a Distinguished Tradition – U.S. World Leadership on Refugee and Displacement Crisis Response and U.S. Government Reorganization***
Full report here

SUMMARY OF REPORT
Supported by the American people and the United States Congress over many decades, the U.S. government has been at the forefront of efforts to ease the suffering of civilians who have endured forced displacement and deprivation.

The Trump administration is now engaged in a broad effort to consider the organization of the U.S. government, which will include an examination of how the government is structured for international humanitarian response.

The stakes in this organization discussion are very high, as we are living in a period of severe humanitarian suffering and overwhelming challenges worldwide. More than 65 million people are forcibly displaced globally, and tens of millions are severely food insecure. Administration officials and Members of Congress have long advocated strong support for generous and effective humanitarian response, to provide global leadership based on U.S. values and U.S. interests in addressing despair and desperation that can threaten peace and stability.

Because the stakes are so high, the question of U.S. organization for international humanitarian response requires careful consideration of important program and policy issues that has yet to take place. Amidst this level of global need, it is fully appropriate that the U.S. government consider how to make its humanitarian efforts as effective as possible while minimizing disruption to aspects that are functioning well. This is a significant gap that this report seeks to address.

It is clear that the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) both have key roles to play in international humanitarianism that are inherent in their respective organizational missions, and each should retain essential functions while enhancing "jointness," complementarity, and coordination.

The Department of State's responses to crises include efforts to address refugee flight, which becomes a key issue for affected countries during bilateral diplomatic discussions. The State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration works at the nexus between security, international politics, diplomacy and human rights, on the one hand, and humanitarian assistance, on the other. Repeatedly in recent decades, the Department of State's capacity to tightly integrate diplomacy with the tools of humanitarian assistance and refugee resettlement has been critical to achieving outcomes favorable to the United States. Moreover, the Department of State has responsibly led and administered the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, and should continue to do so, as the program has served U.S. foreign policy and national security interests while reflecting American values. In doing so, the Department of State works closely – and should continue to work closely – with the Department of Homeland

Security, which already interviews every refugee applicant before he or she travels to the United States.

USAID has equally important and complementary humanitarian response capacities that should be sustained and even strengthened. USAID's Disaster Assistance Response Teams (DARTs) provide a rapidly deployable field-based capacity for the United States in assessing both newly emerging and protracted humanitarian crises. In addition, while the bulk of State Department humanitarian assistance provides core support for international humanitarian organizations (enabling the United States to significantly influence the practices of such organizations), a higher percentage of support from USAID and its disaster assistance account can be focused on more quickly emerging requirements through project support to both international organizations and non-governmental organizations. In addition, USAID is the U.S. government's major provider of international humanitarian food aid, and USAID's logistical capacities make this an appropriate area of focus for the agency.

Consolidation of the functions of either agency into the other would weaken the functions that are inherent in their respective organizational missions. Rather, we propose enhanced "jointness" and collaboration rather than consolidation, which would not only preserve essential functions of both State and USAID, but also enhance effectiveness in U.S. humanitarian response.

Finally, we are deeply concerned by proposals that would effectively end the State Department role in international humanitarianism by eliminating the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, and transferring its overseas assistance role to USAID and its refugee admissions responsibilities to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

These proposals ignore the special capacities of the Department of State and the importance of integrating diplomacy with international humanitarian assistance and resettlement. With respect to the Refugee Admissions Program itself, such a shift would, without any reasonable justification, conflict starkly with the stated objectives of the 1980 Refugee Act.

Most importantly, the elimination of the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration – the bureau established to manifest U.S. diplomatic, legal and moral concerns about refugees – will send an obvious and powerful signal, within the United States and to the rest of the world, that the United States is diminishing its historical concerns about the displaced and disenfranchised.

This would ill-serve U.S. interests and would be a betrayal of the values that have characterized our nation from its founding.

U.S. Global Leadership Coalition – *Opportunities for Reforming and Strengthening Diplomacy and Development*
Full report here

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The USGLC reviewed over 60 reports by think tanks, NGOs, and national security and foreign policy experts from across the political spectrum on ensuring America's civilian tools of national security advance our security and economic interests around the world. These reports focused on a broad range of issues with a wide spectrum of recommendations – from one suggesting moving USAID into the State Department to the other extreme of consolidating all of government-wide development programs into an elevated Cabinet-level agency headed by USAID. Neither of these two positions carry significant bipartisan support.

However, there is consensus on seven key areas – among the vast majority of reports – to strengthen, improve, and reform diplomacy and development. While reports offer different options as to how to tactically implement these areas of reform, these seven areas of consensus provide a smart pathway forward for the reform agenda.

1. Ensure Distinct and Independent U.S. Development Agency
Nearly all reports agree that diplomacy and development have different, equally important strategic missions that require a distinct and independent development agency. Options for ensuring an independent development agency include designating the USAID Administrator as Director of Foreign Assistance and strengthening USAID's existing budget and policy capacity to ensure it can be a strategic partner with the State Department.

2. Reduce Duplication and Inefficiencies at the State Department and USAID
Most reports identified a range of approaches to reduce duplication and inefficiencies in America's
diplomacy and development programs. Options for how to address these issues focused on the need for
better coordination in global health, humanitarian assistance, and economic growth along with reforming procurement, human resources, and earmarks that limit program effectiveness.

3. Enhance Efforts to Promote Economic Growth
Nearly all reports agree that America's global economic leadership and efforts to promote economic growth are critical to our own prosperity and American jobs at a time when we face rising competition from countries like China. Options for strengthening these efforts include greater leveraging of private sector expertise and resources to have an impact at scale, unleashing development finance, and increasing America's economic diplomacy around the world.

4. Strengthen Civilian Tools in Fight Against Terrorism
Nearly all reports agree that America's civilian tools of national security will be critical in fighting terrorism and preventing violent extremism, especially in fragile states. Options for

improving these tools include strengthening civilian capacity to operate in conflict environments and deepening engagement with allies to broaden cooperation around the world.

5. Bolster Humanitarian Assistance
A wide range of reports highlight the unprecedented, complex, and chronic crises that threaten our national security and require that the U.S. bolster and strengthen our humanitarian assistance programs. Options for bolstering assistance include reducing or eliminating inefficient American cargo preference and investing in local capacity to respond to disasters in weak and fragile states.

6. Increase Focus on Results in Foreign Assistance
Reports strongly agree that foreign assistance must demonstrate a return on investment and maximize the impact of taxpayer dollars. Options include building on reforms that invest in new technologies to develop innovative solutions, strengthening monitoring and evaluation to ensure policy decisions are driven by data, and developing strategies for transitioning countries from foreign assistance.

7. Work with Congress to Ensure Robust Resources and Sustainable Reforms
Nearly all reports recognized that, given the challenges our nation faces today, the debate on reforming diplomacy and development cannot be separated from resources. Options include working with Congress to increase resources for the International Affairs Budget, as well as to ensure that reforms are sustained over time.

Statement for the Record
Submitted by Mr. Connolly of Virginia

Serious, credible, and ambitious diplomacy can solve the world's most intractable challenges. As America's premier diplomatic agency, the U.S. Department of State requires a nimble workforce, modern technology, and a strategic vision to achieve U.S. national security objectives. While the Trump Administration's State Department redesign may well be described as ambitious, it is neither serious nor credible, and if implemented, will make Americans less safe.

In response to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) April directive for agencies to develop reorganization plans, the State Department submitted a redesign proposal on September 15. Amidst cautionary tones that this is an "employee-led effort" and a visionary document with no predetermined outcomes, internal emails have illuminated discussions to remove any mention of "democracy" or "justice" from the department's mission statement. People are fighting and dying for democracy across the world because the United States has demonstrated the freedom and opportunity that reside in democratic institutions. We cannot abandon these brave advocates for democracy.

Secretary Tillerson has defended a 32 percent cut to U.S. diplomacy and development programs and projected budget cuts of $5-10 billion relative to FY 2017 spending over the next five years. A serious reform effort does not retrofit an organization to comply with a decimated bottom line. Such devastating cuts constitute a unilateral retreat that would grind essential programs to a halt, risking American lives and investments in the process.

When Secretary Tillerson testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 14, 2017, he acknowledged the "intense interest in prospective State Department and USAID redesign effort," and committed to "work as a team and with Congress to improve both organizations." Furthermore, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-31) requires the Secretary of State to submit a report to Congress, including a detailed justification and analysis, "prior to implementing any reorganization of the Department of State or the United States Agency for International Development, including any action taken pursuant to the March 31, 2017 Executive Order 13781 on a Comprehensive Plan for Reorganizing the Executive Branch."

Notwithstanding these assurances, the State Department's redesign has been exclusive and opaque. Limited Congressional consultations have merely described the process, but lacked any substance regarding the content of State's recommendations to OMB or opportunities for Congressional input. The diplomacy and development agendas are best served by collaboration between the executive and legislative branches of the federal government. In Congress, there are a host of reforms that attract consensus on both sides of the aisle, including enhancing diplomatic security and increasing transparency and accountability of foreign assistance.

Last fall, I wrote a letter with Ranking Member Engel requesting that the Diplomatic Security Bureau work to close the numerous outstanding recommendations made by the nonpartisan Government

Accountability Office (GAO) and my office has been working with the State Department to implement those diplomatic security reforms. Nonetheless, GAO has 27 open "priority" recommendations for the State Department, and 23 of them relate to diplomatic security. Given the critical nature of these recommendations and their impact on the safety of our diplomatic corps, State should make the implementation of these reforms an urgent priority.

Last summer, Congress passed and President Obama signed the Foreign Assistance Transparency and Accountability Act (FATAA, P.L. 114-191), which I introduced with my Republican colleague, Judge Ted Poe. This bill requires the President to establish guidelines on measurable goals, performance metrics, and monitoring and evaluation plans for foreign aid programs. FATAA is bringing needed transparency to an often misunderstood part of the federal budget and its implementation should be part and parcel of any discussion on reforming U.S. foreign assistance.

This Committee also needs to better assert its role in overseeing foreign affairs by putting forward robust reauthorization bills for the State Department and USAID. Congress has not enacted a State Department authorization bill since 2002. As a staff member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I worked on the last comprehensive reauthorization of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. That was in 1985. Regular enactment of these authorizing bills is a long-neglected priority, and the clarity of our mission has suffered as a result.

That is why I intend to reintroduce the Global Partnerships Act, which I began working on with former Chairman Howard Berman several years ago. This legislation strengthens the role of the USAID Administrator, codifies some of the successful reforms of USAID Forward, and empowers USAID as an independent development agency. Folding USAID into the State Department, as the Administration has reportedly considered, would be detrimental to the achievement of distinct U.S. diplomacy and development objectives.

I urge the Trump Administration to conduct meaningful consultations with Congress early and often as it embarks on its redesign of the State Department and USAID. As a co-equal branch of government, Congress has a critical role to play in authorizing U.S. diplomacy and development programs, proposing innovative reforms, and ensuring that our foreign affairs agencies are equipped to meet the challenges of the 21st century. I look forward to hearing from our witness regarding specific plans for State's substantive engagement with Congress on the redesign and how the reorganization will achieve U.S. national security objectives.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Chairman Edward R. Royce
September 26, 2017

Question:

As part of the redesign process, has the Department considered implementing strategic planning and budgeting procedures that would obligate missions to clearly define U.S. objectives in a country or region, align staff and programmatic resources around those objectives, and then measure for results?

Answer:

The Joint State-USAID Strategic Planning (JSP) process currently provides Department leadership with well-defined resource recommendations, based on a thorough analysis of budget and performance data, that support overall strategic priorities. Individual bureau and mission strategic plans align with the overarching State-USAID JSP strategic priorities, resource requests, and fiscal constraints. As part of the Redesign initiative, State and USAID are considering ways to improve data-informed policy formulation within the existing JSP process.

The Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (FATAA) requires U.S. Government agencies to closely plan, monitor, evaluate, and report on U.S. foreign assistance programs and share certain information with the public. This Act reinforces many management practices the Department has already been working towards to meet our preceding international commitments and improve effectiveness and accountability. A comprehensive draft policy covering Program Design and Performance Management is under development, and an accompanying set of guidelines, tools, and training were released that enable bureaus to align programmatic resources to objectives and measure progress and results.

Question:

I understand the Department is aiming for an 8% reduction in its current workforce. What current civil service and foreign service assignments and positions, either domestically or at U.S. embassies and consulates overseas, do you expect to eliminate to meet this reduction?

Answer:

The Department is developing a workforce reduction plan consistent with OMB guidance. Specific information on position reductions may be subject to adjustment once the redesign is completed and as such is not currently available. Foreign and Civil Service intake planning is based on replacing less than 100 percent of projected attrition. In both cases, we believe this measured approach to hiring reflects a careful balance of workforce continuity and stability within the overarching context of the Department's ongoing redesign.

For the Foreign Service, intake planning figures were developed to ensure that sufficient numbers of new entry level Foreign Service personnel are available to fill critical overseas postings and, over the course of their careers, fill higher level positions in our most critical Generalist and

Specialist skill categories. Civil Service intake focuses hiring on those mission critical occupations that provide important policy development and program support here in Washington and in concert with our colleagues serving overseas.

Question:

Is the Department also contemplating a reduction in its Locally Employed Staff workforce, whether Foreign Service Nationals or Personal Service Agreements?

Answer:

At this time, the Department is not planning a global reduction of our Locally Employed Staff work force. These staffing levels are regularly reviewed by diplomatic missions and the Department to ensure that they are consistent with policy priorities, security and logistical requirements, and available resources.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Ranking Member Eliot Engel
September 26, 2017

Question:

U.S. foreign assistance programs are critical to advancing stability and growing the economies of developing countries, which are vital to U.S. national interests and can help avoid costlier conflicts. As former Defense Secretary Robert Gates noted: "Development contributes to stability. It contributes to better governance. And if you are able to do those things and you're able to do them in a focused and sustainable way, then it may be unnecessary for us to send soldiers." Do you share the view of Secretary Gates and many other military leaders that robust investments in civilian foreign assistance and diplomacy budgets are necessary for effective U.S. leadership in the world?

Answer:

The United States is committed to doing its fair share to respond to global crises, and America will remain the global leader as the State Department and USAID support the President's priorities to defend national security, assert U.S. leadership, and foster opportunities for U.S. economic interests. We will continue to be the leader in international development, global health, democracy and good governance initiatives, and humanitarian efforts. Focusing our efforts, including through redesign, will allow us to successfully advance our most important policy goals and national security interests while ensuring that other donor countries contribute their fair share toward meeting global challenges.

Question:

Many think tanks, coalitions, and independent bipartisan task forces have advocated aligning the mission of the Department and USAID with budget resources by granting full budget, policy, and planning authority to USAID, increasing clear lines of accountability for results, and ending the duplication inherent in the State Department's Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources (F Bureau). Should USAID, our lead development agency, assume policy and budget authority over development programs? What options related to aligning budget and resources are under consideration?

Answer:

As part of the redesign process, we are looking at several ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our foreign assistance including looking at process and management improvements, specifically related to budget planning to maximize results. We agree that USAID plays a key role in the execution of our foreign policy, as the lead development agency for the U.S. government, and are exploring ways to strengthen that leadership. F leads the coordination of U.S. foreign assistance. It advances U.S. national security and development objectives by coordinating policy, planning and performance management efforts, promoting evidence-informed decision

making, and providing strategic direction for the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) foreign assistance resources.

Question:

Procurement flexibility is essential to State and USAID's ability to support effective, timely outcomes in the most efficient way possible. Too often overly restrictive procurement regulations make it difficult to get the right person for the job including due to salary limits imposed by salary history requirements and/or because they are a non-U.S. person expert. They place unrealistic and discriminatory limitations on compensation for locally engaged staff, particularly when such persons are relocated to a third country to support U.S. priorities. Given the redesign's focus on improving efficiency, plans for approving the procurement procedures and regulations for awards made by the State Department and USAID, including revisions to compensation limits for non-U.S. experts and locally-engaged staff, as well as any financial threshold after which senior approvals, may be needed. Please clarify how this plan avoids unnecessary stove-piping and overlap, enables the agencies to support a diverse range of partners including though small and large awards, and makes procurement and the delivery of assistance more effective including through the use of local and third-country staff.

Answer:

The Department remains committed to working with Congress on the steps we are considering to improve the ability of the Department and USAID to achieve critical foreign policy goals, including with respect to procurement. We will also work with Congress to pursue any statutory changes necessary to implement those steps. At the end of this process, our goal is to ensure the State Department and USAID are better equipped to address the foreign policy challenges of the United States.

Question:

The U.S. has historically provided global leadership in empowering women and girls through the Office of Global Women's Issues. We understand that the State Department has plans to downgrade the GWI from the Secretary's Office.

Answer:

Empowering women and girls and advancing their human rights through U.S. foreign policy is a priority for the Department. We believe that aligning the Office of Global Women's Issues to report to the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights (J) will give the office greater access to administrative and policy resources. Additionally, the role of Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues will continue to lead the office's mission and sustain global leadership on these issues

Question:

We understand that PRM/Consular Affairs will not be shifting to the Department of Homeland Security. Are there any current responsibilities of either PRM or Consular Affairs that might be shifted to other agencies? If yes, what responsibilities to what agencies?

Answer:

We are in the second phase of our employee-led redesign process, which is reviewing how we can structure our processes, workforce, and technology to better achieve our mission. Reports in the media identified functions of the Bureaus of Consular Affairs and Population, Refugees, and Migration for possible transfer; these are not decisions that have been made. We will continue to keep Congress apprised of the results of our review and any changes.

Question:

USAID has improved the sustainability of its programs and increased the resilience of the communities with which it partners to reduce the need for emergency assistance in the future. Food for Peace nonemergency programs have been among the most effective ways to fund and support innovation and best practices to promote resilience in the most vulnerable populations. Food for Peace nonemergency programs have had a dedicated amount of multi-year, multi-sector funding, but that would not continue if we were to enact the President's budget. Does the State Department believe resilience funding is effective and will it support resilience programmatic activity? How will the Administration support USAID's resilience agenda?

Answer:

The State Department and USAID recognize and believe in the preventative value of building resilience to recurrent crises. While Food for Peace Title II funding was not requested in the FY 2018 President's Budget, resilience funding and strategic policy emphasis continue to be a priority, at the headquarters and mission level. The effectiveness of resilience investments is attested to by a 2013 study in the drylands of Kenya and Ethiopia that estimated that every $1 invested in food security and resilience over the long-term will result in nearly $3 in reduced humanitarian assistance, avoided losses, and improved well-being.

The State Department and USAID's continued support for resilience is reflected in its elevation to one of three objectives in the U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy. The targeting of people and places subject to recurrent crises in, for example, Mali, Niger, northeastern Nigeria, Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda as part of the country selection and targeting process for this next phase of Feed the Future, as guided by the Global Food Security Act and corresponding Strategy, also reflects this continued support. These efforts harness a range of USAID and interagency resources for resilience under the umbrella of Feed the Future.

A key aspect of these efforts to build resilience to recurrent crises is leveraging the resources of other donors and shifting responsibility for managing risk and building resilience to the private sector and communities and countries themselves. Kenya's commitment of $1.6 billion to its Ending Drought Emergencies initiative exemplifies this shift and has been matched by $1.5

billion in donor commitments, including from USAID. The private sector is also playing an increasingly important role. In Ethiopia's drylands, for example, strategic investments by Feed the Future helped attract $15 million in private sector investment in the livestock sector to tap high demand export markets, resulting in a ten-fold increase in the value of livestock sales in just a few years. Similarly, a small investment in testing an innovative livestock insurance product in northern Kenya through a Feed the Future Innovation Lab led to the scaling of that product by the Government of Kenya and private sector partners in 2016. That insurance program has already paid out $5 million total to vulnerable pastoralist households in the face of the current drought.

Question:

I signed a letter last month with Chairman Royce and the Chair and Ranking Member of the House Appropriations Committee regarding access to State and USAID's submissions to OMB. When will the State and USAID Redesign submissions to OMB be made available to this Committee? How do you intend to work with Congress in a collaborative way on an ongoing basis to ensure that this restructuring effort is successful? How were priorities and functions of State and USAID identified? How will the State Department measure efficiency and effectiveness when assessing programs and functions at USAID and State moving forward?

Answer:

State and USAID submitted an Agency Reform Plan to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on September 13, 2017 in response to OMB memorandum M-17-22. OMB is currently reviewing the plan as part of the FY 2019 budget formulation process. While State and USAID cannot provide the complete Agency Reform Plan to Congress in advance of the FY 2019 President's Budget Request, we are continuing to brief our Congressional committees on Redesign in the interim and look forward to continued consultations.

Question:

A comprehensive review of U.S. foreign engagement and a coherent diplomatic and development strategy are the logical starting point for any significant restructuring of the U.S. diplomatic and development architecture. We should determine the priority functions of State and USAID before deciding what form they should respectively take and the amount of State Department appropriations they receive. When can we expect to see a U.S. foreign engagement strategy from the Administration? Will that strategy be a component part of the broader national security strategy? If yes, how are you working with other parts of the Executive Branch to develop that strategy?

Answer:

The Department of State and USAID are developing our FY2018-2022 Joint Strategic Plan (JSP) to fulfill the strategic planning requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act-Modernization Act (GPRA-MA). GPRA-MA requires strategic plans be submitted to Congress and made publicly available by February 2018. The JSP is the enterprise-level strategic plan that articulates the joint priorities of the Department of State and USAID, as well as the goals

and objectives we seek to achieve. The priorities and goals articulated in this document are being developed in conjunction with the National Security Strategy to ensure alignment throughout the Administration's foreign policy. In addition, we are coordinating this plan with other members of the Executive Branch who have foreign policy equities to ensure a coherent approach that advances the Administration's top priorities and maximizes our collective resources. Subsequent strategies, such as sub-departmental level strategies (Bureau or Mission strategies) will align with the JSP.

Question:

The President's FY18 budget requested that Congress eliminate the Development Assistance Account, which provides basic poverty reduction services, such as safe drinking water, basic education, microfinance, and agriculture support, to millions of people worldwide. In its place, the President requested creation of a new account, the Economic Support and Development Funds, which would encompass the USAID Development Assistance Account and the State Department's Economic Support Funds Account. Given that these two accounts serve distinct functions and reflect the mandates and separate expertise of State and USAID, will the proposed restructuring seek to implement this change through policy as well as through appropriations

Answer:

In an effort to streamline accounts and ensure the most effective use of taxpayer dollars, the FY 2018 budget request proposes the new, consolidated Economic Support and Development Fund (ESDF). This streamlining of accounts does not mean that development programs are entirely eliminated, or that development is no longer important to the United States. Rather, it allows the State Department and USAID to better assess, prioritize, and target development-related activities in the context of broader U.S. strategic objectives and partnerships.

Question:

The Department has confirmed that there are no plans to merge USAID into State or create USAID as an independent agency at this time. Does that mean there is a time when a merger of State and USAID might be considered? Given USAID and State Department's unique missions, as well as the fact that development and diplomacy are distinct disciplines with distinct expertise, how will the Secretary work to strengthen USAID as an independent agency, in both the short and long term?

Answer:

While development and diplomacy may be unique disciplines, they operate together, and the Secretary intends to maximize the relationship between the Department of State and USAID to ensure that both entities are able to deliver. The Secretary will continue to carefully review and consider the best path forward for strengthening U.S. diplomacy and development work. We look forward to working with the USAID Administrator on future reform efforts.

Question:

The Secretary's letter to this Committee identified a number of ambassadorial or special envoy functions that would be moved into regional or functional bureaus, either retaining the ambassadorial role or not. In a number of these cases, the Secretary's memorandum references "realignment" of personnel and support costs to new offices. The Special Envoy for Sudan and South Sudan is a regional issue that is cross-border in nature and requires high level diplomatic attention and coordination across multiple continents in addition to the African continent. Will the bureau have the flexibility to create an additional DAS or senior position reporting to AF Assistant Secretary?

Answer:

Resolving the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan and civil conflicts in both Sudan and South Sudan remain top policy priorities for the U.S. government in Africa, as does continuing our effort to see Sudan take positive actions regarding U.S. policy priorities. As stated in the Secretary's letter, to better execute the mission of the Department, the Secretary has determined the Office of the Special Envoy for Sudan and South Sudan should be eliminated, and its allocated budget, staff members, and responsibilities reallocated to the Bureau of African Affairs (AF). The successor to the Office of the Special Envoy for Sudan and South Sudan will be integrated into the structure of AF, and continue to focus its efforts on these vital issues. At present a Senior Foreign Service Officer leads the office. The AF Assistant Secretary will ensure that issues requiring high-level diplomatic attention are delegated to a senior official at the appropriate level.

Question:

One Deputy Assistant Secretary in the EUR Bureau has 17 countries plus Holocaust issues in his portfolio. Given the Russia challenge, unfinished issues in the Balkans, and a rise in nationalist rhetoric across the region, it is time to revisit the alignment of countries within EUR and possibly to add a DAS to the Bureau. Please consider realigning countries, DAS portfolios, and the number of DAS positions within the EUR Bureau so that appropriate attention can be given (sic) to the various countries and challenges in EUR.

Answer:

The organization and structure of the State Department and the various bureaus are currently being reviewed through a disciplined process. We would not like to prejudge, in any way, the outcome of that review. For the time being, however, we believe that the European Bureau is capable of managing the issues for which it is responsible and ensuring adequate staff support. We are of course always willing to take a look at areas where we can do better, and we are happy to respond to any specific concerns you may have.

Question:

Given the serious the foreign interference in last year's election and serious cyber threats to critical US infrastructure, I oppose the downgrading of the cyber coordinator position and have introduced bipartisan legislation that would put this position at the Assistant Secretary level. The Administration has indicated this initial move to EB is temporary. Please justify why this short-term move is in the interest of the Department. Please provide a timeline for when the long-term arrangement for this critical function will be determined. Is it anticipated that any realigned positions or support costs will be reduced?

Answer:

Advancing the full range of U.S. interests in cyberspace is an Administration priority, and the redesign will enable the Department to more effectively fulfill its role in leading the international community on cyber policy and protecting the United States against threats to critical infrastructure. One of the goals of the redesign is to consolidate and rationalize related issue sets, and as an interim step, the Department has unified cyber policy and digital economy policy issues within the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. Since assuming the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Cyber and International Communications and Information Policy on September 18, 2017, Mr. Robert Strayer has been actively engaged in high-level consultations with Japan, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom, as well as key allies and key partners in the Arab and African regions. He also successfully led the United States delegation to the ITU's World Telecommunication Development Conference.

The Department is committed to elevating and providing the appropriate resources for leadership on cyber policy as an essential issue. The Department looks forward to working with the Committee as we improve our ability to deliver on mission on this important issue.

Question:

USAID there are reports that USAID's Regional Development Mission for Asia in Bangkok will close. Regional Missions are essential to development efforts (for example, USAID's East Africa Regional Mission will be critical to democracy assistance programs in the Democratic Republic of the Congo). Will regional offices be closed under the State Department's redesign efforts? What data sets and guiding principles will be used to make these determinations?

Answer:

As part of the redesign process, USAID is looking for ways to optimize our regional platforms. We believe that regional missions provide valuable programmatic and administrative support for our work in the field particularly when we are operating in non-permissive environments. Therefore, our focus is on improving the effectiveness and efficiency of our platforms based on cost effectiveness, strategic alignment with USAID's core mission and the efficiency of operations.

A management assessment was conducted of the Regional Development Mission for Asia (RDMA) earlier this year. Based on that assessment and an implementation plan by the Mission and Asia Bureau, USAID is not closing RDMA. However, based on the management assessment's recommendations, USAID will be looking to adjust the staffing footprint and shift programs to bilateral missions in the region or Washington, where appropriate.

Question:

Global Health represents 14.8 percent of total function 150 spending, reflecting the U.S. government's broad leadership role in this sector; and, it is anticipated that the U.S. will continue to be the leader in responding to both natural, humanitarian/complex disasters, and post-conflict development around the world. Given the Administration's proposed $1.93B cut to these accounts, what efficiencies or improvements does the Administration expect to realize through the redesign process in the critical areas of global health and global disaster relief?

Answer:

With funding in the President's FY 2018 budget request, the United States will continue significant funding for global health programs by prioritizing smart investments that save lives. The United States will continue to be a leader in providing humanitarian assistance around the globe. Advancing global health efforts and responding to humanitarian crises relies upon partnership from country governments and other donors -- continued success is linked to sustained involvement. The Administration will focus its efforts to maximize management efficiencies, leverage other donor resources, and continue strong engagement with partner countries to address shared challenges to global health and humanitarian assistance.

Question:

Does this administration believe the issue of international religious freedom is the most important human rights issue globally? If it is just as important as other human rights issues, why retain the Ambassador-at-large position and a separate report on just this issue, rather than including religious freedom in the overall human rights report?

Answer:

The right to exercise one's freedom of thought, conscience, and religion is a universal human right, and is enshrined in our First Amendment. The *International Religious Freedom Act of 1998* established the position of Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom as well as the requirement of an annual Religious Freedom Report. The IRF Act passed with overwhelming bipartisan Congressional support. The State Department takes very seriously the responsibilities mandated under the IRF Act. We look forward to continuing to work with Congress in the future to protect all those who face abuse or persecution on account of their beliefs, and to encourage international religious freedom around the globe.

Question:

Has the Department considered having Ambassadors sign off on the various human rights reports for their countries, instead of or in addition to the Department adjudicated report? If not, why not? If yes, what are the pros and cons of such an approach?

Answer:

The initial drafts of each of the individual *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* are submitted by our embassies, which are full partners in the editing and review process as the drafts are finalized. In this manner, the resources of both the Department and missions abroad are brought to bear to produce the most comprehensive report. It is standard Department of State practice that each ambassador sign off on the text of the country report for the specific post to which he or she is assigned.

Question:

How does the State Department determine whether a post is family friendly? Given the relative risk of the dangers of the air quality in India, how does the Department continue to designate a post like New Delhi or Ulan Bator [sic] a family friendly post?

Answer:

Foreign Service families face particular challenges and unique conditions arising from the worldwide nature of the Foreign Service mission. The Department of State does not have an official designation as "family friendly." Instead, there are a number of factors that the Department uses to determine hardship or danger differentials. Each post generates its own post profile report, which employees use as part of their decision on which posts to put on their bid list for assignments, keeping in mind the context of worldwide availability. In addition, employees and families, as well as community liaison officers, submit information on each post as part of the Overseas Briefing Center's Post Info to Go research tool.

Information on air quality conditions for affected posts is also included in this tool. We take seriously the health needs of our employees. In response to the increased health risk of air pollution, the Department has employed a network of air monitoring sensors that reports hourly on the air quality conditions of nearly 40 posts and sends alerts to U.S. personnel and citizens when the ambient air quality is hazardous.

Question:

From the Heritage Foundation to the Center for American Progress, one area of reform on which think tanks have overwhelmingly agreed is strengthening our public diplomacy programs to combat extremist propaganda and false narratives. Has this issue been discussed as part of the "re-design" effort? What more can the Department do to successfully counter these threats?

Answer:

The State Department's redesign teams have reviewed recommendations from the Department's bureaus, think tanks, and academic sources on numerous issues, including about the use of public diplomacy to better counter extremist propaganda and false narratives.

The Department's response to extremist propaganda includes identifying and empowering credible local partners–such as journalists, religious authorities, and non-governmental organizations–to advocate against extremism. The Department's Global Engagement Center (GEC) uses data science technology, including online targeted counter-messaging to degrade the efforts of groups like ISIS, while leveraging the expertise of employees detailed from across the interagency.

The Department is currently seeking funding from the Defense Department to address the threat of disinformation from foreign countries. The GEC plans to use this new funding for field operations to include: coordinating U.S. government efforts in specific sub-regions; enhancing the capacity of local actors to build resilience against disinformation, including thwarting attacks on their IT systems; providing attribution of adversarial disinformation; and convening anti-disinformation practitioners, journalists, and other influencers to exchange best practices.

Question:

In light of reports that consideration was being given to eliminating from the State Department mission statement reference to sustaining a "just and democratic" world, I am concerned that some elements of the reorganization may reflect a downgrading of efforts to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in foreign policy and development assistance. What impact will the reorganization have on the promotion of democracy? Will the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) continue to provide contracts and grants for democracy programs?

Answer:

With funding in the President's FY 2018 budget request, the United States will continue significant funding for democracy and governance programs by prioritizing smart investments that protect human rights and support democratic values worldwide. In order to remain a successful leader in supporting democracy, human rights, and rule of law, the U.S. must rely upon partnerships from country governments and other donors in addition to investing US taxpayer dollars. The Administration will focus its efforts to maximize management efficiencies, leverage other donor resources, and continue strong engagement with partner countries to address shared challenges to democracy and the rule of law worldwide.

At this time, DRL continues to issue grants and cooperative agreements that support democracy and human rights worldwide. Several other bureaus in State and USAID, including but not limited to USAID's Center of Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance, also continue their work in the democracy and governance space with the resources they have available.

Question:

Does the Administration believe that democracy assistance that strengthens institutions in fragile states is a cost-effective way to promote U.S. foreign policy? How will the administration prioritize the role that democracy assistance can play in long term development and stabilization in its policies and budgeting?

Answer:

Diplomacy and development play an indispensable role in protecting our nation's safety and advancing prosperity for the American people. With such a broad array of threats facing the United States, our FY 2018 budget request aligns with the Administration's objective of making America's security our top priority. Supporting countries in strengthening democracy, human rights, and governance (DRG) is critical for defending national security, fostering economic opportunities for the American people, asserting U.S. leadership and influence, and ensuring effectiveness and accountability to the American taxpayer. It is also fundamental to reducing fragility, which reflects weak governing institutions, and a fragmented society, or broken social compact – or a combination thereof in the relationship between society and the state.
Even with the reductions in funding, we will continue to lead on global democracy and good governance initiatives that support long-term stabilization in some of the world's most unstable regions. As part of our efforts, we will continue to partner with key allies to protect Americans and American interests, advance bilateral partnerships, open new markets for U.S. businesses, and promote American interests abroad, in a manner that puts America first. Focusing our efforts will allow us to advance our most important policy goals and national security interests, while ensuring that other donor countries contribute their fair share toward meeting global challenges.

Question:

A letter sent by Sec. Tillerson to this Committee in August asked Congress to "amend the statute" to expand the title of Ambassador-at-Large global HIV/AIDS (which currently oversee the PEPFAR program) to codify a role of "Special Representative for Global Health Policy" with the aim of the position leading to a "more comprehensive approach to global health."

Can you clarify what this amending the statute title means as it relates to global health programming both at USAID but also HHS and DOD? Does this point to a consolidation of global health programming?

Answer:

Expanding the title of the Ambassador-at-Large for Global HIV/AIDS, which oversees the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), to also include the role of Special Representative for Global Health Policy enables a more comprehensive approach within the State Department and across the U.S. government (including the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Defense) to address challenges to global health. PEPFAR has accelerated the progress toward a world safer and more secure from infectious disease threats by strengthening the global capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to them. Annually, with the support of the U.S. Congress, PEPFAR invests significant resources into developing

comprehensive health and community systems globally, but the Administration recognizes that host-country policy reforms are a key element in ensuring that not only U.S. funding works more effectively, but that countries can bolster their ability to swiftly detect and respond to infectious diseases and other outbreaks—enhancing global health security and protecting America's borders. This expansion of the title does not point to a consolidation of global health activities, but will allow for PEPFAR to be better leveraged as a foreign policy tool, expanding the role of the PEPFAR coordinator which reinforces the U.S. government's ability to drive policies that are needed to make U.S. investments in health and beyond more effective.

Question:

In light of the multibillion dollar supplemental appropriations that have been needed to respond to health security emergencies like Ebola and Zika, as well as the growing threats of anti-microbial resistance and non-communicable diseases, it has become increasingly clear the United States must leverage its leadership and investments more effectively to address huge gaps in access to trained and supported frontline health workers connected to strong and sustainable health systems to fully address new and existing threats.

How specifically in the health area are you approaching these redesign discussions in terms of maximizing flexibility and the power of our investments to enable our partners to save lives and halt threats before they reach the scale of potential global catastrophes?

Answer:

The State Department, with other agencies of the United States government, is engaged with bilateral and multilateral partners to leverage our investments to advance key health issues – addressing emerging infectious diseases, environmental health, strengthening global health security, countering antimicrobial resistance, and reducing the burden of non-communicable diseases – in support of U.S. foreign policy. The Department works closely with other U.S. federal agencies to secure high-level support in international policy fora (e.g., the World Health Organization, G20, and Arctic Council) and leverages these commitments to mobilize action aligned with U.S. priorities.

The Department leads U.S. government coordination for implementation of the Global Health Security Agenda (GHSA). This partnership with other nations, international organizations, and public and private stakeholders builds capacity around the world to prevent avoidable epidemics that could spread to the United States. As a result, GHSA countries are better able to detect threats early and respond rapidly and effectively to disease outbreaks, reducing the likelihood of global pandemics. The Department leverages and maximizes U.S. government investment in GHSA through diplomatic outreach that encourages other donor countries, international organizations, and the private sector to actively engage in capacity building through GHSA and recipient countries to take action to implement health security regulations and best practices.

The Department is also pursuing innovative approaches to mobilize advances in health system capacity at the community level world-wide. This includes strengthening faith-based

engagement on drug-resistant disease. The Department is promoting the development of innovative solutions to achieve health-security objectives in low-resource, low-infrastructure settings, by working with the private sector, academia, and foreign governments both inside and out of the public-health sector. For example, we are working with federal partners, as well as academia and industry, to make new disease-forecasting tools a fundamental component of effective public health systems. We also support the development and dissemination of a mosquito-habitat mapper, mobilizing citizen participation in the detection of mosquito breeding sites.

Question:

Over 80% of the department's bureaus don't have people nominated to lead them. What is the holdup on the nominations? Is the President choosing to leave positions unfilled until the redesign is implemented? What are the impacts on the department and on U.S. policy of not having permanent leadership for the regional bureaus?

Answer:

We have identified and/or employed approximately 60% of the Presidential appointments that require the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate. Many individuals are currently undergoing the extensive vetting process for potential nominees. The Administration does not plan to leave positions unfilled until the redesign is implemented. The Department will continue to utilize the experience of both Career Civil Service and Career Foreign Service members of the State Department until permanent leadership positions are filled.

Question:

The United States faces multiple foreign policy challenges from the ongoing war in Syria to several famines, including in South Sudan and Yemen, to the nuclear crisis on the Korean peninsula. Can you guarantee that the U.S. presence in the world - the deployment of our diplomats that advance our interests - will not decrease due to these reforms? Will your planned cuts require the closure of any consulates or USAID missions? Will we have to fold up shop in specific countries?

Answer:

State and USAID's priorities are to support the interests of the United States abroad. Diplomacy and development play an indispensable role in protecting our nation's safety and advancing prosperity for the American people. The U.S. physical presence abroad is driven by foreign policy priorities and weighed against risks to personnel and facilities, as well as the availability of resources to support the U.S. mission. As the Secretary has previously stated, "the primary mission must always be advocating for the national interests of the United States." Focusing on more effective operations and assistance will enable this mission, not diminish it. Choices, not always easy ones, regarding the allocation of resources and our physical presence abroad may have to be made in the future. At this time, Redesign has not resulted in plans to close any diplomatic facilities. Any decision to do so would be carefully considered and data-informed.

USAID is undertaking a comprehensive metrics based approach to inform programming and decision-making to advance the goal of ending the need for development assistance.
State and USAID will continue to consult Congress regarding the U.S. presence abroad.

Question:

Which of your efforts will require legislative changes? Which of the efforts will the administration start implementing on its own? What is the timeframe for implementing the changes?

Answer:

The Department of State and USAID submitted an Agency Reform Plan to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on September 13, 2017 in response to OMB memorandum M-17-22. OMB is currently reviewing the plan as part of the FY 2019 budget formulation process. While State and USAID cannot discuss any proposed legislative requests in advance of the FY 2019 President's Budget Request to Congress, we look forward to continued consultations with Congress in the interim. For those items that can be implemented within existing authorities, the Department has been engaging with our Congressional committees and looks forward to continued collaboration. An implementation timeline is still in development.

Question:

In the briefing provided to staff about the "redesign," State said every decision would be data driven. What are the data sets the administration has used to make decisions on the special envoys?

Answer:

Prior to announcing proposed changes to the special envoy positions, the Department solicited feedback from stakeholders, including current and former State Department employees and outside organizations, such as think tanks. The Secretary's notification to Congress was generally consistent with the recommendations of several outside groups and observers who have closely studied this issue.

Question:

The administration submitted its budget proposal months ago - including a more than 30 percent cut for State and USAID. Did your reform process start by first conducting a comprehensive assessment of the needs of U.S. national security that State advances or did they start with these draconian budget cuts as the goal and limiting factor?

Answer:

We reviewed and continue to review options to ensure the efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the United States' diplomatic and development efforts. I believe, and as Secretary Tillerson has stated, it is our people first and foremost – not the level of resources – that will determine our ability to retain our global leadership position. Our FY 2018 budget request will allow us to continue to be the leader in international development, global health, democracy and good governance initiatives, and humanitarian efforts even with reductions in funding.

Question:

In rejecting the administration's drastic cuts, members of Congress are concerned that the administration might decide to not spend the money that Congress deems necessary for carrying out U.S. foreign policy. In the Budget Control Act of 1974, Congress prohibited President Richard Nixon from "impoundment" by withholding funding of programs he opposed. As you know, the Supreme Court upheld the law the following year. Will the State Department spend money as Congress directs and fully implement the Budget Control Act??

Answer:

The Department of State and USAID will obligate funds appropriated by Congress consistent with applicable law, including the Impoundment Control Act.

Question:

The presentation that the department provided Congress on the State-AID redesign said that it would create a minimum of 10 percent in savings over the next five years over seven different areas, such as modernizing the IT systems, and up to 20 percent more broadly. What are the estimated savings in each of the seven areas of the redesign? Please specifically describe the metrics and data used to conjure the 10 percent and 20 percent savings estimates.

Answer:

State and USAID submitted an Agency Reform Plan to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on September 13, 2017 in response to OMB memorandum M-17-22. OMB is currently reviewing the plan as part of the FY 2019 budget formulation process. While State and USAID cannot discuss budget planning and estimated savings in advance of the FY 2019 President's Budget Request to Congress, we look forward to continued consultations with our Congressional committees regarding Redesign planning in the interim. In general, the estimates of Redesign investments and savings are derived from State and USAID financial data modeling relative to FY 2016-FY 2017 spending and industry benchmarks in both public and private sectors.

Question:

One of the most efficient ways the Department can recruit top talent into the Civil Service at State is through the highly competitive Presidential Management Fellows (PMF) program. Do

you intend to honor the job offers made to PMFs many of whom are foregoing better paying jobs in the private sector to come work for you—or would you advise them to seek careers elsewhere? Will the Department continue to participate in this OPM program going forward?

Answer:

PMFs are recognized as an integral part of the Department of State's workforce. The PMF program will continue and the Secretary recently approved limited PMF hiring. However, future PMF hiring decisions will be considered as part of the Department's overall strategically managed hiring plan, in line with the Department's Redesign efforts. The Department currently has a very active PMF Program with 77 current PMFs.

Question:

The State Department Authorities Act of 2017 required the State Department to appropriately track advancement of unrepresented groups throughout the Department's workforce. What is the status of this effort and the required report to Congress?

Answer:

The Secretary and I are committed to a diverse workforce. As the Secretary has stated, "the U.S. State Department should be a clear display of America's values and our people, not just in our mission but in the composition of our workforce." The Bureau of Human Resources (HR) and the Office of Civil Rights (S/OCR) Chief Diversity Officer continuously assess and evaluate the Department's effectiveness. HR appointed a Senior Advisor on Diversity, Inclusion, and Outreach in the Director General's Office to provide strategic direction to the Department's diversity outreach activities and to help recruit and retain a workforce that reflects the diversity of the United States.

The Department continues to emphasize a data-driven approach in order to increase transparency and accountability at all levels. In 2016, the Department expanded diversity statistics that are posted on the Department's internal website, charting our workforce by type of employment and by gender, race, ethnicity, and disability.

The Department has seen significant progress in recruiting and hiring minorities. Minorities make up 32% of new Foreign Service Officer Hires (Hispanic - 9%, Asian - 11%, and African-American – 12%). The percentage of Hispanic and African-American hires has doubled and the percentage of Asians has almost doubled since 2013.

Our annual MD-715 Report looks at diversity within the career senior ranks from year to year, and includes a barrier analysis. S/OCR uses this data to identify triggers in employee selection and career development participation. The Department has sent the report to Congress.

Question:

How is the Administration raising human rights-related concerns with the Government of India and at what levels? Was it raised in any of Secretary Tillerson's engagement with Indian officials?

Answer:

As Secretary Tillerson has said, our foreign policy is guided by our fundamental values around freedom, human dignity, and the way people are treated. During his recent visit to India, the Secretary paid his respects at Gandhi Smriti, a memorial to Mahatma Gandhi. In doing so he highlighted the fundamental principles of civil liberties and individual dignity shared by the United States and India.

India has a rich heritage of cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity, a vibrant civil society, strong democratic institutions, and a commitment to the rule of law. However, as with many countries, India faces pressing human rights challenges. The most significant of these, as acknowledged in the State Department's annual Human Rights Report, include security force abuses, corruption, and societal violence based on gender, religious affiliation, caste, and tribe. The Department of State raises these concerns at every appropriate opportunity. This includes private diplomatic discussions, as well as through engagement with civil society and representatives of India's many faiths, castes, and tribes. Through this engagement, we hope to strengthen our bilateral human rights cooperation and to demonstrate global leadership as two democracies committed to supporting civil society and upholding democratic values, transparency, and the rule of law.

Question:

What commitments does the U.S. believe Sri Lanka made via its 2015 UN HRC resolution? How would the Department rate Sri Lanka's progress in achieving each of these individual commitments? Please provide an assessment for each commitment.

Answer:

UN Human Rights Council resolution A/HRC/30/1 of October 2015, which Sri Lanka co-sponsored and which was renewed in March 2017, welcomes Sri Lanka's commitments to address violations of human rights; ensure accountability, justice, and reconciliation; devolve political authority; strengthen processes of truth-seeking and reparations; and undertake a comprehensive approach to dealing with the past.

The government of Sri Lanka has taken steps to fulfill its commitments, but needs to do more. To address reconciliation, Sri Lanka established a Secretariat for Coordinating Reconciliation Mechanisms (SCRM) and an Office for National Unity and Reconciliation. President Sirisena also signed legislation to establish an Office of Missing Persons (OMP) in July 2017. Sri Lanka ratified the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance in May 2016. The steering committee of a constitutional assembly issued

an interim report with recommendations for new constitutional provisions in September 2017. The government has sought international input on counterterrorism legislation and has prepared several initial drafts of a law to replace the Prevention of Terrorism Act (PTA), but it has not repealed the law.

The United States commends the Sri Lankan government for its reconciliation efforts and communication strategy to unite the country. We continue to press Sri Lanka to fulfill all of its outstanding commitments in Resolution A/HRC/30/1, including appointing independent and credible commissioners to the OMP and establishing a truth-seeking commission, an office of reparations, and a judicial mechanism to investigate and prosecute allegations of past violations of human rights and international humanitarian law.

Question:

Last week, INTERPOL's General Assembly voted to grant membership to Palestine. We understand that the United States pushed a strategy that included amendments to eligibility criteria, withdrawal of bids by member states, namely Palestine, Kosovo and Solomon Islands, and delay of the new member votes until eligibility criteria was studied. That strategy failed, and Palestine was admitted to INTERPOL and Kosovo missed the opportunity to join. As you know, under the Foreign Relations Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 1990, 1991, 1994 and 1995, the U.S. shall not provide funding or contributions to any "affiliated organization of the United Nations" or a specialized agency of the United Nations if Palestine becomes a member of that organization. Please detail the different amendments proposed to the eligibility criteria and country-by-country vote breakdowns. Please also detail the legal analysis and rational for why INTERPOL does not fall within the restrictions of the Foreign Relations Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 1990, 1991, 1994 and 1995.

Answer:

Section 414 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, provides that no funds authorized to be appropriated by any act may be made available "for the United Nations or any specialized agency thereof which accords the Palestine Liberation Organization the same standing as member states." Section 410 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, prohibits voluntary or assessed contributions to the United Nations or to any "affiliated organization of the United Nations" that grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood. INTERPOL is an independent international police organization and is not a "specialized agency" or "affiliated organization" of the United Nations for purposes of these two provisions. INTERPOL's constitution does not reference the United Nations, and it has not entered into an agreement with the United Nations recognizing INTERPOL as a "specialized agency" of the United Nations or establishing any other formal affiliation.

At the General Assembly in 2016, INTERPOL members, including the United States and Israel, voted to suspend the processing of applications pending completion of a formal report from an appointed expert adviser that clarified the process and criteria for membership. Upon completion of that report, the INTERPOL Executive Committee submitted a draft resolution clarifying the process and criteria for membership, including, a clarification that the term "country"

in the INTERPOL constitution means "state," for consideration at the General Assembly in September 2017.

In advance of the General Assembly in 2017, the United States provided a number of comments and suggested revisions. These revisions were intended to clarify the intent of the resolution and the international law criteria for statehood. The United States also objected to the consideration of an applicant's status as "a member of other intergovernmental organizations and, in particular, a Member of the United Nations or an Observer State recognized by the United Nations" as an element to be considered in an application. We further requested that the draft resolution include language making clear that police bodies of INTERPOL member countries have appropriate authority over their country's border security and controls, or the ability to liaise with border officials that have such effective authority. During the General Assembly, the United States also sought to clarify that the draft resolution would not serve as a basis for reconsideration of current memberships. The United States' proposed amendments to the resolution were presented and voted upon by the General Assembly; all were voted down.

The voting at the INTERPOL General Assembly was conducted electronically on each of the amendments proposed by the United States and other countries. Immediately after each individual vote, the overall results were displayed and, in the case of resolutions, whether the resolution was adopted. Although access to voting results for non-secret votes is available visually upon request following a vote, INTERPOL does not maintain records of such votes; and therefore, we are unable to obtain a copy of the vote broken down by country.

Question:

The response to Engel QFR #26 from the hearing with Secretary Tillerson said, "We take seriously the allegations raised by the Humanitarian Law Center, and are reviewing the report." Now that you have had opportunity to review the report, have you engaged the government of Serbia on how it will prosecute the perpetrators of the massacres or whether some form of international tribunal will be needed?

Answer:

We have brought the report by the Humanitarian Law Center to the attention of Serbia's newly appointed War Crimes Prosecutor. We believe that those guilty of moving the bodies of Albanian civilians from Kosovo to clandestine mass graves in Serbia to conceal evidence of earlier massacres should be brought to justice.

We share your frustration with the lack of progress in Serbia, and in the Western Balkans region generally, on investigating and prosecuting war crimes cases. We have raised the issue with Serbian officials at all levels of government, including with Serbian President Aleksandar Vucic, continually emphasizing the importance of Serbia thoroughly investigating such atrocities and bringing those responsible to justice. In addition, we remind Serbian officials that prosecuting human rights abuses such as these is imperative for Serbia to fulfill its obligations under Chapter 23 (Judiciary and Fundamental Rights) of the European Union (EU) *acquis* as it pursues EU accession. The U.S. Ambassador to Serbia, Kyle Scott, regularly speaks out, both publicly and privately, on the need to bring war criminals to justice.

The United States has strongly supported the International Criminal Court for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). Following the closing of the Tribunal this year, the United States will continue to push for justice for war crimes committed in the Balkan conflicts of the 1990s—but now it is imperative that momentum shift toward national prosecutions. The United States continues to push for timely and just prosecution of the remaining cases, without regard to the ethnicities of victims or perpetrators. To that end, we have worked to help Serbia and other former Yugoslav states improve their judicial systems and to expand regional cooperation, which is critical to building solid cases and conducting successful prosecutions.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative Steve Chabot
September 26, 2017

Question:

On August 28, 2017, Secretary Tillerson informed Congress that he plans to eliminate 30 Special Envoy, Special Representative, and Coordinator positions from the Department of State and intends to consolidate many of their duties under existing bureaus or offices. What are the Department's plans for the Special Envoy to Syria and Special Envoy to Defeating ISIS? Will the individuals currently holding those two be replaced? Why, or why not?

Answer:

The Department will be able to better execute its mission by integrating certain envoys and special representatives offices within the regional and functional bureaus. The Department will continue to meet its mandate and work toward achieving critical foreign policy goals covered by special envoy positions. The integration of certain special envoy positions will also address concerns that under the current structure, a special envoy or representative may circumvent the regional and functional bureaus that make up the core of the State Department. On August 28, the Department notified and reported to the Committees on certain organizational changes related to special envoys and related positions, and we continue to seek feedback on the Department's plans for special envoy positions. As outlined in that August 28 notification letter, the Department intends to retain the Special Envoy for the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, which will continue to be organized under the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs (NEA) and will be reassessed as ISIS becomes more of a diffused threat. The Department intends for the functions of the Special Envoy for Syria to be retained within NEA and performed by a deputy assistant secretary in NEA.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative Brad Sherman
September 26, 2017

Question:

During the FY2018 State and Foreign Ops budget hearing with Secretary of State Tillerson on June 14, 2017, I stated to Secretary of State Tillerson the following:

> "We in Congress decide how much money is going to be spent, we've got the overall view. We might plug a tax loophole or have savings in another part of the budget that would allow us to spend more on Foreign Ops, but we do our best job when we get guidance. I would hope that you would submit for the record, how you'd spend a 10%, 20%, or 30% increment, what your recommendation to us is, if we can find the money to provide that."

Following my statement, Secretary of State Tillerson gave an affirmative nod. Following the hearing, I submitted the Question below for the Record:

> "Please submit for the record, how the Department of State would spend a 10%, 20%, or 30% increment to its budget? What would your recommendation be if those funds were available?" [BP]

The following is Secretary of State Tillerson's answer (provided over three months after the FY2018 budget hearing):

> "The Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) support the President's FY 2018 budget request which will protect our national security, foster economic prosperity, assert leadership, and ensure effectiveness and accountability for U.S. taxpayer dollars. The Department looks forward to working with Congress as we obligate and expend funds consistent with applicable laws."

Unfortunately, this is not an answer to the question I asked; Secretary of State Tillerson did not answer my inquiry as to how the Department of State would spend an incremented budget. Can you please provide an answer to the question? How would the Department of State spend a 10%, 20%, or 30% increment to its budget? What would your recommendation be if those funds were available?

Answer:

We believe we can build a State Department that is more effective as well as more efficient within the President's budget request. The Department remains committed to ensuring effectiveness of U.S. taxpayer dollars; driving efficiencies; working hand and hand with DOD and other agencies across the government to identify duplication of efforts; meeting objectives within fiscal constraints; and working on behalf of the American people to advance national security objectives and foreign policy goals. If additional funds were made available by Congress, how those funds would be used would depend in large part upon what the funds were provided for and

upon the current state of affairs at the time the funds were provided. We would look to enhance Administration priorities, and to respond to Congressional guidance and to any pressing needs at the time funds became available. We would ensure the best use of resources in support of our foreign policy goals and congressional priorities and, as is our practice, consult with Congress on our spending plans.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative Brian Fitzpatrick
September 26, 2017

Question:

Mr. Sullivan, as you know, the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS) system offers administrative support to federal agencies with employees stationed overseas. ICASS is a cost-sharing system, in which participating agencies contribute funds relative to the costs they incur by using the system. However, the GAO has found that nearly all participating agencies decline or refuse some level of support from ICASS and instead find alternative means of providing select services, leading to higher administrative costs: In a time where we need to save every dollar for diplomatic efforts, what steps can the State Department and Congress take to reform the ICASS system and to contain costs and reduce duplication of administrative support services overseas?

Answer:

The Department of State is committed to containing costs and reducing duplication of administrative support services overseas. We have been successful in reducing the growth rate of the global ICASS budgets in General Services and Building Operations, and in other areas over the last few years, saving $56 million.

Since the last GAO review (2012), the Department has actively engaged the interagency to achieve greater efficiency through regionalization of support services. For instance, the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Department of State have consolidated services, such as warehousing, motor pools, and expendable supplies. We have also implemented furniture and appliance pools and institutionalized measurable Uniform Service Standards.

The Department of State remains dedicated to improving its service delivery methods, through the Redesign and beyond, and making use of the most efficient and cost effective processes that help save U.S. taxpayer dollars.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative Gregory Meeks
September 26, 2017

Question:

With the many reports of fellowship programs and detail assignments for State Department personnel all being put on hold, it's hard to not take reports that the Trump Administration is trying to dismantle the State Department's premier role in foreign policy seriously. It is my understanding that they have indeed been halted. I believe strongly in the Pearson program and have hosted many Fellows because they have proven over the years to be a benefit to both the House and the Department of State. What do you believe are the long-term impacts of halting professional development programs like the Pearson program on the hill, long-term assignments across the U.S. government and opportunities to study at the National War College will have on the State Department?

Answer:

As part of our efforts to build and empower a 21st century workforce, and provide a maximum foreign policy return on U.S. taxpayer dollars, the State Department is conducting a strategic review of all external assignments. While this review is being conducted, some of these assignments have been put on hold. Recently some of the reviews have been completed and assignments are continuing. For the remainder, this hold is temporary, and we are endeavoring to ensure there is minimal impact on personnel and operations. Other training and development opportunities that do not involve assignments outside the Department continue uninterrupted, such as the Civil Service New Leaders Program.

Question:

One of the most efficient ways the Department can recruit top talent into the Civil Service at State is through the highly competitive Presidential Management Fellows (PMF) program: Do you intend to honor the job offers made to PMFs many of whom are foregoing better paying jobs in the private sector to come work for you—or would you advise them to seek careers elsewhere? Will the Department continue to participate in this OPM program going forward?

Answer:

PMFs are recognized as an integral part of the Department of State's workforce. The Secretary recently approved limited PMF hiring, and the PMF program will continue at the State Department. Future PMF hiring decisions will be considered as part of the Department's overall strategically managed hiring plan, in line with the Department's Redesign efforts. It is the Department's intention to continue with this program.

Question:

As I have expressed in letters to the Secretary and raised during his appearance before the committee, I am deeply concerned about the continuation of the Pickering and Rangel programs: Will the Secretary commit to increasing the proportion of foreign service officers admitted into the foreign service through the Pickering and Rangel fellowships, as required by the State Department Authorities Act that became law in December 2016?

Answer:

The number of Pickering and Rangel Fellows remains at its historical range of approximately 30 per program. The recruitment for the 2018 cohort of Rangel Fellows began in June and recruitment for the 2018 cohort of Pickering Fellows began in October. The Department appreciates that Congress authorized an increase in the Rangel and Pickering programs each by 10 Fellows in Section 706 of the 2017 Department of State Authorization Act. This increase did not occur in FY2017, as this directive did not come with additional funding.

Question:

A few months ago, former Undersecretary for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns testified before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and said morale at the State Department is the lowest he's ever seen it. From conversations many of us have had since then and reports we have seen, it doesn't seem to have improved: Is the Department concerned about morale? If so, how do you intend to convey that to the many men and women who have dedicated their careers and lives to serving their country, who now may be considering leaving?

Answer:

The Secretary and I value our employees as our most important resource. I've held town hall meetings at several U.S. embassies abroad and Department offices in Washington to share updates and hear from our employees directly. We have met with our employees to discuss the redesign process and listen to their ideas and concerns.

Continued engagement and candid input from our employees remain vital to the success of our redesign effort. An internal portal continues to be open for employees to submit their ideas and suggestions for increased efficiencies to inform that effort. We look forward to continuing to work with our employees and will seek their continued engagement and input.

Question:

A number of critical special envoy positions at the Department will be removed or retired because they have, according to the Secretary, "accomplished or outlived their original purpose." This is despite broad recognition that their elimination undercuts the Administration's efforts to effectively and efficiently implement key foreign policy initiatives. One such position is the Special Envoy for the Colombian Peace Process that led to the successful peace talks between the Colombian government and FARC rebels. Given how important this relationship has been

historically, and this critical stage in the peace process, do you think now is a good time to cut this position when help is still needed to carry out the implementation of the peace accord?

Answer:

The Department will be able to better execute its mission by integrating certain envoys and special representatives offices within the regional and functional bureaus. The Department will continue to meet its mandate and work toward achieving critical foreign policy goals covered by special envoy positions. The integration of certain special envoy positions will also address concerns that under the current structure, a special envoy or representative may circumvent the regional and functional bureaus that make up the core of the State Department. On August 28, the Department notified and reported to the Committees on certain organizational changes related to special envoys and related positions, and we will continue to seek feedback on the Department's plans for special envoy positions. As outlined in the August 28 notification letter, the Department intends for functions of the Special Envoy for the Columbian Peace Process to be assumed by Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative David Cicilline
September 26, 2017

Question:

I received a response, dated August 25, 2017, from the State Department to an earlier inquiry regarding violence against the LGBT community Chechnya, in which it stated that Secretary Tillerson wrote a letter to Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov "expressing concern" about the targeting of LGBT people by the Chechen authorities. Will the State Department make this letter public, or share it with myself and other Members of Congress who would like to see it?

Answer:

I remain deeply concerned about violence targeting the LGBTI community in Chechnya, and the Department continues to be outspoken on this issue. While we do not share or publish private diplomatic communications, I can confirm that Secretary Tillerson sent a letter to Minister Lavrov expressing our concerns about violence and targeting of LGBTI persons in Chechnya.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative Ami Bera
September 26, 2017

Question:

PEPFAR was established in 2003 by President Bush and it really is one of the success stories of history. PEPFAR is currently supporting 11.5 million people on life saving anti-retrovirals and nearly 2 million babies have been born HIV-free to pregnant women living with HIV. In South Africa, in 2005, HIV deaths accounted for half of its deaths. Now it's less than a third, and life expectancy has climbed by over a decade.

Secretary Tillerson has noted that he would like to expand the title of the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator to reflect a more comprehensive approach to global health. Can you please elaborate on the State Department's views on this expanded title and what, if anything, it means for global health programming?

Answer:

Expanding the title of the Ambassador-at-Large for Global HIV/AIDS, which oversees the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), to also include the role of Special Representative for Global Health Policy enables a more comprehensive approach within the State Department and across the U.S. government (including the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Defense) to address challenges to global health. PEPFAR has accelerated the progress toward a world safer and more secure from infectious disease threats by strengthening the global capacity to prevent, detect, and respond to them. Annually, with the support of the U.S. Congress, PEPFAR invests significant resources into developing comprehensive health and community systems globally, but the Administration recognizes that host-country policy reforms are a key element in ensuring not only that U.S. funding works more effectively, but also that countries can bolster their ability to swiftly detect and respond to infectious diseases and other outbreaks—enhancing global health security and protecting America's borders. This expansion of the title does not point to a consolidation of global health activities, but will allow for PEPFAR to be better leveraged as a foreign policy tool, expanding the role of the PEPFAR coordinator which reinforces the U.S. government's ability to drive policies that are needed to make U.S. investments in health and beyond more effective.

Question:

The PEPFAR program retains a unique role as coordinating the work of multiple agencies to effectively address the HIV/AIDS epidemic around the world. How will the PEPFAR program fit into the State Department under 'redesign' and do you foresee any major suggested structural changes to the program?

Answer:

State Department's Office of the U.S. Global AIDS Coordinator and Health Diplomacy (S/GAC) leads, coordinates, and directs funding for the U.S. government response to global HIV/AIDS through the U.S. President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) and oversees U.S. contributions to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria as well as the work of global health diplomacy. By leading internal U.S. government coordination, as well as coordination with the Global Fund, S/GAC has been able to leverage PEPFAR resources and the Global Fund's investment to increase results. For example, over the past three years, PEPFAR was able to increase treatment results by more than 60% while in a flat budget. This was possible through strong support from the U.S. Congress and the U.S. government's leadership in advocating policy reforms, and focusing the program and improving partner performance.

PEPFAR will continue to adopt methods to increase accountability, transparency, and internal U.S. government coordination. The program continues to reassess its business approaches to maximize impact and advance global efforts to control the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Department of State leadership and coordination remains vital for PEPFAR and global health diplomacy. The combination of strong U.S. government commitment on global HIV/AIDS in Washington and the irreplaceable role of Chiefs of Mission at post, across the over 60 countries where PEPFAR is being implemented, have enabled PEPFAR to have the tremendous impact while coordinating across other U.S. government implementing agencies. The U.S. government agencies that implement PEPFAR include: USAID, Peace Corps, and across the Departments of Health and Human Services, Defense, Treasury, and Labor. S/GAC's role in oversight, coordination, and accountability of the U.S. government implementing agencies is critical to PEPFAR's success, results and outcomes.

Question:

Some NGO leaders and others in the foreign assistance community have expressed concern that U.S. officials have been dismissive of their feedback with respect to reorganizing USAID. In your view, how responsive have Department of State and USAID officials been to the feedback of NGOs and other non-government stakeholders with respect to USAID reorganization? How, specifically, are you consulting the NGOs and private sector? Please provide specific examples of instances where the Department of State and USAID have been responsive to such concerns and feedback.

Answer:

As part of the re-design process, the Department has consulted with outside groups, including think tanks and NGOs, and many of their proposals continue to be actively considered as part of the re-design process. The Department welcomes feedback from all stakeholders in the re-design process.

Question:

In a briefing to HFAC staff members, personnel from the State Department stated that because each agency was required to submit a plan to OMB to eliminate redundancy and increase

efficiencies, there had been limited coordination in the redesign process before September 15th. This is deeply concerning to me as over 20 federal agencies are involved in foreign assistance and diplomatic efforts. During the reorganization process involving other agencies involved in development and diplomacy? What specific mechanisms are in place to ensure that no capabilities are dropped between the State Department, USAID, and other federal agencies in the conduct of American foreign policy?

Answer:

One key focus of the re-design process has been to improve the effectiveness of foreign assistance across the State Department, USAID, and other federal agencies engaged in this mission. The Department's recent submission to OMB was an initial step of the re-design process, and further consultations within the Executive Branch, with Congress, and with outside stakeholders will continue through subsequent phases of the re-design. Throughout this process, the Secretary of State continues to be responsible for coordinating U.S. foreign assistance.

Questions for the Record Submitted to
Deputy Secretary of State John J. Sullivan
By Representative Robin Kelly
September 26, 2017

Question:

Does the folding or eliminating of the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues reflect that information security is no longer a top issue for U.S. foreign policy? How does the Department of State plan to stay engaged on cyber issues?

Answer:

Advancing the full range of U.S. interests in cyberspace is an Administration priority, and the redesign will enable the Department to more effectively fulfill its role in leading the international community on cyber policy. One of the goals of the redesign is to consolidate and rationalize related issue sets, and as an interim step, the Department has unified cyber policy and digital economy policy issues within the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs. The cyber experts on this integrated team have taken the lead on the deterrence and international engagement strategies called for in Executive Order 13800. Further, the Department continues its efforts to promote a framework of responsible state behavior that includes affirmation of the applicability of international law to cyberspace, voluntary norms of state behavior in cyberspace in peacetime and practical confidence building measures. The next phase of the U.S. strategic approach includes a complementary focus on deterrence and adversary-specific planning. The Department also continues to engage with allies and other counterparts on difficult cyber issues both bilaterally and in regional and international organizations, including implementing strategic cyber capacity building programs.

Since assuming the position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Cyber and International Communications and Information Policy on September 18, 2017, Mr. Robert Strayer has been actively engaged in high-level consultations with Japan, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom, as well as other key allies and key partners in the Arab and African regions. He also successfully led the United States delegation to the ITU's World Telecommunication Development Conference. He is also working closely with the other Departments and agencies to address a variety of national security challenges in cyberspace.

The Department is fully committed to elevating and providing the appropriate resources for leadership on cyber policy as an essential issue, and the ongoing redesign process is nearing a decision on where and at what level the cyber responsibilities will reside. The Department looks forward to working with the Committee on this issue.

Question:

One of the seven proposals submitted is improving governance and accountability for IT platforms. Last month the State Department Office of the Inspector General report found that 77% of the Department's FISMA reportable IT assets are non-compliant. What are the department's

plans and progress on implementing the recommendations of the report? Were these recommendations taken into account when you submitted your Agency Reform Proposals?

Answer:

In a continuing effort to address and accelerate system authorization activities, the Department of State has adapted the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) Risk Management Framework (RMF) authorization process by creating Integrated Project Teams (IPT) and augmenting them with volunteers. The IPT pilot process takes the linear approach of the NIST RMF and removes the step by step methodology, and instead, puts all of the responsible agents in the same location for six weeks. At the end of this process, the system being reviewed should have an Authority-to-Operate (ATO) ready to be signed by the Authorizing Official (AO). These IPT pilots began in October 2017, and will be reevaluated in February 2018 to determine if the Department should adopt this new method holistically.

The Department remains committed to improving and refining its information technology security program to better protect its information from ever-increasing cyber threats. For example, the Department procured and implemented a governance, risk management, and compliance application to improve and more efficiently manage the NIST RMF steps, including the Assessment and Authorization (A&A) process. In addition, the Department continues to work in close coordination with agency partners to ensure elevated awareness and preparedness with respect to potential malicious cyber activities. Such collaboration and partnerships have resulted in a number of improvements in the Department's cybersecurity posture. Lastly, under the Federal Information Technology Acquisition Reform Act, the CIO is increasing oversight of systems owned and operated by bureaus. This will allow the Department to manage cyber risks upfront because security controls will be built-in versus bolted on.

Though much work remains, overall, the Department is moving in a positive direction with regard to managing information security risk. This is reflected in the Department's Cybersecurity Strategy which lists specific actions and capabilities to be implemented through FY 2019 and our internal Department Cyber Action Plan for FY 2017 – 2018. We take the concerns and recommendations of the Office of Inspector General seriously and will respond with suggested improvements and implementation of actions to resolve those concerns. Furthermore, we are revising the Department's Information Security Continuous Monitoring (ISCM) strategy, capitalizing on our expanding awareness of DHS's Continuous Diagnostic and Monitoring (CDM) project and available tool suites that support automation. We expect to move newly assessed systems into an Ongoing Authorization (OA) mode once the strategy is complete and CDM capabilities come online. Each of these actions is important; the sum will bring us closer to its goal of providing an interconnected, secure, and innovative application of IT resources.

Question:

What are the State Department's plans for removing or transferring Department officials currently serving in the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues? Will there be any authority or reporting changes for the Chief Information Officer?

Answer:

As mentioned in my testimony, the final decision about where and at what level we will place the cybersecurity responsibility has not been made and is integral to the larger employee-led redesign effort that is underway. The related organizational structures of the Information Resources Management and Diplomatic Security bureaus also play an important role in the Department's cyber security operations.

○