

President's FY20 Request Summary

The Administration released its Fiscal Year 2020 budget today, including its request for international affairs programs. Like the last two budget requests, the international affairs budget took a major hit: overall, the administration allocated \$42.7 billion for the State Department, USAID, and other international affairs programs/agencies, a 24% reduction from FY'19. These cuts hit UN accounts particularly hard: funding for UN peacekeeping operations would be reduced nearly 27% from FY'19 levels; funding for the UN regular budget and the assessed budgets of UN specialized agencies and other international organizations would be cut by more than 25%; and the International Organizations and Programs (IO&P) account, which finances voluntary contributions to the core budgets of a number of UN humanitarian, development, environmental, and human rights entities, was eliminated entirely.

As we have noted following the release of other administration budgets, however, this is far from the end of the story. Congress has the final say over all funding-related decisions, and similar to past years, Members on both sides of the aisle have already made clear their opposition to this request.

Provided below is a summary of how the President's FY'20 request treats specific UN-related accounts. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA): \$1,136,000,000

- The State Department's CIPA account funds U.S. assessments for 12 UN peacekeeping operations and a portion of U.S. assessments for the UN Mechanism for International Criminal Tribunals (MICT), the successor entity to UN war crimes tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, whose mandates ended in 2015 and 2017, respectively. Two other peacekeeping operations (the UN Truce Supervision Organization and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan) are funded by the UN regular budget, and are therefore not included under CIPA. U.S. assessments for the UN Support Office in Somalia (UNSOS)—an entity that provides logistical support and equipment to AU forces operating in Somalia—are also requested under the CIPA account by the administration, but are typically appropriated by Congress under the Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) account.
- The administration's FY'20 CIPA request is \$60 million below its FY'19 request (\$1.196 billion) and \$415 million below the level enacted as part of the FY'19 Omnibus Appropriations bill (\$1.551 billion). The Congressional Budget Justification (CBJ) states that the request "assumes reductions in contributions to UN peacekeeping, which would be achieved through combination of reducing the UN peacekeeping budget as a result of mission closures and/or reducing budgets to existing missions," and that these reductions are "distributed proportionately across all peacekeeping missions." It goes on to state that, "The Department intends to examine and pursue where UN peacekeeping mandates could be reduced or eliminated with an acceptable level of risk to U.S. interests."
- While acknowledging that the decision to close a peacekeeping mission is ultimately the prerogative of the UN Security Council, the CBJ does provide a preview of which operations the U.S. is likely to push for downsizing over the coming year. This includes the UN police

mission in Haiti (MINUJUSTH), which, according to the CBJ, “is anticipated to close in October 2019, with the UN to maintain a to-be-determined, non-peacekeeping presence following October 2019.” State also foresees reductions in troop and police levels for UN missions in Darfur and DR Congo, though not their outright elimination. Interestingly, despite the repeated talk of closures and force-level reductions, the CBJ actually foresees increases (or at least no reductions) in certain missions. For example, it appears that the administration is prepared to support an increase in “the role and size” of the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) “in order to appropriately respond to the severe security and humanitarian situation and to support the fledgling commitment from South Sudanese parties to engage in peace processes.” The request assumes that troop levels for UNISFA (the UN’s peacekeeping presence in the disputed region of Abyei claimed by Sudan and South Sudan) and MINUSCA (Central African Republic) will remain unchanged.

- While the CBJ, as noted above, does reiterate the administration’s intention to seek reductions in the UN peacekeeping budget, it does not explicitly call for enforcement of the 1990s-era 25% cap on U.S. contributions to peacekeeping missions. Last year’s budget request, by contrast, stated that the administration “supports a United States contribution at or below the statutory cap of 25 percent for UN peacekeeping missions.” Nevertheless, we do not believe that this signals a softening of the administration’s approach to the cap. Indeed, the amount requested for CIPA as a whole in FY’20 leaves us several hundred million dollars short of even reaching the cap (the current U.S. peacekeeping assessment rate is 27.89%).
- Since FY’17, Congress has enforced the cap in annual appropriations bills. As a result, the U.S. has accrued nearly \$750 million in peacekeeping arrears to date, a situation which is contributing to significant cash flow problems at the UN. While Congress is unlikely to fund CIPA at the \$1.1 billion requested by the administration, U.S. arrears will nevertheless rise to \$1 billion if it continues to enforce the cap in FY’20.

Peacekeeping Operations (PKO): \$291,435,000

- PKO provides voluntary contributions to several regional peacekeeping initiatives and bilateral security assistance programs. Congress has also historically used the account to fund assessments for UNSOS, which provides logistical support and equipment to the African Union Mission in Somalia, though the administration has historically requested these funds as part of CIPA. In keeping with this longstanding practice, the administration’s CIPA request for FY’20 once again includes funding for UNSOS.
- The administration’s FY’20 PKO request is \$35,000 above the FY’19 request and \$197.2 million below the FY’19 Omnibus. While part of that reduction is due to the absence of UNSOS funding, the President’s budget makes steep cuts to other PKO programs as well. For example, the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI)—a State Department program that provides training and equipment to troop-contributing countries—is funded at only \$56 million in the administration’s request, versus the \$71 million Congress appropriated for the program in FY’19.

Contributions to International Organizations (CIO): \$1,013,693,000

- The State Department’s CIO account funds U.S. dues payments to the UN regular budget (UNRB) and the assessed budgets of more than 40 other UN and non-UN international organizations, including the IAEA, WHO, NATO, and the OAS, among a number of others.
- The FY’20 request comes in \$82 million below the administration’s FY’19 request (\$1.095 billion) and \$347 million below the FY’19 enacted level (\$1.360 billion). Overall, UN agencies funded by CIO would see a nearly 28% cut in funding from FY’18 levels from the U.S. under this scenario. For example, the administration only requests \$473.7 million for the UNRB, more than \$136 million (22%) less than our FY’18 assessment, and roughly \$200 million short of anticipated needs for FY’20. Several UN specialized agencies saw even larger reductions in their U.S. assessments, including: WHO (\$53.2 million, or 47%, less than FY’18), FAO (\$58 million, or 51%, less than FY’18), and FAO (\$42 million, or 49%, less than FY’18). The IAEA, on the other hand, saw a much more modest reduction in funding (just \$1.3 million, or just over 1%, below FY’18).
- This variation in cuts to different agencies reflects the administration’s desire to prioritize, according to the CBJ, “funding for international programs and organizations whose missions substantially advance U.S. foreign policy interests” and make “cuts or reductions to other organizations and programs whose results are unclear or whose work does not directly affect our national interests.”
- Nevertheless, despite these cuts and the rhetoric around “prioritizing” certain activities over others, the CBJ is chock full of language extolling the benefits of engagement with international organizations. For example: “By combining resources and expertise provided by nations from every part of the world, international organizations undertake coordinated efforts that may serve as effective alternatives to acting unilaterally or bilaterally, especially in the areas of providing humanitarian assistance, eradicating disease, setting food and transportation safety standards, and reaching agreement to impose sanctions on rogue states and actors... International organizations offer significant benefits to U.S. taxpayers. Nearly every Federal agency relies on international organizations to help advance foreign and domestic objectives. Countless U.S. businesses and citizens depend on international organizations to reduce barriers to trade, improve border and port security, obtain international patent and trademark protection, set standards for aviation and maritime security, maintain the world’s telecommunications networks, harmonize international law in the areas of child custody, support, and international adoption, and disseminate information about the supply and demand of vital commodities.” Such contradictory sentiments have been hallmarks of previous Trump administration State Department CBJs as well.
- The request does not mention funding for the UN Human Rights Office (OHCHR) or the Human Rights Council (UNHRC), both of which the administration “withheld” from the UNRB in FY’18. However, absent any action by Congress, we expect the administration to once again withhold funding from the UNRB (equivalent to around \$26 million) to express its disapproval with these entities in FY’19 and FY’20 as well.

International Organizations and Programs (IO&P): \$0

- The State Department's IO&P account provides voluntary contributions to a range of UN entities focused on humanitarian, development, environmental, human rights, and gender equality issues, including UNICEF, UNDP, UN Women, the UN Environment Program (UNEP), UNFPA, and OHCHR, among others.
- Long a target of fiscal conservatives, IO&P was repeatedly zeroed out in House SFOPS bills when the chamber was under Republican control, and has also faced elimination in all of the Trump administration's budget requests. Nevertheless, Congress has seen fit to provide robust funding for the account in final appropriations bills: in FY'19, IO&P received \$364 million. We expect a similar dynamic to play out in FY'20.

Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA): \$365,020,000

- The MRA account is a critical source of voluntary funding for several UN agencies focused on refugees and migrants: the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), International Organization for Migration (IOM), and UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA). Congress does not specify how much each agency receives from the account: rather, the actual apportionment of MRA funds to international organizations and NGOs is determined by the State Department.
- The final FY'19 appropriation for MRA was \$3.4 billion, so this represents a major (nearly 90% cut) to the account. According to the CBJ, this is because portions of the account dealing with the provision of humanitarian assistance to displaced persons will be merged with a new humanitarian account administered by USAID, while programs that resettle refugees in the U.S. will continue to be administered by State and funded by MRA: **“In past years, a large portion of the MRA account addressed the protection and assistance needs of refugees, conflict victims, stateless persons, and vulnerable migrants worldwide. Funds primarily supported the programs of international organizations, including the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and the International Organization for Migration (IOM), as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs). As part of an Administration effort to optimize humanitarian assistance, prioritize funding, and use funding as effectively and efficiently as possible, there is no request in MRA for overseas humanitarian assistance needs. Instead, these funds along with funds previously requested in International Disaster Assistance (IDA) account are consolidated in the new International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) account. Funds in IHA will support all aspects of humanitarian assistance, including shelter, protection, emergency health and nutrition, the provision of safe drinking water, livelihoods supports, emergency food interventions, rehabilitation, disaster risk reduction, and transition to development assistance programs and will support consistent oversight of the programs of international organizations, including UNHCR, ICRC, IOM, the World Food Program (WFP), the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In addition, appropriations language under the MRA account gives the Secretary of State authority to transfer funding from IHA to MRA should projected funding for refugee resettlement not be sufficient.”**

- If Congress were to go along with this, it would represent a significant restructuring of how the U.S. government provides humanitarian assistance. **The administration proposes \$5.968 billion for the new IHA account. In FY’19, the IDA and MRA accounts together received more than \$7.8 billion in funding, so the new account does not appear to be absorbing all of the needs from these accounts.**

Table I: CIPA, CIO, & PKO

Account	FY’17 Omnibus	FY’18 Omnibus	FY’19 President’s Request	FY’19 House SFOPS	FY’19 Senate SFOPS	FY’19 Omnibus	FY’20 President’s Request
CIPA	\$1.907 billion (\$553 million base, \$1.354 billion OCO)	\$1.382 billion (\$414.6 million base, \$967.5 million OCO)	\$1.196 billion (all base)	\$1.589 billion (all base)	\$1.683 billion (\$716.4 million base, \$967.4 million OCO)	\$1.551 billion (\$562.3 million base, \$988.7 million OCO)	\$1.136 billion (all base)
CIO	\$1.359 billion (\$1.263 billion base, \$96 million OCO)	\$1.467 billion (\$1.371 billion base, \$96.2 million OCO)	\$1.095 billion (all base)	\$1.364 billion (all base)	\$1.440 billion (1.51 billion base, \$96.2 million OCO)	\$1.360 billion (\$1.264 billion base, \$96.24 million OCO)	\$1.013 billion (all base)
PKO	\$659 million (\$135 million base, \$474 million OCO, plus \$50 million in supplemental funding)	\$537.9 million (\$212.7 million base, \$325.2 million OCO) **Roughly \$145.5 million of this is for UNSOS	\$291.4 million (all base)	\$490.4 million (all base)	\$477.4 million (\$152.2 million base, \$325.2 million OCO)	\$488.7 million (\$163.5 million base, \$325.2 million OCO)	\$291.4 million (all base)

Table II: IO&P Detailed Breakdown

Organization	FY'17 Omnibus	FY'18 Omnibus	FY'19 President's Request	FY'19 House SFOPS	FY'19 Senate SFOPS	FY'19 Omnibus	FY'20 President's Request
Total IO&P	\$339,000,000	\$339,000,000	\$0	\$213,800,000	\$351,750,000	\$364,000,000	\$0
International Contributions for UNESCO Activities	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	
International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)/UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$3,000,000	\$0	
UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF)	\$500,000	\$500,000		\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,100,000	
UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)	\$137,500,000	\$137,500,000		\$132,500,000	\$137,500,000	\$137,500,000	
UN Democracy Fund (UNDF)	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000		\$0	\$3,500,000	\$3,000,000	
UN Women	\$8,500,000	\$8,500,000		\$7,500,000	\$10,000,000	\$8,500,000	
UN Development Program (UNDP)	\$80,000,000	\$80,000,000		\$60,000,000	\$80,000,000	\$80,000,000	
UN Environment Program (UNEP)	\$7,000,000	\$10,000,000		\$0	\$7,500,000	\$10,000,000	
UN Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000		\$0	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	
UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)	\$10,500,000	\$8,500,000		\$0	\$10,000,000	\$9,500,000	
UN Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field	\$1,150,000	\$1,150,000		\$0	\$1,150,000	\$1,150,000	

of Human Rights							
UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture	\$6,550,000	\$6,550,000		\$6,550,000	\$6,550,000	\$6,550,000	
UN Population Fund (UNFPA)**	\$32,500,000	\$32,500,000		\$0	\$37,500,000	\$32,500,000	
Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund	\$32,000,000	\$31,000,000		\$0	\$32,000,000	\$31,000,000	
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
International Maritime Organization (IMO)	\$325,000	\$325,000		\$0	\$325,000	\$325,000	
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)	\$800,000	\$800,000		\$1,200,000	\$800,000	\$1,200,000	
UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sexual Violence in Conflict	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000		\$0	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	
UN Trust Fund to End Violence Against Women	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
UN Haiti Cholera Multi-Partner Trust Fund	N/A	N/A		\$0	\$1,750,000	\$0	
UN Resident Coordinator System	N/A	N/A		\$0	\$0	\$23,000,000	

** Was reprogrammed due to Kemp-Kasten determination.