



### Fiscal Year 2020 UN Funding Recommendations

| Account | FY'17 Omnibus | FY'18 Omnibus | FY'19 Admin. Request | FY'19 House SFOPS | FY'19 Senate SFOPS | FY'19 Final | FY'20 Admin. Request | FY'20 BWC Rec. |
|---------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|
| CIPA    | \$1,907,464   | \$1,382,080   | \$1,196,108          | \$1,589,496       | \$1,683,881        | \$1,551,000 | \$1,136,000          | \$2,596,352    |
| CIO     | \$1,359,206   | \$1,467,408   | \$1,095,045          | \$1,364,415       | \$1,440,375        | \$1,360,270 | \$1,013,693          | \$1,484,638    |
| PKO     | \$659,014     | \$537,925     | \$291,400            | \$490,400         | \$477,425          | \$488,670   | \$291,435            | \$553,777      |

*(Dollar amounts listed in thousands)*

#### **Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA): \$2.596 billion**

With more than 100,000 military, civilian, and police personnel deployed to 14 missions across four continents, peacekeeping is one of the most visible and impactful activities undertaken by the UN in the field. UN peacekeeping operations are authorized by the UN Security Council (UNSC), and since the U.S. is a permanent, veto-wielding member of that body, no mission can be deployed without first receiving U.S. support. The support for peacekeeping has historically been bipartisan and backed by our military because peacekeepers help stabilize fragile states, protect humanitarian convoys, prevent civil wars from metastasizing into full-blown regional conflicts, and decrease the likelihood that dormant conflicts will flare up again. Peacekeeping missions are also:

- Extremely **cost-effective** when compared to other forms of military intervention, having been found to be eight times less expensive than the deployment of U.S. forces by a [2018 GAO report](#). The UN's total annual peacekeeping budget of roughly \$7 billion is equivalent to just 1% of all U.S. defense spending, and represents less than 0.5% of all annual global military expenditures;
- A case study in the benefits of **international burden-sharing**. The U.S. only contributes several dozen uniformed personnel to UN peacekeeping missions, with the rest coming from more than 120 countries, including Indonesia, Jordan, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Ghana, Tanzania, and Rwanda.

**Many UN peacekeeping missions have successfully completed their mandates** and closed their doors over the years. For example, UN missions in Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire, and Liberia made significant contributions to stability in these West African countries before being withdrawn in 2005, 2017, and 2018, respectively. At the same time, the UN is currently confronting serious challenges in a number of other places. In South Sudan, peacekeepers are still protecting nearly 200,000 civilians who have fled a devastating civil war and sought refuge at UN bases, even while a shaky peace agreement has taken effect. In Mali, UN forces working to secure the country's vast northern region have increasingly come under threat from armed extremist groups, including a regional affiliate of al-Qaeda, with nearly 100 personnel killed in militant attacks since July 2013. UN peacekeepers are also working to protect civilians from armed groups in DR Congo and the Central African Republic, prevent a flare-up of hostilities along the Israel-Lebanon border, and promote stability in a host of other contexts.

UN peacekeeping operations are financed through member state assessments—payments that countries are legally obligated to make by virtue of belonging to the UN. These are determined by a formula that takes into account a member state's gross national income (GNI), GNI per capita, debt burden, and several other factors. The five permanent members of the Security Council (U.S., China, UK, France, and Russia) are then assessed at a slightly higher rate than what they pay for the regular budget, because they have veto power over the establishment of peacekeeping missions. Assessment rates are renegotiated by the UN General Assembly every three years, and the current U.S. rate of 27.9% represents a reduction from the 1990s, when it paid nearly 32%. Meanwhile, China's peacekeeping assessment rate has ballooned over the last decade, from just 3.1% in 2008 to 15.2% in 2019.



Unfortunately, since the mid-1990s, U.S. law has arbitrarily capped U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping operations at 25%. This law is anachronistic: since 2000, the U.S.'s regular budget contributions have been subject to a 22% ceiling agreed to by the UN, an arrangement that no other developed country benefits from. Because a country's regular budget assessment rate plays a major role in determining its peacekeeping assessment, the regular budget cap keeps the U.S. peacekeeping rate at a significantly lower level than what it would be otherwise. According to a document released by the State Department in December, without this ceiling, the U.S. would be obliged to pay 27% of the regular budget and 33% for peacekeeping.

While Congress has frequently waived this requirement in annual appropriations bills, since FY'17 it has declined to do so, **causing the U.S. to accrue \$750 million in peacekeeping arrears**. The effect of these unilateral underpayments is increasingly worrisome: the UN is currently facing a significant and growing cash crunch, with the result that countries who provide troops to peacekeeping missions—including U.S. partners and allies like Rwanda, Bangladesh, Tanzania, and Indonesia—are not being fully reimbursed for their contributions. If these arrears continue building, they will affect the ability of peacekeeping forces to deploy into the field, compromising their ability to fulfill their responsibilities. As a result, BWC's FY'20 recommendation for CIPA—the State Department account that funds our UN peacekeeping assessments, with the exception of Somalia-related expenses, detailed under PKO below—includes sufficient funds to pay our dues at the full assessed rate (\$1.846 billion) plus an additional \$750 million to cover our arrears. We also request bill language lifting the 25% cap for FY'20 and retroactively for FY'17-FY'19: *“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading in this and prior acts shall be made available for United States assessed contributions up to the amount specified in the Annex accompanying United Nations General Assembly document A/70/331 Add.1 and the Annex accompanying United Nations General Assembly document A/73/350 Add.1.”*

#### **Contributions to International Organizations (CIO): \$1.484 billion**

The State Department's CIO account funds U.S. assessments for the UN regular budget (UNRB) and more than 40 other UN and non-UN international organizations. The UNRB is essential to the overall functioning of the UN, as it provides a reliable source of funding for many of the organization's core activities outside of peacekeeping. These include special political missions operating in Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, Libya, and other key countries, where they work to facilitate democratic elections, coordinate the distribution of humanitarian and development assistance, and support the development of strong, effective, and accountable governing institutions. **The UNRB also finances efforts to ensure international implementation and compliance with sanctions adopted by the Security Council against terrorist organizations like ISIS and Al-Qaeda and rogue states like North Korea.** These types of activities are manifestly in the national security interest of the United States and, much like peacekeeping, are an excellent example of international burden-sharing: **other UN member states pay 78% of their costs**. The U.S. participated fully in the process of formulating the requirements for the UNRB, and it was adopted by consensus in the General Assembly with U.S. support.

Besides the Regular Budget, CIO funds U.S. assessments for a range of UN specialized agencies. These include the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which plays a critical role in ensuring nuclear safety and preventing nuclear proliferation, including by continuing to monitor Iran's nuclear program; and the World Health Organization (WHO), responsible for coordinating the global response to public health emergencies.



In FY'18, the Trump administration unilaterally withheld \$18.9 million from its UNRB payments to express disapproval of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and an additional \$7.67 million for the UN Human Rights Council (pursuant to Section 7048(c) of the State/Foreign Ops bill). These withholdings are counterproductive, as they affect not only the entities in question, but all other activities financed by the UNRB. These entities also play a critical role in advancing U.S. human rights priorities: for example, the Human Rights Council authorizes, and OHCHR helps implement and coordinate, international investigations into human rights abuses in a number of countries, including North Korea, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Belarus, DR Congo, and South Sudan, among others. These types of activities help raise international awareness of human rights violations, magnify the voices of human rights defenders and civil society organizations working on the ground, and serve as a tool for applying pressure to repressive governments. They also provide an evidentiary basis that can potentially aid future efforts to hold human rights abusers accountable for their actions. We therefore urge you to do the following:

- Do not include withholding language in Section 7048(c) on the Human Rights Council, as this provision has been ineffective in promoting reform of the Council and simply cuts money from other regular budget programs that the U.S. supports;
- Consider bill language that would prevent the administration from withholding funds for OHCHR without Congressional approval: *“Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading are made available to pay not less than the full fiscal year 2020 United States assessment for each respective international organization.”*

BWC is recommending \$1.484 billion for CIO in FY'20. This number reflects an increase in the UN regular budget for Calendar Year 2019 (of which the U.S. assessment is approximately \$91 million) agreed to by the U.S. and other Member States in December 2018. The bulk of this increase is to cover additional costs associated with existing political missions in Colombia, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen, the new office of UN Special Envoy on Myanmar, and a new investigative team on crimes committed by ISIS. In addition, BWC's recommendation includes \$33 million withheld by the administration for the aforementioned human rights-related activities and capital improvement projects in FY'18.

**Peacekeeping Operations (PKO): \$553.7 million**

Funds requested for the PKO account support a number of regional peacekeeping activities and bilateral security initiatives. In recent years, Congress has used PKO to fund assessed contributions for the UN Support Office in Somalia (UNSOS), which, due to the capacity constraints of African Union forces, provides equipment and logistical support to the AU Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). AMISOM continues to work to stabilize Somalia and help Somali security forces defeat Al-Shabaab, a terrorist organization that has pledged fealty to Al-Qaeda, which has carried out a number of deadly attacks against civilians in the region. PKO also includes funding for the State Department's Global Peace Operations Initiative, a peacekeeper training and equipping program that has facilitated the deployment of more than 197,000 personnel from 38 countries to 29 peace operations around the world. The \$553.7 million recommendation for PKO in this document includes funds for these voluntary programs, as well as funding sufficient to pay our UNSOS assessments at the full assessed rate of 27.9%.