Fiscal Year 2022 UN Funding Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>FY'19 Omnibus</th>
<th>FY'20 Omnibus</th>
<th>FY'21 President’s Request</th>
<th>FY’21 House SFOPS</th>
<th>FY’21 Senate SFOPS</th>
<th>FY’21 Omnibus</th>
<th>FY’22 BWC Recs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIPA</td>
<td>$1,551,000</td>
<td>$1,526,383</td>
<td>$1,079,200</td>
<td>$1,456,314</td>
<td>$1,441,094</td>
<td>$1,456,314</td>
<td>$2,701,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO</td>
<td>$1,360,270</td>
<td>$1,473,606</td>
<td>$966,244</td>
<td>$1,505,928</td>
<td>$1,479,343</td>
<td>$1,505,928</td>
<td>$1,595,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO</td>
<td>$488,670</td>
<td>$457,368</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$457,348</td>
<td>$406,508</td>
<td>$440,759</td>
<td>$548,065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dollar amounts in this table are listed in thousands.

Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA): $2.701 billion

The CIPA account funds U.S. assessments for 11 UN peacekeeping missions, including critical operations in Mali, South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Central African Republic, Lebanon, and the Golan Heights. All of these missions were approved by the UN Security Council—of which the U.S. is a permanent member with veto power—and play a central role in stabilizing conflict zones by separating warring parties, protecting civilians, facilitating delivery of humanitarian assistance, and helping fragile states carry out democratic elections and build effective governance structures. Support for peacekeeping has historically been bipartisan and backed by our military because peacekeeping missions:

- **Save lives**: Research shows that peacekeeping supports civilian protection. One study, which examined civilian death tolls from civil wars in sub-Saharan Africa over 15 years, found that in places where no peacekeeping troops were deployed, average monthly civilian deaths totaled 106. However, in instances where at least 8,000 UN troops were present, civilian deaths dropped by 98%.

- **Cost Less than other forms of intervention**: Two studies published by the U.S. Government Accountability Office more than a decade apart (in 2006 and 2018) found that a UN operation is one-eighth the cost to American taxpayers of deploying a comparable U.S. force. Overall, at just over $6.5 billion, the UN’s peacekeeping budget is equivalent to less than 1 percent of total annual U.S. defense spending.

- **Promote 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.

Assessment rates for peacekeeping are determined by each country’s ability to pay, with permanent members of the Security Council (the U.S., UK, France, Russia, and China) paying slightly more than they do for the regular budget in recognition of their unique responsibility for greenlighting peacekeeping missions. Under this formula, the U.S. is currently assessed at a rate of 27.89 percent. Unfortunately, since the mid-1990s, U.S. law has arbitrarily capped U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping at 25 percent. While Congress has frequently waived this requirement on an ad hoc basis, since FY’17 it has not done so, causing the U.S. to accrue approximately $1.019 billion in cap-related arrears under the CIPA account.
In part because of these underpayments, UN peacekeeping faces a growing cash crunch, and the UN is unable to sufficiently reimburse countries who participate in peacekeeping for their contributions of personnel and equipment. To date, the UN has amassed hundreds of millions of dollars in outstanding reimbursement payments to Ethiopia, Rwanda, Bangladesh, Tanzania, Senegal, and other member states. This creates significant challenges for troop-contributors, most of whom are lower-income countries that rely on reimbursements to help sustain complex longer-term peacekeeping deployments. Continued U.S. underpayments also threaten to:

- **Erode U.S. influence at the UN and cede the floor to countries that do not share our values.** China has significantly increased its participation in UN peacekeeping in recent years. Currently, it is the tenth largest troop-contributor (providing more than the other permanent members of the Security Council combined), and the second largest financial contributor. China is seeking to use this expanded profile to more aggressively articulate its agenda at the UN, including by challenging the human rights and civilian protection related aspects of UN peacekeeping mandates.

- **Undermine our ability to push for critical reforms at the UN, sapping the good will and cross-regional support necessary to make progress on our priorities.** During the Obama Administration, the U.S. and UN worked together to adopt a number of critical reforms and efficiencies, cutting the cost per peacekeeper by 18 percent and reducing the number of support staff on missions to lower administrative costs. The UN also undertook important efforts to combat sexual exploitation and abuse by UN personnel, including an unprecedented policy calling for the repatriation of entire units whose members engaged in widespread instances of abuse. This was all done at a time when the U.S. was not enforcing the 25 percent cap. Failing to pay our dues in full alienates like-minded countries, sends the message that we are more interested in punishing the organization than improving it, and makes it less likely that future U.S. entreaties around cost, efficiency, and accountability will be taken seriously.

BWC’s FY’22 recommendation for CIPA includes sufficient funds to pay our estimated FY’22 peacekeeping assessments at the full assessed rate ($1.681 billion), plus an additional $1.019 billion to pay back arrears. In order to make these payments, language will need to be included in appropriations legislation waiving the statutory cap: “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): $1.596 billion**
The CIO account funds U.S. assessments for the UN regular budget (UNRB) and more than 40 other international organizations, including UN specialized agencies like the World Health Organization (WHO). The UNRB is essential to the overall functioning of the UN, providing 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, Yemen, Somalia, Libya, Colombia, and other key countries, where they work to support peace processes, facilitate democratic elections, coordinate distribution of humanitarian and development assistance, and support the development of strong, effective, and accountable governing institutions;

• 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;

• Much of the organization’s core international human rights monitoring and advocacy work, as more than 40 percent of the annual budget of the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) comes from the UNRB.

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.

During its time in office, the Trump Administration made several significant changes (some relying on legal authorities granted by Congress, others unilaterally) to the level and pace of disbursements from this account.

• For starters, the Administration withheld assessed contributions to the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and the UN Human Rights Council that are channeled through the UN regular budget, totaling $90 million from FY’17-FY’20.

• In addition, the Administration repeatedly slow-walked the disbursement of funds for those portions of the regular budget that it was willing to pay.

These budgetary decisions eroded the financial health of the UN system. In terms of the UN itself, the late or outright non-payment of regular budget dues has touched off repeated liquidity crises that threaten the ability of the organization to pay staff and vendors, as well as carry out key programs. In order to prevent insolvency, the Secretary-General has been forced to institute a hiring freeze and other undesirable austerity measures.

These actions do not serve coherent policy objectives. Instead, they complicate the delivery of multilateral initiatives that advance fundamental U.S. national interests, threaten to erode U.S. influence in favor of China, which is expanding its own role within international organizations, and abrogate the will of Congress, which has appropriated funds under CIO expressly for the purpose of meeting U.S. financial obligations to the UN and its specialized agencies.

BWC’s recommendation of $1.596 billion for CIO would help repair the damage caused by these decisions by fully meeting our estimated current commitments under the account ($1.506 billion) and paying back the $90 million we owe for UN human rights mechanisms. In addition to appropriating these funds in final FY’22 SFOPS legislation, we also urge Congress to:
• Include language in the bill specifying that CIO funds “shall be made available” to pay the full amount of the U.S. assessment for the UN regular budget and other international organizations financed by the account. This will prevent the Executive Branch from ignoring Congress and unilaterally withholding funds to particular agencies: “Provided, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for payment of the full United States assessment to the United Nations regular budget at 22 percent; Provided further, That such funds shall also be made available for the full United States assessment for other international organizations funded under this heading.”

**Peacekeeping Operations (PKO): $548 million**

The PKO account supports several non-UN regional peacekeeping operations and bilateral security initiatives, including an international observer force in the Sinai Peninsula that monitors security provisions of the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty. PKO also finances U.S. assessments for the UN Support Office in Somalia (UNSOS), which provides critical equipment and logistical support to the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). By working to help local forces defeat al-Shabaab, an al-Qaeda linked terrorist group that has carried out numerous attacks in Somalia and the wider region, both of these entities play an essential role in advancing U.S. counterterrorism objectives in East Africa. BWC’s FY’22 recommendation would allow the U.S. to fulfill its current financial obligations to UNSOS, as well as pay back an estimated $92.7 million in arrears accrued due to application of the aforementioned peacekeeping cap.