



United Nations Issues: U.S. Funding to the U.N. System

The United States is the single largest financial contributor to the United Nations (U.N.) system. Congress has long debated the appropriate level of U.S. contributions to U.N. system activities and whether U.S. funds are being used efficiently and effectively. Since 2017, the Trump Administration has proposed significant overall decreases in U.S. funding to the United Nations; however, Congress has generally funded U.N. entities at higher levels than the Administration has requested. Compared to FY2019 funding levels, the President's FY2020 budget proposed reducing U.N. peacekeeping funding by 27%, decreasing U.N. regular budget and specialized agency funding by 25%, and eliminating funding to some U.N. funds and programs.

U.N. System Funding

The U.N. system is made up of interconnected entities including specialized agencies, funds and programs, peacekeeping operations, and the U.N. organization itself. The U.N. Charter, ratified by the United States in 1945, requires each member state to contribute to the expenses of the organization. The system is financed by assessed and voluntary contributions from U.N. members. *Assessed contributions* are required dues, the payment of which is a legal obligation accepted by a country when it becomes a member. Such funding provides U.N. entities with a regular source of income to pay for staff and implement core programs. The U.N. regular budget, specialized agencies, and peacekeeping operations are financed mainly by assessed contributions. *Voluntary contributions* fund special funds, programs, and offices. The budgets for these entities may fluctuate annually depending on contribution levels.

U.N. regular budget and U.N. specialized agencies. The U.N. regular budget funds the core administrative costs of the organization, including the General Assembly, Security Council, Secretariat, International Court of Justice, special political missions, and human rights entities. The regular budget is adopted by the U.N. General Assembly to cover a two-year period. Since the late 1980s, most Assembly decisions related to the budget have been adopted by consensus. When budget votes occur (which is rare) decisions are made by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting, with each country having one vote. The approved regular budget for 2018-2019 is \$5.8 billion, or \$2.9 billion a year. The General Assembly negotiates a scale of assessments for the regular budget every three years based on a country's capacity to pay; assessments for the 2019-2021 time period were adopted in December 2018. The U.S. assessment is currently 22%, the highest of any U.N. member state. The U.S. rate is set by a ceiling that was agreed to in the General Assembly in 2000.

U.N. specialized agencies are autonomous in executive, legislative, and budgetary powers. Some agencies follow

the scale of assessment for the U.N. regular budget, while others use their own formulas to determine assessments.

U.N. peacekeeping funding. There are currently 14 U.N. peacekeeping missions worldwide with over 88,000 military, police, and civilian personnel. U.N. Security Council resolutions establishing new operations specify how each mission will be funded. In most cases, the council authorizes the General Assembly to create a separate special account for each operation funded by assessed contributions. The approved budget for the 2018/2019 peacekeeping fiscal year is \$7.02 billion. The Assembly adopts the peacekeeping scale of assessments every three years based on modifications of the regular budget scale, with the five permanent council members assessed at a higher level than for the regular budget. The current U.S. peacekeeping assessment (adopted in December 2018) is 27.89%.

U.S. Funding

Congress has generally authorized funding to the U.N. system as part of Foreign Relations Authorization Acts; appropriations are provided to the Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development to meet obligations. When authorization bills are not enacted, Congress has waived the authorization requirements and appropriated funds through accounts in annual Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPS) appropriations bills.

The Administration's FY2020 budget proposed significant decreases in funding to accounts supporting the United Nations (see **Table 1**). The *Contributions to International Organizations (CIO) account*, which funds assessed contributions to the U.N. regular budget, specialized agencies, and other international organizations, would be reduced by 25%, from \$1.36 billion in FY2019 to \$1.01 billion in FY2020. Of the FY2020 request, \$785.38 million is designated for U.N. entities. (FY2019 funding for U.N. entities is still being finalized.) The request prioritizes funding for organizations whose missions "substantially advance U.S. foreign policy interests" and reduces funding for those whose "results are unclear" and "work does not directly affect our [U.S.] national security interests."

The *Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account*, which funds U.S.-assessed contributions to most U.N. peacekeeping operations, would be reduced by 27%—from \$1.55 billion in FY2019 to \$1.13 billion in FY2020. The request states the Administration's "commitment to seek reduced costs by reevaluating the mandates, design, and implementation" of missions, and sharing the burden "more fairly" among U.N. members.

The *International Organizations and Programs (IO&P) account*, which received \$364 million in FY2019 (including \$319.7 million for U.N. entities), funds U.S. voluntary

contributions to many U.N. funds and programs, including UNICEF and UN Women. For FY2020, the Administration proposed eliminating the account; a similar proposal was included in the FY2018/FY2019 budget requests.

Table I. Selected U.S. Contributions, by Account
(Thousands of \$ U.S. Dollars)

	FY17 Act.	FY18 Act.	FY19 En.	FY20 Req.
CIO	1,359,206	1,467,408	1,360,270	1,013,693
<i>of which U.N.</i>	<i>1,056,431</i>	<i>1,089,985</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>785,386</i>
CIPA	1,907,564	1,382,080	1,551,000	1,136,000
PKO/UNSOS ^a	165,266	101,070	N/A	N/A
IO&P	339,000	339,000	364,000	0
<i>of which U.N.</i>	<i>295,275</i>	<i>296,275</i>	<i>319,750</i>	<i>0</i>

Sources: Annual, congressional budget justifications and SFOPS appropriations legislation and explanatory statements.

Note: N/A = not available.

- a. Administrations generally request U.N. Support Office in Somalia (UNSOS) funds through CIPA; however, Congress funds UNSOS through the Peacekeeping Operations account (PKO), which funds non-U.N. peacekeeping missions.

In addition to the aforementioned funding, the United States provides voluntary contributions to U.N. entities through other SFOPS accounts. For example, it contributed \$5.6 billion to U.N. humanitarian-related activities through *the global humanitarian accounts* in FY2017, including Migration and Refugee Assistance, International Disaster Assistance, and Food for Peace, Title II (P.L. 480). (Comprehensive FY2018 funding allocations are not yet available.) Congress generally appropriates overall funding to each of these accounts, while the executive branch determines how funds are allocated based on foreign policy priorities and humanitarian needs. Entities that received the bulk of this funding in FY2017 included the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (\$1.4 billion) and the World Food Program (\$2.6 billion). Voluntary U.N. funding is also provided through *accounts addressing health, security, and development*, such as Economic Support Fund and Global Health Programs. U.N. funding from these accounts in FY2017 totaled about \$1 billion, including \$239 million for the WHO, \$229 million for UNICEF, and \$94 million for the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Selected Policy Issues

U.N. regular budget scale of assessments. Over the years, U.S. policymakers have expressed concern that current regular budget assessments levels result in the United States providing the bulk of funding while having minimal influence on the budget process. Some have called for increased transparency in the process for determining the scale of assessments. On the other hand, some contend that the current assessment level is roughly equivalent to the U.S. share of world gross national income. They argue it reflects the U.S. commitment to the United Nations, affirms U.S. global leadership, leverages contributions from other countries, and helps the United States achieve its goals in U.N. fora.

Executive branch role. The executive branch has significant leeway to determine the use of funds for certain accounts without congressional consultation. Some policymakers are concerned that the Administration may not allocate funding to U.N. entities as Congress intended. Appearing to reference this issue, the explanatory statement to the FY2019 SFOPS bill included language that “assumes the payment of the full [U.S.] assessment at each respective organization” for CIO. It also stated that IO&P funds “shall be made available for core contributions for each entity.” This represents the first time such language was included in SFOPS explanatory statements. Some of these concerns stemmed from the Administration’s 2018 decisions to no longer fund the U.N. Relief Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) (funded through the global humanitarian accounts) and to withhold contributions to the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (funded through CIO). To further address this issue, some have suggested that Congress legislate annual funding levels for specific U.N. entities.

U.S. peacekeeping assessment cap. In 1995, due to concerns that the U.S. peacekeeping assessment level was too high (over 30%), Congress set a limit of 25% on the funds authorized after FY1995. Between FY2001 and FY2016, Congress enacted legislation to raise the cap temporarily so that U.S. contributions were closer to U.N. assessment levels. Congress did not enact a cap adjustment for FY2017 through FY2019, and it returned to 25%. As a result, that the United States accumulated \$521 million in cap-related arrears from FY20017 to FY2018.

Tracking U.S. funding. U.S. funding to the United Nations is complex and often difficult to track in a timely and accurate manner. Challenges include changes in U.S. assessment and exchange rates, U.N. budget adjustments, deferred U.S. payments, and differences between the U.S. and U.N. fiscal years. Consequently, U.S. payments are often behind and reported U.S. and U.N. funding levels may not match. Recognizing these issues, Congress has enacted U.N. funding reporting requirements, including the State Department’s annual *Contributions to International Organizations* report, which was expanded in FY2016.

U.S. funding and U.N. reform. Over the years, Congress has enacted legislation linking U.S. funding to specific U.N. reform benchmarks or U.N. activities. For example, since the 1980s the United States has withheld funding for activities related to the Palestinians. In addition, appropriations bills since FY2014 have linked U.S. funding to U.N. efforts to enhance whistleblower protection and audit transparency. Some Members have opposed such actions due to concerns that they may interfere with U.S. influence and ability to conduct diplomacy in U.N. fora. Others maintain that the United States should use its position as the largest financial contributor to push for reform, in some cases by withholding funding.

Luisa Blanchfield,

IFI0354

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.