Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2020 Budget and Appropriations

Updated February 11, 2020

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
R45763

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

SUMMARY

R45763

February 11, 2020

Cory R. Gill
Analyst in Foreign Affairs

Marian L. Lawson
Specialist in Foreign Assistance Policy

Emily M. Morgenstern
Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy

Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2020 Budget and Appropriations

Each year, Congress considers 12 distinct appropriations measures, including one for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPS), which includes funding for U.S. diplomatic activities, cultural exchanges, development and security assistance, and U.S. participation in multilateral organizations, among other international activities. On March 11, 2019, the Trump Administration submitted to Congress its SFOPS budget proposal for FY2020, which totaled $42.72 billion in discretionary funds ($42.88 billion when $158.9 million in mandatory retirement funds are included), reflecting adherence to discretionary funding caps, as determined by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA; P.L. 112-25).

The FY2020 request would have represented a 2.5% increase in SFOPS when compared to the FY2019 request but a 21% decrease in SFOPS funding when compared to the FY2019 enacted funding levels. Within these totals, Department of State and Related Agency funding would have been reduced by 15.7%, with the greatest cuts to the Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs (56%), International Organizations (26%), and the U.S. Agency for Global Media (22%) accounts. The Foreign Operations accounts would have seen a reduction of 23.5%, with the greatest cuts to the non-health development assistance (39%), humanitarian assistance (34%), and global health (28%) sectors.

On May 16, the House Appropriations Committee agreed to its SFOPS measure (H.R. 2839) that would have provided $56.54 billion in total spending ($56.39 in discretionary spending). The bill included either level or increased funding in nearly all accounts compared to FY2019. It did not include the President's proposal to consolidate spending into the proposed Economic Support and Development Fund (ESDF) and International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) accounts, and moved the Economic Support Fund (ESF) account from Title III (Bilateral Economic Assistance) into Title IV (International Security Assistance) to make clear the committee's desire to keep ESF distinct from the Development Assistance (DA) account. Finally, the bill would have provided funds to make operational the new U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (pursuant to the BUILD Act of 2018; P.L. 115-254). On June 19, 2019, the House passed the FY2020 SFOPS legislation in a "minibus" measure that included three other appropriations bills—Labor, Health and Human Services, Education; Defense; and Energy and Water Development (H.R. 2740). While the topline funding level remained the same, some monies were shifted among the various accounts due to adopted amendments.

On September 26, 2019, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved its SFOPS measure for FY2020, S. 2583, which would have provided $55.16 billion in total new funding ($54.377 billion net, after proposed rescission of $316 million of prior-year funds). Much like the House measure, the bill included level or increased funding for most accounts compared to FY2019 and did not include the President's proposals to consolidate spending into the ESDF and IHA accounts. However, unlike the House bill, the Senate committee measure kept ESF in Title III (Bilateral Economic Assistance), consistent with prior year appropriations.

FY2020 began with all appropriations bills unfinished. Congress and the President approved two continuing resolutions to fund federal agencies through November 21, 2019 (P.L. 116-59) and December 20, 2019 (P.L. 116-69), respectively, at the FY2019 funding level. On December 20, 2019, Congress passed, and the President later signed, two consolidated appropriations bills (P.L. 116-93 and P.L. 116-94). SFOPS funding was included as Division G of P.L. 116-94, Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020. The measure included $54.84 billion for SFOPS accounts in FY2020, a nearly 1% increase from the FY2019-enacted level and approximately 28%

more than the Administration's request. Of that enacted total, $8.0 billion, or approximately 15% was designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO).

This report provides an account-by-account comparison of the FY2020 SFOPS request, House and Senate SFOPS legislation, and the final FY2020 SFOPS appropriation to FY2019 funding in **Appendix A**. The International Affairs (function 150) budget in **Appendix B** provides a similar comparison.

This report will not be updated further unless there is renewed congressional activity on FY2020 appropriations.

Contents

Overview 1
Congressional Action 3
State Department Operations and Related Agency Highlights 4
Selected Key Programs and Priorities 6
Foreign Operations Highlights 10
Key Sectors 14
Country and Regional Aid Allocations 20

Figures

Figure 1. SFOPS funding, FY2009-FY2020 request 1
Figure 2. Requested and Enacted OCO SFOPS Funding, FY2012-FY2020 3
Figure 3. Humanitarian Assistance Budget Requests and Enacted Funding, by Account, FY2013-FY2020 16
Figure 4. Security Assistance by Account, FY2018–FY2020 18
Figure 5. Proportional Aid By Region, FY2018 and FY2020 request 21

Tables

Table 1. SFOPS Requests and Actual Funding, FY2012-FY2020 2
Table 2. Status of State-Foreign Operations Appropriations, FY2020 3
Table 3. State Department and Related Agency: Selected Accounts 5
Table 4. Diplomatic Security Annual Appropriations, FY2019-FY2020 Enacted 8
Table 5. U.S. Payments of Assessments to International Organizations and Peacekeeping Missions, FY2019-FY2020 Request 9
Table 6. Foreign Operations by Type, FY2018-FY2020 11
Table 7. Global Health Programs Funding by Subaccount, FY2018-FY2020 15
Table 8. Aid for Select Foreign Assistance Sectors, FY2019 vs. FY2020 19
Table 9. Top 10 Country Recipients of U.S. Aid, FY2018 & FY2020 Request 20

Table A-1. State Department, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2018 Actual, FY2019 Enacted, and FY2020 Request, Committee-Passed bills, and Enacted 22
Table B-1. International Affairs Budget FY2018 Actual, FY2019 Enacted, and FY2020 Request and Enacted 30

Appendixes

Appendix A. SFOPS Funding, by Account 22
Appendix B. International Affairs Budget 30

Appendix C. SFOPS Organization Chart 31

Contacts

Author Information..... 31

Overview

On March 11, 2019, the Trump Administration proposed its FY2020 budget for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPS) accounts, which fund U.S. diplomatic activities, cultural exchanges, development and security assistance, and U.S. participation in multilateral organizations, among other international activities. The SFOPS budget includes most international affairs (function 150) funding, as well as funding for international commissions in the function 300 budget. The request totaled $42.72 billion in discretionary funds ($42.88 billion when $158.9 million in mandatory retirement funds are included), which was 2.5% higher than the FY2019 request but 21% below the FY2019 enacted SFOPS funding level. It was lower than any SFOPS funding level in the last decade (**Figure 1**), and represented about 3% of the total discretionary budget authority (an estimated $1.313 trillion) requested for federal programs in FY2020.

Figure 1. SFOPS funding, FY2009-FY2020 request

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)



Source: Annual SFOPS Congressional Budget Justifications (CBJs); P.L. 116-6.

The Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94), signed into law on December 20, 2019, included $54.84 billion for SFOPS accounts in FY2020, a nearly 1% increase from the FY2019-enacted level and approximately 28% more than the Administration's request. Of that enacted total, $8.0 billion, or approximately 15% was designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO).

In SFOPS, there is often disparity between requested and enacted appropriations. During the Obama Administration, Congress typically provided less SFOPS funding than was requested, though the gap narrowed over time. Thus far in the Trump Administration, Congress has enacted significantly more SFOPS funding than the amount requested, both because the requested amounts have represented large cuts and because enacted funding levels have been high relative to most recent years (**Table 1**). The FY2020 budget request continued this pattern.

Table 1. SFOPS Requests and Actual Funding, FY2012-FY2020

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)

	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020
Request	61.35	56.41	51.96	55.01	54.83	60.21	40.21	41.66	42.72
Actual	54.37	51.91	50.89	54.39	54.52	59.78	56.25	56.26	54.84
Difference	-11.4%	-8.0%	-2.1%	-1.1%	-0.6%	-0.7%	+39.9%	+35.0%	+28.0%

Sources: Annual SFOPS CBJs; P.L. 116-6; P.L. 116-94.

Note: FY2019 and FY2020 actuals are the enacted appropriation.

The Budget Control Act and Overseas Contingency Operations

Since FY2012, the appropriations process has been shaped by the discretionary spending caps put in place by the Budget Control Act of FY2011 (BCA; P.L. 112-25). Congress has repeatedly amended the BCA to raise the caps, most recently by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (BBA 2019; P.L. 116-37). The BBA 2019 raised discretionary spending limits set by the BCA for FY2020 and FY2021, the final two years the caps are in effect.[1]

In addition to raising the caps, another way that Congress has managed the constraints imposed by the BCA budget caps is through the use of Overseas Contingency Operations funding, which is excluded from the BCA discretionary budget caps.[2] Congress began appropriating OCO in the SFOPS budget in FY2012, having previously provided OCO funds for the Department of Defense. Originally used to support shorter-term, temporary contingency-related programming in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan that was not part of the "base" or "core" budget, the use of OCO has expanded considerably over the years. In FY2019, OCO funds were used to support 11 different SFOPS accounts, from USAID operating expenses and the Office of Inspector General to International Disaster Assistance and Foreign Military Financing.

When Congress raised the BCA caps for FY2019, the Administration chose not to request OCO funding for FY2019 SFOPS. Congress nevertheless designated $8 billion of FY2019 SFOPS funding as OCO, a 33% reduction in OCO spending compared to FY2018 and the second year in a row that SFOPS OCO levels declined significantly.

While the FY2020 SFOPS request did not include OCO funding, the Administration's FY2020 defense budget request included an unprecedented amount of OCO funding, widely viewed as a means of increasing defense spending without amending the BCA's defense discretionary spending cap. Through BBA 2019, Congress established OCO funding targets for both defense and nondefense discretionary spending. For foreign affairs OCO, Congress designated $8 billion for FY2020 and FY2021, indicating its intent to continue to use OCO in SFOPS appropriation measures for the next two fiscal years. Congress adhered to that target, and remained consistent with FY2019 funding, in the final FY2020 SFOPS appropriation, providing $8 billion in OCO, representing nearly 15% of the total SFOPS funding (**Figure 2**).

[1] For more information on BBA 2019, see CRS Insight IN11148, *The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019: Changes to the BCA and Debt Limit*, by Grant A. Driessen and Megan S. Lynch.

[2] For more information on the use of OCO in the international affairs budget, see CRS In Focus IF10143, *Foreign Affairs Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Funding: Background and Current Status*, by Susan B. Epstein and Emily M. Morgenstern.

Figure 2. Requested and Enacted OCO SFOPS Funding, FY2012-FY2020

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)



Sources: Annual SFOPS CBJs; P.L. 116-6; P.L. 116-94.

Congressional Action

Table 2. Status of State-Foreign Operations Appropriations, FY2020

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)

	302(b) Allocations		Committee Action		Floor Action		Conference/Agreement		
Chamber	**House**	**Senate**	**House**	**Senate**	**House**	**Senate**	**House**	**Senate**	**Final**
Date	5/8/19	9/12/19	5/16/19	9/26/19	6/19/19		12/17/19	12/19/19	12/20/19
Total $	48.54	55.00	56.54	54.38	56.55		54.84	54.84	54.84

Sources: FY2020 House Appropriations Committee report on subcommittee allocations, available at https://docs.house.gov/meetings/AP/AP00/20190516/109499/HMKP-116-AP00-20190516-SD001.pdf, H.R. 2839, and H.R. 2740, P.L. 116-94.

Notes: The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended, includes a requirement that the House and Senate approve a budget resolution that becomes the basis for the allocation of funds to the Appropriations Committee that are then divided among the 12 subcommittees, as required by Section 302(b). Neither the House nor the Senate has passed a budget resolution for FY2020. However, in May 2019 the House provided interim sub-allocations for appropriations subcommittees. Committee-recommended total budget authority in the House was $48.54 billion (excludes OCO).

House SFOPS Legislation. On May 16, 2019, FY2020 SFOPS legislation (H.R. 2839, with accompanying report H.Rept. 116-78) was introduced and approved by the full House Appropriations Committee. The legislation included total SFOPS funding of $56.54 billion, 0.4% higher than FY2019 enacted funding and 32% more than requested. Of that total, $48.54 billion was base funding—the 302(b) allocation level approved by the House committee—and $8 billion was designated as OCO. On June 19, 2019, the House passed the FY2020 SFOPS legislation in a "minibus" measure that included three other appropriations bills—Labor, Health and Human Services, Education; Defense; and Energy and Water Development (H.R. 2740). While the topline

funding level remained the same, some monies were shifted among the various accounts due to adopted amendments.

Senate SFOPS Legislation. On September 26, 2019, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved an SFOPS measure for FY2020, S. 2583 (with accompanying report S.Rept. 116-126), that would have provided $55.16 billion in total new funding. This represented an increase of 0.1% from FY2019-enacted funding and a 27% increase from the requested level. Of that total, $47.16 was base funding and $8 billion was designated as OCO. The measure did not reach the Senate floor for consideration.

Continuing Resolutions. On September 26, 2019, the Senate approved H.R. 4378, the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020 (approved by the House on September 19th), which continued funding for most federal agencies and accounts at the FY2019 funding level through November 21, 2019. The legislation was signed by the President on September 27. On November 21, 2019, the Senate approved a second continuing resolution—H.R. 3055, the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2020, and Further Health Extenders Act of 2019 (approved by the House on November 19th). The legislation, which funded federal operations at the FY2019 funding level through December 20, 2019, was signed by the President on November 21, 2019.

Enacted Legislation. On December 20, 2019, the President signed into law P.L. 116-94, a full-year appropriation that included $54.84 billion in total SFOPS funding (Division G). This enacted level represented a nearly 1% increase from the FY2019-enacted funding level and was approximately 28% more than the Administration's FY2020 request. Of that total, $16.72 billion was for State Department and related agencies operations, and $38.70 billion was for foreign operations accounts. Nearly 15%, or $8.0 billion of the total SFOPS appropriation was designated as OCO.

State Department Operations and Related Agency Highlights

For FY2020, the Administration sought to cut funding for the Department of State and Related Agency appropriations accounts from the $16.46 billion Congress enacted for FY2019 to $13.87 billion, a 15.7% reduction. The Administration's FY2020 request exceeded its FY2019 request for these accounts, which totaled $13.26 billion, by around 4.6%. The Administration's priorities to be funded through Department of State and Related Agency accounts included

- sustaining the global diplomatic workforce and operations;
- protecting U.S. government personnel and overseas missions; and
- preserving strategic participation in international organizations to achieve outcomes favorable to the United States and its allies.[3]

Conversely, the House bill and the Senate committee bill both sought to increase funding for these accounts. The House bill would have raised funding to $17.35 billion, or 5.4% above the FY2019 funding level. The Senate committee bill, if enacted, would have boosted funding to $16.53 billion, or 0.4% more than the FY2019 funding level.

The FY2020 enacted appropriation (P.L. 116-94) provided $16.72 billion for the Department of State and Related Agency accounts, which is about 1.6% above the FY2019-enacted level. This

[3] Documents provided by the State Department at budget roll-out briefings, March 11, 2019.

funding level exceeded that of the Senate committee bill by 1.1% and was approximately 3.6% less than the amount included in the House bill.

Table 3 provides detailed information regarding the extent of the Administration's proposed cuts to these accounts, the House and Senate committee bill funding levels, and the appropriations provided in P.L. 116-94.

Table 3. State Department and Related Agency: Selected Accounts

(In billions of current U.S. dollars, includes enduring and OCO funds)

Account	FY2019 enacted	FY2020 request	*% change FY19 enacted to FY20 request*	FY2020 House	FY2020 Senate Committee	FY2020 enacted	*% change FY19 enacted to FY20 enacted*
Diplomatic Programs	9.17	8.42	*-8%*	9.25	8.89	9.13	*-0.5%*
Worldwide Security Protection	*4.10*	*3.78*	*-8%*	*4.10*	*3.78*	*4.10*	*0.0%*
Embassy Security, Construction & Maintenance	1.98	1.63	*-18%*	1.99	1.89	1.98	*0.0%*
Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs	0.70	0.31	*-56%*	0.73	0.74	0.73	*+4.2%*
International Organizations	2.91	2.15	*-26%*	3.65	3.05	3.00	*+3.1%*
U.S. Agency for Global Media (fmr. Broadcasting Board of Governors)	0.81	0.63	*-22%*	0.81	0.81	0.81	*+0.3%*
State and Related Agency Total (includes Function 300 funding and other commissions)	16.46	13.87	*-16%*	17.35	16.53	16.72	*+1.6%*

Sources: FY2019 and FY2020 SFOPS CBJs and FY2019 Addendum; P.L. 116-6; H.R. 2740; S. 2583 P.L. 116-94; CRS calculations.

Notes: Only selected accounts noted, total will not reflect the sum of the listed accounts. Percentage changes may not reflect numbers included in this table due to rounding.

a. Includes Contributions to International Organizations and Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities accounts, which largely comprise the assessed obligations (dues) to the many international organizations and peacekeeping efforts that the United States supports. Excludes voluntary contributions to multilateral organizations, which are usually provided through Title V of annual SFOPS appropriations laws.

Proposed New Account

The Worldwide Security Protection (WSP) sub-account within the Diplomatic Programs account has been used to fund programs that the State Department's Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS) and other bureaus implement to protect the department's staff, property, and information. As part of its FY2020 request, the Administration asked Congress to create a new WSP standalone account and authorize the transfer of all unobligated WSP funds into this account by no later than the onset of FY2021 (October 1, 2020). The Administration maintained that creating this account would increase the transparency of WSP expenditures through more clearly indicating distinctions between funding for diplomatic programs and security-related activities. For its FY2021 budget request, the State Department reportedly intends to request WSP funding in this new account. To date, no legislation has been introduced in Congress that would create a new WSP account.

Selected Key Programs and Priorities

As in previous years, the majority of both the funding the Administration requested and the budget authority Congress provided for the Department of State and Related Agency appropriations accounts was for diplomatic programs, diplomatic security and embassy construction, and contributions to international organizations and international peacekeeping activities. For FY2020, such programs accounted for approximately 88% of the Administration's request and 84% of the funds Congress appropriated for these accounts. Some of the Administration's priorities within these areas, as identified by the Department of State in its Congressional Budget Justification and other materials provided to Congress, are detailed below.

Diplomatic Programs

The Diplomatic Programs account is the State Department's principal operating appropriation and serves as the source of funding for several key functions. These include domestic and overseas State Department personnel salaries; the operations of the department's strategic and managerial units, such as the Office of the Secretary and the Bureaus of Administration, Budget and Planning, Information Resource Management, and Legislative Affairs; and foreign policy programs administered by the Bureaus of African Affairs, Conflict and Stabilization Operations, and others.

The Administration's FY2020 request for Diplomatic Programs totaled $8.42 billion, an 8% reduction from the $9.17 billion Congress enacted for this account in FY2019. The House bill and Senate committee bill would have appropriated $9.25 billion and $8.89 billion, respectively, for this account. P.L. 116-94, the FY2020-enacted appropriation, provided $9.13 billion for Diplomatic Programs, or 0.5% less than the FY2019 funding level and 8% more than the Administration's request.

The Administration maintained that its request was consistent with past congressional guidance regarding appropriate State Department on-board personnel volumes and would sustain the Foreign Service and Civil Service workforces at their end-of-2017 levels.[4] Both the House bill and Senate committee bill included oversight provisions pertaining to Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel levels.[5] The enacted legislation provided funding for not less than 12,870 permanent Civil Service staff and 13,031 permanent Foreign Service Officers, which the joint explanatory statement accompanying the law maintained was consistent with the State Department's current hiring targets and would restore State Department personnel to pre-hiring-freeze levels in place during FY2016.[6]

Among other priorities funded by the Diplomatic Programs account, the joint explanatory statement provided an additional $500,000 apiece to the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs for implementation of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F, Title XII, Division A of P.L. 114-328).[7] The Senate committee report accompanying its bill, which also sought to provide this increased

[4] Section 7073(b)(1) of P.L. 116-6 notes that funds made available by the law "are made available to support the agency-wide on-board Foreign Service and Civil Service staff levels of the Department of State and USAID at not less than the levels as of December 31, 2017."

[5] For example, see Section 7069 of H.R. 6385 and Section 7075 of S. 3108.

[6] See Section 7063(d) of P.L. 116-94 and U.S. Congress, *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, 116th Cong., 1st sess., Division G, p. 62.

[7] *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, Division G, p. 5.

funding, stated that it was necessary for the hiring of additional staff to strengthen implementation of the law.[8] The Senate committee report also expressed concern with what it characterized as the lack of information sharing between the Departments of State and the Treasury necessary for sanctioning foreign individuals for direct or indirect involvement in significant corruption or gross violations of human rights under this law. The committee report included a reporting requirement, which was made part of the enacted appropriations law, requiring the Secretary of State to submit a plan to Congress aimed at improving coordination with the Department of the Treasury on such efforts.[9]

Diplomatic Security

The Administration's FY2020 budget request sought to provide approximately $5.41 billion for the department's key diplomatic security accounts: $3.78 billion for the Worldwide Security Protection (WSP) allocation within the Diplomatic Programs account and $1.63 billion for the Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance (ESCM) account.[10] The WSP allocation supports the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS), which is responsible for implementing security programs to protect U.S. embassies and other overseas posts, diplomatic residences, and domestic State Department offices. The ESCM account supports the Bureau of Overseas Buildings Operations (OBO); provides the State Department's share of costs involved with the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of U.S. overseas posts around the world; and funds "brick and mortar" security measures at these posts.

As illustrated in **Table 4**, enactment of the Administration's request would have marked a decline of 8% for WSP and 18% for ESCM relative to the FY2019 enacted figures. Among the priorities the Administration sought to fund through its request were the construction of new embassy compounds in Qatar, Brazil, and Malawi and new U.S. consulates in Italy and Indonesia.[11] Proposed cuts included a $50 million reduction in DS operations in Iraq due to the suspension of operations at the U.S. Consulate General in Basrah.[12]

The enacted legislation, P.L. 116-94, appropriated $4.10 billion for WSP and $1.98 billion for ESCM, for a total of approximately $6.08 billion in diplomatic security funding. This funding totals around 12% more than the Administration's request, 7% more than the Senate committee bill would have provided, and 0.2% less than the appropriated funds included in the House bill. The aggregate appropriation for diplomatic security is nearly identical to that provided in FY2019. However, P.L. 116-94 appropriated around $7.4 million more for Worldwide Security Upgrades, a sub-item within ESCM that includes the State Department's share of the costs to

---

[8] See U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2020*, report to accompany S. 2583, 116th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 116-126 (Washington, DC: GPO, 2019), p. 27; additional funding for this purpose was also noted in the House committee report accompanying its bill, see U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2020*, report to accompany H.R. 2839, 116th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 116-78 (Washington, DC: GPO, 2019), p. 14.

[9] See Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2020*, p. 92 and Section 7019(e) of P.L. 116-94.

[10] U.S. Department of State, Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Year 2020, March 11, 2019, at https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/290302.pdf, p. 9.

[11] For a detailed project list, *Congressional Budget Justification, Appendix 1: Department of State Diplomatic Engagement, Fiscal Year 2020*, March 11, 2019, at https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/291298.pdf, p. 290.

[12] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Year 2020*, March 11, 2019, p. 14.

plan, design, and build new embassies and other facilities abroad, while providing an equivalent lesser amount for the operations and repair and construction programs funded through ESCM.

The enacted appropriations law also carried over notification requirements from previous years that Congress applies to conduct oversight of diplomatic construction projects abroad, including ongoing embassy construction projects in Lebanon, Indonesia, Mexico, and India.[13] With respect to the U.S. Consulate General in Basrah, the law requires that any change to the status of operations there is subject to consultation with and notification to Congress.[14]

Over the past several years, Congress provided no-year appropriations for both WSP and ESCM, thereby authorizing the State Department to indefinitely retain appropriated funds beyond the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. As a result, the department has carried over large balances of unexpired, unobligated WSP and ESCM funds each year that it is authorized to obligate for purposes including multiyear construction projects and unexpected security contingencies. For example, for FY2019, the State Department carried over more than $7.2 billion in previously appropriated funds for ESCM.[15] In this context, P.L. 116-94 included a rescission of $242.5 million in unobligated ESCM funds previously appropriated pursuant to the Security Assistance Appropriations Act, 2017 (division B of P.L. 114-254) for embassy construction projects in high-threat countries that were subsequently postponed indefinitely.[16]

Table 4. Diplomatic Security Annual Appropriations, FY2019-FY2020 Enacted

(In millions of current U.S. dollars, includes enduring and OCO funds)

	FY2019 enacted	FY2020 request	*% change FY19 enacted to FY20 request*	FY2020 House	FY2020 Senate Committee	FY2020 enacted	*% change FY19 enacted to FY20 enacted*
Worldwide Security Protection	4.10	3.78	*-8%*	4.10	3.78	4.10	*0.0%*
Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance	1.98	1.63	*-18%*	1.99	1.89	1.98	*0.0%*
Diplomatic Security (total)	**6.08**	**5.41**	***-11%***	**6.09**	**5.67**	**6.08**	***0.0%***

Sources: FY2019 and FY2020 SFOPS CBJs; P.L. 115-141; P.L. 116-6; H.R. 2740; S. 2583 P.L. 116-94; CRS calculations.

Notes: Percentage changes may not reflect numbers included in this table due to rounding. Annual appropriations data do not reflect available carryover funds.

Assessments to International Organizations and Peacekeeping Missions

Through the Contributions to International Organizations (CIO) account, the United States pays its assessed contributions (membership dues) to the United Nations (U.N.), the U.N. system of organizations (including, for example, the International Atomic Energy Agency), inter-American organizations such as the Organization of American States, and other international organizations.

[13] For more information, see House Committee on Appropriations, *State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2020*, p. 24, U.S. Congress, *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, 116th Cong., 1st sess., Division G, p. 37. See also Section 7004(c) of P.L. 116-94.

[14] See Section 7041(c)(2) of P.L. 116-94.

[15] The White House, Office of Management and Budget, *A Budget for a Better America*, Fiscal Year 2020, Appendix, p. 775

[16] *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, Division G, p. 63.

Additional funding is provided to international organizations through the various multilateral assistance accounts, as described in the Foreign Operations section of this report. Separately, the United States pays its assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping missions through the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Operations (CIPA) account. Recent funding levels for both accounts are detailed in **Table 5**.

Table 5. U.S. Payments of Assessments to International Organizations and Peacekeeping Missions, FY2019-FY2020 Request

(In millions of current U.S. dollars, includes enduring and OCO funds)

	FY2019 enacted	FY2020 request	*% change FY19 enacted to FY20 request*	FY2020 House	FY2020 Senate committee	FY2020 enacted	*% change FY19 enacted to FY20 enacted*
Contributions to International Organizations	1.36	1.01	*-26%*	1.52	1.47	1.47	*+8.3%*
Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities	1.55	1.14	*-26%*	2.13	1.58	1.53	*-1.6%*
Total	**2.91**	**2.15**	***-26%***	**3.65**	**3.05**	**3.00**	***+3.1%***

Sources: FY2019 and FY2020 SFOPS CBJs; P.L. 115-141; P.L. 116-6; H.R. 2740; S. 2583 P.L. 116-94; CRS calculations.

Notes: Percentage changes may not reflect numbers included in this table due to rounding.

The Administration's CIO account request noted that it prioritized funding for international organizations "whose missions substantially advance U.S. foreign policy interests" while cutting contributions to organizations whose work either does not directly affect U.S. national security interests or renders unclear results. While the request sought to fund the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the International Atomic Energy Agency near recent levels, it looked to cut funding for the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) by approximately 50% each. The Administration's request specifically noted that these cuts owed to "these entities' less direct linkages to U.S. national security and economic prosperity."[17]

With regard to CIPA, the Administration's request assumed that the State Department would make progress in efforts to negotiate reductions in the overall budgets of peacekeeping missions or the closure of certain missions altogether.[18] The U.S. assessment for U.N. peacekeeping (last negotiated in 2018) is 27.89%; however, Congress has capped the U.S. contribution at 25%.[19] If

[17] Congressional Budget Justification, *Appendix 1: Department of State Diplomatic Engagement*, Fiscal Year 2020, March 11, 2019, at https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/291298.pdf, p. 322.

[18] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Year 2020,* March 11, 2019, pp. 41-43.

[19] The 25% cap was enacted in the early 1990s due to concerns that the U.S. rate assessment for U.N. peacekeeping missions was too high. Over the years, the gap between the actual U.S. assessment and the enacted cap has led to peacekeeping funding shortfalls. The State Department and Congress often covered these shortfalls by raising the cap for limited periods and allowing for the application of U.N. peacekeeping credits (excess U.N. funds from previous peacekeeping missions) to U.S. outstanding balances. For several years, these actions enabled the United States to pay its assessments to U.N. peacekeeping missions in full. However, Congress has not elected to temporarily raise the cap since FY2016. In addition, the Trump Administration has since mid-2017 allowed for the application of peacekeeping

the Administration's request was enacted, it would have provided 58% of total U.S. assessed dues owed for FY2020.[20] The remainder of these dues would have been compounded into arrears. The State Department estimated that the United States accumulated about $725 million in peacekeeping arrears from FY2017 to FY2019 as a result of the U.S. cap.[21]

The FY2020 appropriations law provided a combined total of $3 billion for CIO and CIPA, which marked an increase of 40% relative to the Administration's request, and was 17% and 2% less, respectively, than the House and Senate committee funding levels. The joint explanatory statement explicitly provided that not less than $67.4 million of the CIO appropriation was for the FY2020 U.S. contribution to NATO, which totaled approximately 9% more than the U.S. contribution to the alliance in FY2018.[22] The joint explanatory statement further noted that no funds were included in the law to withdraw the United States from NATO.[23] Information provided to Congress by the Department of State indicates that the department intends to fund the WHO and FAO through this account near recent-year levels.[24]

With regard to CIPA, the joint explanatory statement maintained that sufficient funds were appropriated for the United States to continue providing contributions at the statutory level of 25% rather than the assessed rate of 27.89%.[25] Both the House and Senate committee reports made note of compounding U.S. peacekeeping arrears. The House committee report recommended applying a share of the FY2020 CIPA appropriation for the payment of arrears accumulated in FY2017 and FY2018—however, this may not be possible as the final FY2020 CIPA appropriation provided in P.L. 116-94 was around $600 million less than the level included in the House bill. The Senate committee report encouraged the State Department to alleviate the issue of compounding arrears through reviewing peacekeeping missions for potential cost savings while ensuring mission effectiveness.[26]

Foreign Operations Highlights

The foreign operations accounts in the SFOPS appropriation, together with the Food for Peace and McGovern-Dole food aid programs funded through the agriculture appropriation, comprise the foreign assistance component of the international affairs budget. The Administration's FY2020 foreign operations request totaled $29.01 billion, about 1.5% more than the Administration requested for these accounts for FY2019 and 23% less than Congress enacted for FY2019. Total foreign aid, including the food aid programs in the agriculture appropriation, would have been cut by 27%. The foreign aid request outlined four general priorities[27]

---

credits up to, but not beyond, the 25% cap.

[20] Documents provided by the State Department at budget roll-out briefings, March 11. 2019.

[21] In addition, the House committee bill would set the U.S. peacekeeping contribution rates at the full assessed rates for calendar years 2016, 2017, and 2018 for paying peacekeeping arrears. However, it would not raise the 25% cap for FY2020.

[22] *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, Division G, p. 11; Congressional Budget Justification, *Appendix 1: Department of State Diplomatic Engagement*, Fiscal Year 2020, March 11, 2019, at https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/291298.pdf, p. 323.

[23] *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, Division G, p. 11.

[24] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Year 2021*, February 10, 2020, p. 41.

[25] *Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying H.R. 1865*, Division G, p. 7.

[26] House Committee on Appropriations, *State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2020*, pp. 29-30.

[27] Documents provided by the State Department at budget roll-out briefings, March 11, 2019.

- Supporting U.S. friends and allies.
- Winning the great power competition.
- Promoting a "journey to self-reliance" for developing countries.
- Sharing the burden of international security and development with more partners.

Under the President's proposal, assistance levels would have been cut across all aid types and sectors. The House legislation, H.R. 2740, included $39.2 billion for foreign operations, a slight increase compared to FY2019, and about 34% more than the Administration requested. The Senate committee bill, S. 2583, included $38.95 billion for foreign operations accounts, almost level with the House recommendation. The final appropriation, P.L. 116-94, included $38.70 billion for foreign operations accounts, a 1.2% increase over FY2019 funding and 33% more than requested (**Table 6**).

Table 6. Foreign Operations by Type, FY2018-FY2020

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)

	FY2018 actual	FY2019 enacted	FY2020 request	% *change FY19 enacted to FY20 request*	FY2020 House, as passed	FY2020 Senate committee	FY2020 enacted	% change FY19 enacted to FY20 enacted
USAID Administration	1.62	1.67	1.55	-7%	1.69	1.68	1.66	-0.7%
Global Health Programs	8.72	8.84	6.34	-28%	9.30	9.12	9.09	+2.9%
Non-Health Development Assistance (includes Treasury TA, excl. indep. agencies)	8.09	7.87	5.38	-39%	5.36[a]	7.69	7.66	-2.7%
Humanitarian Assistance	7.65	7.82	6.33	-34%	7.97	7.82	7.83	+0.1%
Independent Agencies	1.37	1.37	1.20	-12%	1.39	1.39	1.39	+1.3%
Security Assistance	9.03	9.15	7.41	-19%	11.21[a]	9.11	9.01	-1.5%
Multilateral Assistance	1.83	1.86	1.52	-18%	2.34	2.07	2.08	+12.1%
Export Promotion	-0.08	-0.34	-0.73	115%	-0.06	0.08	-0.23	-93.2%
Foreign Operations, Total	38.22	38.24[b]	29.01	-24%	39.20	38.95	38.70	+1.2%

Sources: FY2019 and FY2020 SFOPS CBJs and FY2019 Addendum; P.L. 115-141; P.L. 116-6; H.R. 2740; S. 2583; P.L. 116-94; CRS calculations.

a. The House bill placed the Economic Support Fund ($2.18 billion) under the Security Assistance title for the first time rather than the bilateral development assistance title, where in prior years and in both the request and the Senate committee bill it is counted as Non-Health Development Assistance.

b. This does not reflect $320 million in rescinded prior-year funds included in the general provisions of the FY2019 appropriation. Does not include foreign assistance funded through the agriculture appropriation, including the Food for Peace and McGovern-Dole programs (see **Appendix B**).

Proposed Account Consolidations and Restructuring

In the FY2020 request, the Administration proposed to consolidate accounts in two areas:

- Most non-health development assistance accounts—Development Assistance; Economic Support Fund; Assistance to Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia; and the Democracy Fund—would have been combined into a single new Economic Support and Development Fund (ESDF). The Administration made a similar

request for both FY2018 and FY2019, but Congress did not enact the proposed account restructuring.

- For the first time, the Administration proposed to consolidate the four humanitarian assistance accounts—International Disaster Assistance (IDA), Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA), Food for Peace, Title II and Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance (ERMA)—into a single International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) account. Budget documents stated that the consolidated account would be managed by USAID under the policy authority of the State Department (see Humanitarian Assistance section below).

The Administration suggested that consolidation of these accounts would streamline management to allow more efficient deployment of resources.

The House passed legislation, H.R. 2740, did not adopt the account structure proposed by the Administration. However, it did move the Economic Support Fund account from Title III (bilateral economic assistance) of the bill to Title IV (security assistance), making comparisons of the two titles to the request or to prior appropriations potentially misleading. The committee report notes that ESF funds "are provided to advance United States interests by helping countries meet political and security needs," and may be provided in countries that also receive Development Assistance funds, seemingly clarifying the purpose for distinct accounts rather than a combined ESDF.[28]

The Senate committee bill did not adopt the account structure changes proposed by the Administration or the House bill. It did, however, add a "restructured debt" account line under the Treasury Programs heading, with $20 million in recommended funding, that was included in neither the Administration request nor the House bill.

P.L. 116-94, like the Senate bill, maintained the development and humanitarian assistance account structure used in the FY2019 legislation, but added a $15 million line item for debt restructuring under Treasury Programs.

Independent Agencies

Under the FY2020 request, funding for independent SFOPS agencies would have been reduced by 12% overall from FY2019 levels. Requested Peace Corps funding was $396.2 million (a 3.5% reduction from FY2019) and for the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), $800 million (an 11.6% reduction). As in the FY2019 budget request, the FY2020 request proposed elimination of two independent development agencies—the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) and the U.S. Africa Development Foundation (USADF)—and incorporation of their staff and small grant activities into USAID's Western Hemisphere and Africa bureaus, respectively. The request specified that funding was included for 40 staff positions to enable this transition, as well as $20 million in ESDF to support small grants.

H.R. 2740, as passed, would have maintained funding for the MCC and USADF at FY2019 levels while increasing funding for the Peace Corps (3.5% increase) and IAF (44%, with the increase to be used to support the Central America Strategy, the Caribbean Basin Strategy, and for programs in Colombia). The committee report made clear that the committee did not assume the proposed consolidation of IAF and USADF into USAID.

[28] Section 531 of the Foreign Assistance Act (22 U.S.C. §2346) defines ESF and authorizes the President to "furnish assistance to countries and organizations, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, in order to promote economic or political stability.... The Secretary of State shall be responsible for policy decisions and justifications for economic support programs under this chapter."

S. 2583, the committee-passed bill, would have provided overall funding for independent agencies at much the same level recommended by the House bill, but would have maintained Peace Corps and MCC funding at the FY2019 level. USADF funding would have increased by 10% and IAF by 67% compared to FY2019, with the committee specifying that the funds were not for close-out costs.

The enacted legislation adopted the Senate funding levels for all the independent agencies, a 1.3% increase, in total, over FY2019 funding.

Multilateral Assistance

The various multilateral assistance accounts, through which the United States contributes to multilateral development banks and international organizations that pool funding from multiple donors to finance development activities, would have been cut by about 18% from FY2019, to $1.52 billion, under the request. As in the FY2018 and FY2019 requests, the Administration included no funding in the FY2020 request for the International Organizations and Programs (IO&P) account, which funds U.S. voluntary contributions to international organizations, primarily United Nations entities such as UNICEF. Congress appropriated $339 million for IO&P in FY2019. The Administration also requested no funding for the Global Environment Facility (GEF), describing the FY2019 appropriation as sufficient to cover FY2019 and FY2020.

The House legislation, H.R. 2740, would have increased total funding for international organizations by nearly 26%, to $2.34 billion. This included a 91% increase compared to FY2019 for the IO&P account, with report language allocating funds for core contributions to specific agencies, including $147.5 million for UNICEF and $55.5 million for the U.N. Population Fund. The IO&P allocation also included $170.5 million for the U.N. Relief and Work Agency (UNRWA, which works in Palestinian territories) and report language specified that $226.6 million of multilateral assistance should support humanitarian and development efforts in the West Bank and Gaza. The bill also included $139.6 million for the GEF and $30 million for the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

The Senate committee bill, S. 2583, included $2.07 billion for multilateral aid accounts, an 11.5% increase over FY2019 funding. The increase was driven by a 12% IO&P funding increase and inclusion of $206.5 million in International Bank of Reconstruction and Development funding that was in the Administration request but not the House bill or the FY2019-enacted appropriation.

The enacted legislation included a total of $2.082 billion for multilateral assistance, a 12% increase over FY2019 funding. Within that total, IO&P funding was increased by 15% to $390.5 million, offset in part by the lack of a contribution to the African Development Bank ($32 million in FY2019). All other multilateral accounts were funded at the same level as FY2019.

Export Promotion Assistance/International Development Finance Corporation (IDFC)

Export promotion activities in FY2020, as in all recent years, are expected in total to return more to the Treasury through offsetting collections (such as fees and loan interest payments) of the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) than is appropriated for these programs.

In 2019, OPIC was dissolved and replaced by the new U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (DFC), which also incorporates USAID's Development Credit Authority (DCA). The request included increased administrative funding to support this transition ($98 million,

compared to $80 million for OPIC administration and $10 million for DCA administration in FY2019).[29] The FY2020 request also included $200 million in program funds to support DFC credit subsidies, technical assistance and feasibility studies. As in FY2018 and FY2019, the Administration's export promotion request called for the elimination of the U.S. Trade and Development Agency, seeking $12.1 million for an orderly shutdown. Congress appropriated $79.5 million for TDA in both FY2018 and FY2019.

H.R. 2740, as passed, did not include funding for OPIC, anticipating its termination under the BUILD Act, and instead provided funds for the DFC, including $164 million for the capital account (45% less than requested), to include $101 million for administrative expenses. It also set an $80 million limit on transfers to the DFC to support direct and guaranteed loans and included several reporting requirements for the new agency. The bill also included $75 million for TDA, a 5.7% cut from current year funding.

The Senate committee bill, S. 2583, would have funded the DFC through several specific budget allocations: $98 million for administrative expenses, $150 million for an equity fund, $50 million (by transfer from the Development Assistance account) for a program accounts, and $2 million for the Inspector General. Like the House bill, the Senate committee bill anticipated offsetting collections to exceed DFC appropriations in FY2020. S. 2583 also included $79.5 million for TDA.

P.L. 116-94 provided $299 million for a DFC corporate capital account (including $119 million for administrative expenses, $150 million for equity investments, and $30 million for other programs), $80 million for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans through a program account, and $2 million for the Inspector General. Like the House and Senate bills, the enacted legislation assumes that offsetting collections will make appropriations for the DFC unnecessary. The bill also included $79.5 million for TDA.

Key Sectors

As in previous years, the bulk of aid requested for FY2020 was for global health, humanitarian, and security assistance programs.

Global Health

The total request for the Global Health Programs (GHP) account for FY2020 was $6.34 billion, a 28% cut from the FY2019 enacted funding level. Global health sub-accounts would have been cut across the board under the request, with reductions ranging from 11% for malaria programs to nearly 55% for family planning and reproductive health programs (**Table 7**).

[29] For more on the DFC, listen to CRS podcast WPD00009, The BUILD Act and the New U.S. International Development Finance Corporation, by Marian L. Lawson and Shayerah Ilias Akhtar.

Table 7. Global Health Programs Funding by Subaccount, FY2018-FY2020

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)

	FY2018 actual	FY2019 enacted	FY2020 request	% change FY19 enacted to FY20 request	FY2020 House	FY2020 Senate committee	FY2020 enacted	% change FY19 enacted to FY20 enacted
HIV/AIDS	6,000.0	6,050.0	4,308.4	-28.8%	6,260.0	6,210.0	6,260.0	+3.5%
Malaria	755.0	755.0	674.0	-10.7%	755.0	789.0	770.0	+2.0%
Maternal and Child Health	829.5	835.0	619.6	-25.8%	850.0	847.0	851.0	+1.9%
Family Planning/Rep. Health	524.0	524.0	237.0	-54.8%	750.0	581.5	524.0	0.0%
Nutrition	125.0	145.0	78.5	-45.9%	145.0	150.0	150.0	+3.4%
Tuberculosis	261.0	302.0	261.0	-13.6%	310.0	310.0	310.0	+2.6%
Other	195.6	226.5	165.0	-27.2%	226.5	228.5	227.5	+0.4%
Total	8,690.0	8,837.5	6,343.5	-28.2%	9,296.5	9,116.0	9,092.5	+2.9%

Sources: FY2020 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-6; P.L. 115-141; P.L. 115-31; H.R. 2740; S. 2583; P.L. 116-94.

Notes: The HIV/AIDS subtotal includes amounts provided to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. "Other" includes vulnerable children, global health security, and neglected tropical diseases. Additional funds for global health programs are occasionally made available from other aid accounts, such as the Economic Support Fund. These are not included in this table.

HIV/AIDS program funding would have been cut by nearly 30% from FY2019 funding levels, though the Administration asserted that the requested funding would be sufficient to maintain treatment for all current recipients. The Administration proposed limiting U.S. Global Fund contributions to 25% of all donations, rather than the 33% that the United States has provided since the George W. Bush Administration.

The House legislation, H.R. 2740, included nearly $9.30 billion for GHP, which would have increased GHP funding by 5% over FY2019 levels and was 47% more than requested. Sub-sector allocations specified in the accompanying report would have maintained level funding or slight increases for most health subsectors compared to FY2019 levels, with the exception of family planning and reproductive health funding, which would have increased by 30%. The bill included $1.56 billion for the Global Fund, retaining the U.S. contribution limit at 33% of the total, and directed the Administration to fully obligate the funds for the first installment of the new replenishment round. In addition, the House committee bill included a provision that would have prohibited funds appropriated in the act, or prior SFOPS Acts, from being used to implement the Administration's expansion of the "Mexico City Policy," which prohibits all global health funding (expanded from family planning funding) to foreign NGOs engaged in voluntary abortion activities, even if such activities are conducted with non-U.S. funds.[30]

S. 2583 would have provided $9.12 billion for GHP in total, about 3% more than the FY2019 funding, with slight increases in all health subsectors compared to the FY2019 subsector allocations, as specified in the accompanying report. Compared to the House bill, the Senate committee bill included significantly less funding for family planning and reproductive health

[30] For more information on this policy, see CRS In Focus IF11013, *Protecting Life in Global Health Assistance Policy*, by Tiaji Salaam-Blyther and Sara M. Tharakan.

programs (-22%) and more for malaria programs (+4.5%). The bill would have provided $1.56 billion for the Global Fund, the same as the House bill.

The enacted appropriation included a total of $9.09 billion for GHP, 2.9% more than the FY2019 funding level and 43% more than the Administration's request. The increase over FY2019 funding was driven by modest increases across all global health subcategories, as detailed in the explanatory statement, with the exception of family planning and reproductive health, which was maintained at the FY2019 funding level. The biggest increases were to HIV/AIDS (+3.5%) and nutrition (+3.4%) activities. Like the House and Senate bills, the enacted appropriation allocated $1.56 billion for the Global Fund.

Humanitarian Assistance

The FY2020 budget request for humanitarian assistance was $5.97 billion, a 37% decrease from the FY2019 appropriation (including funds for Food for Peace in the Agriculture appropriation). The request continued a long-standing trend of humanitarian budget requests being significantly smaller than prior-year enacted funding levels, at times reflecting the fact that humanitarian assistance funds may be carried over from year to year and unobligated balances from prior years may still be available (**Figure 3**).

Figure 3. Humanitarian Assistance Budget Requests and Enacted Funding, by Account, FY2013-FY2020

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)



Sources: Annual SFOPS CBJs; H.R. 2740; S. 2583; S. 2522; P.L. 116-94.

Notes: FY2020 House funding is as reported by committee. IHA = International Humanitarian Assistance, FFP = Food for Peace, IDA = International Disaster Assistance, ERMA = Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance, MRA = Migration and Refugee Assistance. In contrast with **Table 6**, this chart includes FFP funds, part of the agriculture appropriation, not foreign operations, to show the full scope of humanitarian assistance.

The Administration's budget justification asserted that "when combined with all available resources, average funding available for 2019 and 2020 roughly matches the highest-ever level of U.S. overseas humanitarian programming, and is sufficient to address needs for Syria, Yemen, and other crisis areas."[31]

[31] FY2020 State Department, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Congressional Budget Justification, p. 77.

For FY2020, as noted earlier, the budget proposed to fund all humanitarian assistance through a new, single global International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) account. IHA would have been managed by the newly consolidated Humanitarian Assistance Bureau at USAID, but with a "senior dual-hat leader" under the policy authority of the Secretary of State reporting to both the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator. The proposal would have effectively moved the administration of refugee and migration assistance funding from State to USAID. The State Department would have retained approximately 10% of MRA funding to support refugee diplomacy and administrative expenses, costs associated with resettlement of refugees in the United States, and support for refugee resettlement in Israel.

Within USAID, the proposal would also have eliminated the Food for Peace Act, Title II funding currently appropriated through the agriculture appropriation but administered by USAID. The Administration previously proposed this in FY2018 and FY2019, citing inefficiency and the ability to provide food assistance through other accounts. Under the proposed plan, emergency food assistance would also have been funded through the IHA account.

H.R. 2740, as passed, would have provided $7.97 billion in foreign operations humanitarian assistance, a 2% increase over FY2019 funding and about 26% more than requested.[32] Funding was provided through the traditional accounts (IDA, MRA and ERMA) rather than the proposed IHA account. An additional $1.85 billion was included in the Senate committee-passed agriculture appropriation, H.R. 3164, for Feed for Peace.

S. 2583 included $7.82 billion for foreign operations through the traditional account structure. The Senate committee-passed agriculture appropriation, S. 2522, included $1.716 billion for Food for Peace, for a humanitarian aid total of $9.53 billion, almost level with FY2019-enacted funding.

The enacted legislation maintained both the account structure and funding levels for humanitarian assistance. P.L.116-94 included a total of $9.55 billion for humanitarian assistance in the SFOPS and Agriculture divisions, a 0.2% increase over FY2019 funding, with slight increases to the IDA and Food for Peace accounts.

Security Assistance

The FY2020 request for military and security assistance was $7.415 billion, a 19% cut from FY2019 enacted levels. Reductions were proposed for every account (**Figure 4**). As is typical, the bulk of security assistance requested by the Administration (67%) would have been Foreign Military Financing (FMF) aid to Israel ($3.3 billion), Egypt ($1.3 billion), and Jordan ($350 million). As in FY2018 and FY2019, the Administration's FY2020 request sought authority to provide FMF assistance through a combination of grants and loans, including loan guarantees, rather than the current use of FMF on an almost exclusive grant basis. The Administration asserted that loan authority would enable partners to purchase more U.S.-made defense equipment and promote burden sharing in security cooperation activities.

FY2020 International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) funding would have decreased by 37%, with a notable increase requested for Colombia ($209 million from $143

[32] Total humanitarian assistance in the International Affairs budget includes these foreign operations accounts as well as Food for Peace Title II funding in the Agriculture appropriation. The Trump Administration has requested no funding for Food for Peace in any of its budget requests, but Congress has continued to appropriate funding for the program, making the disparity between the Administration and Congress on total humanitarian funding even greater than that seen in the foreign operations accounts.

million in FY2018) and decrease for Afghanistan ($95 million, down from $160 million in FY2018).

The House legislation, H.R. 2740, included $11.21 billion for security assistance, an almost 23% increase over the FY2019 funding level and a more than 50% increase over the Administration request. The difference was almost entirely due to the House bill including the Economic Support Fund account under security assistance rather than bilateral economic assistance. Excluding ESF funds, security assistance in the bill would have been reduced about 1% from FY2019 funding.

The Senate committee bill, S. 2483, included the traditional accounts under the security assistance heading and provided a total of $9.11 billion, on par with FY2019 funding. However, within that total INCLE funding would have decreased by 9% and NADR funding would have increased by 11% compared to FY2019.

P.L. 116-96 provided $9.014 billion in security assistance accounts, a reduction of about 1.5% from FY2019 funding, keeping the FY2019 account structure. Funding was reduced from the FY2019 level for the INCLE, PKO and FMF accounts (-7.1%, -6.4%, and -0.6%, respectively), while NADR and IMET funding increased (+3.6% and +1.9%, respectively).

Figure 4. Security Assistance by Account, FY2018–FY2020

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)



Source: FY2020 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-6; H.R. 2740; S. 2483; P.L. 116-94.

Note: FY2020 House and Senate amounts are as passed by the House and reported by Senate committee, respectively.

Other Foreign Assistance Sectors

In addition to proposed cuts to global health and humanitarian assistance, the FY2020 budget request would have reduced funding from the previous year's enacted levels for almost all development sectors. Programs to counter trafficking in persons would have been cut the least, 25%, while activities related to environmental protection, microenterprise, water and sanitation, and education would have been cut by more than 60%. Democracy promotion and food security funding would have been reduced by about half. One exception to the proposed sector cuts was gender equality funding, which would have increased by about 80%, driven by the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative (WGDP), rolled out by Ivanka Trump in February 2019, for which the budget request included $100 million (**Table 8**).

Table 8. Aid for Select Foreign Assistance Sectors, FY2019 vs. FY2020

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)

Foreign Assistance Sector	FY2019 Enacted	FY2020 Request	% change, FY2019 enacted-FY2020 Req.	FY2020 House, as passed	FY2020 Senate committee	FY2020 Enacted	% change, FY2019 enacted-FY2020 Enacted
Democracy Programs (excl. NED)	2,400.0	1,212.3	-49.5%	2,400.0	2,819.0	2,400.0	0.0%
Education (basic and higher)	1,035.0	406.7	-60.7%	1,160.0	750.0	1,110.0	+7.2%
Food Security	1,000.6	492.0	-50.8%	1,005.6	1,000.6	1,005.6	+0.5%
Environment	500.7	113.9	-77.3%	886.7	949.6	906.66	+81.1%
Economic Growth	n.a.	1,930.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Water and Sanitation	435.0	164.7	-62.1%	435.0	450.0	450.0	+3.4%
Gender Equality	215.0	388.5	+80.7%	230.0	161.0	330.0	+53.5%
Trafficking in Persons	67.0	50.2	-25.1%	67.0	67.0	67.0	0.0%
Micro and Small Enterprise	265.0	71.1	-73.2%	265.0	265.0	265.0	0.0%

Sources: P.L. 116-6, Division F; FY2020 SFOPS CBJ; H.R. 2740; S. 2483; P.L. 116-94

Notes: Categories in the enacted legislation and the budget request may not be precisely comparable. Enacted categories are from the sector allocations and gender equity sections of the legislation; request categories are those listed under cross-cutting sectors in the ESDF portion of the CBJ. n.a. = not applicable. While most sector allocations are written in legislation as "no less than," funding for the WGDP, counted under the Gender Equality total, is written as "up to."

The House legislation, H.R. 2740, recommended development sector allocations similar to those enacted for FY2019, with the exception of environment programs, for which the allocation would have increased by 77%. In addition to the funding allocation, the environmental programs section also specified that funding may be used to support the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (Paris Agreement) and that none of the funds in the act, or in prior SFOPS appropriations acts, may be used to withdraw from the Paris Agreement. The report accompanying the legislation (H.Rept. 116-78) called for the USAID Administrator to provide a detailed implementation plan of the WGDP to Congress, including focus countries and planned metrics, within 90 days of enactment.

Sector allocations in the Senate committee bill, S. 2483, would have increased funding for democracy and environment programs relative to the FY2019 funding (+17% and +90%) and the House bill (+17% and +7%, respectively), while providing fewer funds for education and gender equality programs than both the FY2019 legislation (-28% and -25%) and the House bill (-30% and -35%). Senate committee allocation in all sectors, with the exception of gender equality (-59%), would have been higher than the Administration requested for FY2020.

P.L. 116-94 included sector allocations more similar to the FY2019 legislation than to the Administration's request. As in the House and Senate bills, the enacted legislation significantly increased environment sector funding compared to FY2019 (+81%). Funding for education (+7.2%), water and sanitation (+3.4%) and gender equality (+53.5%) also increased compared to FY2019, though the gender equality funding total included "up to" $100 million for the WGDP, creating potential for a significantly lower allocation.

Country and Regional Aid Allocations

Top aid recipients under the request, consistent with recent years, would have been allies in the Near East who receive the bulk of military aid, including Israel and Egypt; strategically significant development partners such as Jordan and Afghanistan; and several global health focus countries in Africa (**Table 9**). Notable reductions in aid were proposed for South Africa (-171%) and West Bank/Gaza (-43%).

Table 9. Top 10 Country Recipients of U.S. Aid, FY2018 & FY2020 Request

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)

FY2018 Actual		FY2020 Request	
1. Israel	$3,100.0	1. Israel	$3,300.0
2. Jordan	$1,525.0	2. Egypt	$1,400.0
3. Egypt	$1,419.3	3. Jordan	$1,300.0
4. Afghanistan	$697.4	4. Afghanistan	$532.8
5. Kenya	$663.5	5. Nigeria	$431.8
6. South Africa	$586.6	6. Uganda	$415.5
7. Nigeria	$580.2	7. Mozambique	$403.5
8. Tanzania	$557.6	8. Kenya	$383.8
9. Uganda	$537.0	9. Zambia	$364.9
10. Mozambique	$494.9	10. Tanzania	$348.4

Source: FY2020 SFOPS CBJ; material provided by the State Department at FY2020 budget roll-out briefings.

The Near East and Africa would have continued to be the top regional aid recipients under the request, together comprising more than 75% of aid allocated by country or region (**Figure 5**).The FY2020 request emphasized large increases for the Indo-Pacific and Europe and Eurasia regions relative to the FY2019 request, as part of the emphasis on countering Chinese and Russian influence. However, the requested funding for East Asia and the Pacific was 14% less, and the South and Central Asia request almost 17% less, than the FY2018 allocations for those regions (FY2019 country and regional allocations are not yet available). Aid to Europe and Eurasia would have been reduced by 54%, aid to the Western Hemisphere by 30%, and aid to sub-Saharan Africa by 35%. The MENA region would have seen the smallest proportionate cuts under the request, about 8%, and increased its share of regionally allocated aid from 36% to 44%.

Figure 5. Proportional Aid By Region, FY2018 and FY2020 request

(in millions of current U.S. dollars)



Source: FY2020 SFOPS CBJ.

These country and regional allocations did not include the nearly $6 billion requested for humanitarian assistance. Humanitarian assistance is not requested by country and could significantly change country and regional aid totals once allocated. In addition, the FY2020 budget request sought authority to transfer $500 million in aid from unspecified accounts as necessary to meet needs related to the crisis in Venezuela.

The House legislation and report, H.R. 2740/H.Rept. 116-78, did not provide comprehensive country and regional allocations, but did specify aid levels for several countries and regions, including $3.305 billion for Israel, $1.403 billion for Egypt, $1.525 billion for Jordan, $457 million for Colombia, $160 million to support the Indo-Pacific Strategy, $541 million designated for Central America as a region, and $280 million for the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

S. 2583/S. 126 also did not provide comprehensive allocations by country, but did specify many such aid levels, including $3.305 billion for Israel, $1.432 billion for Egypt, $1.650 billion for Jordan, $448 million for Ukraine, $403 million for Colombia, $322 million for Afghanistan, and $453.6 million for Iraq. The bill and report also included a total of $515 million for Central America as a region, $285 million for the Countering Russian Influence Fund, $375 million for a new Countering Chinese Influence Fund, and $200 million for the Relief and Recovery Fund to assist areas formerly controlled by ISIS.

P.L. 116-94 and the accompanying explanatory statement include detailed funding directives for many countries and regional programs. Among the largest allocations are $3.305 billion for Israel, $1.525 billion for Jordan, $1.432 billion for Egypt, $448 million each for Ukraine and Colombia, and $452 million for Iraq. Major allocations for regional activities include $1.482 billion to support the Indo-Pacific Strategy and the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (P.L.115-409), $300 million for the Countering Chinese Influence Fund, $520 million for Central America (and a directive that funds appropriated for Central America in FY2019 be made available), and $290 million to carry out the purposes of the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

Appendix A. SFOPS Funding, by Account

Table A-1. State Department, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2018 Actual, FY2019 Enacted, and FY2020 Request, Committee-Passed bills, and Enacted

(In millions of current U.S. dollars; numbers in parentheses are the portion of the account totals designated as OCO)

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
Title I. State, Broadcasting & Related Agencies, TOTAL	**16,219.41 (4,179.55)**	**16,456.68 (4,365.77)**	**13,868.78 (0.00)**	**-15.73%**	**17,354.25 (4,190.01)**	**16,525.33 (4,432.47)**	**16,724.18 (4,190.01)**	**+1.6%**
Administration of Foreign Affairs, Subtotal	12,268.81 (3,115.85)	12,328.53 (3,280.87)	10,872.46	-11.81%	12,486.60 (3,105.11)	12,043.83 (3,347.57)	12,355.96 (3,105.11)	+0.2%
Diplomatic Programs	8,820.09 (2,975.97)	9,173.92 (3,225.97)	8,420.23	-8.22%	9,245.27 (2,626.12)	8,894.79 (2,626.12)	9,125.69 (2,626.12)	-0.5%
(of which Worldwide Security Protection)	[3,756.87] (2,376.12)	[4,095.90] (2,626.12)	[3,779.82]	[-7.72%]	[4,095.90] (2,626.12)	[3,779.82] (2,626.12)	[4,095.90] (2,626.12)	0.0%
Capital Investment Fund	103.40	92.77	140.00	50.91%	139.50	139.50	139.50	+50.4%
Embassy Security, Construction & Maintenance	2,314.47 (71.78)	1,975.45	1,632.63	-17.35%	1,987.21 (424.09)	1,889.22 (666.55)	1,975.45 (424.09)	0.0%
(of which Worldwide Security Upgrades)	[1,549.02] (71.78)	[1,198.25]	[916.66]	[-23.50%]	[1,205.65] (424.09)	[1,121.79] (666.55)		
Ed. & Cultural Exchanges	646.14	700.95	309.63	-55.83%	730.00	735.70	730.70	+4.2%
Office of Inspector General	145.73 (68.1)	145.73 (54.90)	141.73	-2.74%	145.73 (54.90)	145.73 (54.90)	145.73 (54.9)	0.0%

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
Representation Expenses	8.03	8.03	7.21	-10.21%	7.21	7.21	7.21	-10.2%
Protection of Foreign Missions & Officials	30.89	30.89	25.89	-16.19%	30.89	30.89	30.89	0.0%
Emergency-Diplomatic & Consular Services	7.89	7.89	7.89	—	7.89	7.89	7.89	0.0%
Repatriation Loans	1.30	1.30	1.30	—	1.30	1.30	1.30	0.0%
Payment American Institute Taiwan	31.96	31.96	26.31	-17.68%	31.96	31.96	31.96	0.0%
International Chancery Center	0.74	0.74	0.74	—	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.0%
Foreign Service Retirement (mandatory)	158.90	158.90	158.90	—	158.90	158.90	158.9	0.0%
International Orgs, Subtotal	2,849.39 (1,063.70)	2,911.27 (1,084.90)	2,149.69	-26.16%	3,648.70 (1,084.90)	3,050.57 (1,084.90)	3,000.19 (1,084.90)	+3.1%
Contributions to Int'l Orgs	1,467.41 (96.24)	1,360.27 (96.24)	1,013.69	-25.48%	1,520.29 (96.24)	1,473.81 (96.24)	1,473.81 (96.24)	+8.3%
Contributions, International Peacekeeping	1,381.98 (967.46)	1,551.00 (988.66)	1,136.00	-26.76%	2,128.41 (988.66)	1,576.76 (988.66)	1,526.38 (988.66)	-1.6%
International Commission subtotal (Function 300)	137.15	141.44	118.41	-16.28%	141.86	164.38	162.80	+15.1%
Int'l Boundary/U.S.-Mexico	77.53	77.53	74.21	-4.28%	77.57	93.17	85.07	+9.7%
American Sections	13.26	13.26	9.75	-26.47%	12.73	15.01	15.01	+13.2%
International Fisheries	46.36	50.65	34.45	-31.98%	51.56	56.20	62.72	+23.8%

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
International Broadcast, Subtotal	807.69	807.90	628.08	-22.26%	808.40	811.73	810.40	+0.3%
Broadcasting Operations	797.99	798.20	623.53	-21.88%	798.70	800.03	798.70	+0.1%
Capital Improvements	9.70	9.70	4.55	-53.09%	9.70	11.70	11.70	+20.6%
Related Approps, Subtotal	241.95	252.78	86.92	-65.61%	254.97	441.34	381.34	+50.9%
Asia Foundation	17.00	17.00	—	-100.00%	19.00	19.00	19.00	+11.8%
U.S. Institute of Peace	37.88	38.63	19.00	-50.82%	38.63	45.00	45.00	+16.5%
Center for Middle East-West Dialogue-Trust & Program	0.14	0.19	0.25	31.58%	0.25	0.25	0.25	+32.4%
Eisenhower Exchange Programs	0.16	0.19	0.27	42.11%	0.27	0.27	0.27	+42.1%
Israeli Arab Scholarship Program	0.07	0.07	0.12	71.43%	0.12	0.12	0.12	+82.4%
East-West Center	16.70	16.70	—	-100.00%	16.70	16.70	16.70	0.0%
National Endowment for Democracy	170.00	180.00	67.28	-62.62%	180.00	360.00	300.00	+66.7%
Other Commissions, Subtotal	13.26	14.76	13.22	-10.43%	13.72	13.50	13.50	-8.5%
Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad	0.68	0.68	0.64	-5.88%	0.64	0.68	0.68	0.0%
International Religious Freedom	4.50	4.50	4.50	—	4.50	4.50	4.50	0.0%
Security & Cooperation in Europe	2.58	2.58	2.58	—	2.58	2.58	2.58	0.0%

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
Congressional-Exec Commission on People's Republic of China	2.00	2.00	2.00	—	2.00	2.25	2.25	+12.5%
U.S.-China Economic and Security Review	3.50	3.50	3.50	—	3.50	3.50	3.50	0.0%
Western Hemisphere Drug Policy Commission	—	1.50	—	100%	0.50	0.00	0.00	-100.0%
FOREIGN OPERATION, TOTAL	**38,219.82 (7,838.46)**	**38,239.85 (3,935.43)**	**29,013.73 (0.00)**	**-23.49%**	**39,197.41 (3,810.00)**	**38,950.06 (3,850.00)**	**38,698.46 (4,092.46)**	**+1.2%**
Title II. Admin of Foreign Assistance	1,620.08 (160.57)	1,674.48 (158.07)	1,545.00	-7.73%	1,690.56	1,680.40	1,663.05	-0.7%
USAID Operating Expenses	1,347.68 (158.07)	1,372.88 (158.07)	1,275.20	-7.11%	1,404.76	1,377.25	1,377.25	0.3%
USAID Capital Investment Fund	197.10	225.00	198.30	-11.87%	210.30	227.65	210.30	-6.5%
USAID Inspector General	75.30 (2.50)	76.60	71.50	-6.66%	75.50	75.50	75.50	-1.4%
Title III. Bilateral Economic Assistance	25,831.04 (6,254.14)	25,891.20 (3,222.78)	19,257.08	-25.62%	24,018.26 (3,134.10)	26,012.49 (3,174.10)	25,961.99 (3,255.335)	0.3%
Global Health Programs (GHP), State + USAID	8,722.50	8,837.45	6,343.48	-28.22%	9,296.50	9,116.00	9,092.45	2.9%
GHP (USAID)	[3,052.50]	[3,117.45]	[2,035.12]	-34.73%	[3,366.50]	[3,236.00]	[3,162.45]	+1.4%
GHP (State Dept.)	[5,670.00]	[5,720.00]	[4,308.37]	-24.68%	[5.930.00]	[5,880.00]	[5,930.00]	+3.7%
Development Assistance	3,000.00	3,000.00	—	n.a.	4,164.87	3,000.00	3,400	13.3%

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
International Disaster Assistance (IDA)	4,285.31 (1,588.78)	4,385.31 (584.28)	—	n.a.	4,435.31 (1,733.98)	4,385.31 (601.64)	4,395.36 (1,733.98)	+0.2%
Transition Initiatives	92.04 (62.04)	92.04 (62.04)	112.04	21.73%	92.04	92.04	92.04	0.0%
Complex Crises Fund	30.00 (20.00)	30.00	—	n.a.	30.00	30.00	30.00	0.0%
Development Credit Authority—Admin	10.00	10.00	—	n.a.	—	0.00	0.00	-100.0%
Development Credit Authority Subsidy	[55.00]	[55.00]	—	n.a.	—	0.00	0.00	n.a.
Economic Support Fund	3,960.85 (2,152.12)	3,717.86 (1,172.34)	—	n.a.	—	3,477.00 (1,172.34)	3,045.00	-18.1%
Economic Support and Development Fund	—	—	5,234.20	n.a.	—	0.00	0.00	n.a.
Democracy Fund	215.50	227.20	—	n.a.	273.70	273.70	273.70	+20.5%
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia	750.33	760.33	—	n.a.	770.33	770.33	770.33	1.3%
Migration & Refugee Assistance	3,366.00 (2,431.20)	3,432.00 (1,404.12)	365.06	-89.36%	3,532.00 (1,400.12)	3,432.00 (1,400.12)	3,432.00 (1,521.36)	0.0%
International Humanitarian Assistance	—	—	5,968.00	n.a.	—	0.00	0.00	n.a.
Emergency Refugee and Migration	1.00	1.00	—	n.a.	1.00	0.10	0.10	-90.0%
Independent Agencies subtotal	1,367.50	1,368.00	1,204.31	-11.97%	1,392.50	1,385.00	1,386.00	+1.3%

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
Peace Corps	410.00	410.50	396.20	-3.48%	425.00	410.50	410.50	0.0%
Millennium Challenge Corporation	905.00	905.00	800.00	-11.60%	905.00	905.00	905.00	0.0%
Inter-American Foundation	22.50	22.50	3.48	-84.53%	32.50	37.50	37.50	+66.7%
African Development Foundation	30.00	30.00	4.62	-84.60%	30.00	33.00	33.00	+10.0%
Department of the Treasury, subtotal	30.00	30.00	30.00	0.00%	30.00	50.00	45.00	+50.0%
Department of the Treasury Technical Assistance	30.00	30.00	30.00	0.00%	30.00	30.00	30.00	0.0%
Debt Restructuring	—	—	—	n.a.	—	20.00	15.00	n.a.
Title IV. Int'l Security Assistance	9,025.26 (1,423.74)	9,153.08 (554.59)	7414.84	-18.99%	11,212.62 (675.89)	9,111.18 (675.89)	9,013.95 (837.12)	-1.5%
Economic Support Fund	—	—	—	—	2,178.73	—		
International Narcotics Control & Law Enforcement	1,368.80 (417.95)	1,497.47	945.35	-36.87%	1,410.67	1,362.29	1,391.00	-7.1%
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining	876.05 (220.58)	864.55	707.15	-18.21%	886.85	960.40	895.75	+3.6%
Peacekeeping Operations	537.93 (325.21)	488.67 (325.21)	291.44	-40.36%	516.35 (325.21)	471.40 (325.21)	457.35 (325.21)	-6.4%
International Military Education & Training	110.88	110.78	100.00	-9.73%	110.88	114.98	112.93	+1.9%

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
Foreign Military Financing	6,131.61 (460.00)	6,191.61 (229.37)	5,370.90	-13.26%	6,109.12 (350.68)	6,202.11 (350.68)	6,156.92 (511.91)	-0.6%
Title V. Multilateral Assistance	1,825.20	1,856.70	1,522.21	-18.02%	2,338.28	2,069.78	2,082.28	12.1%
International Organizations & Programs	307.50	339.00	—	n.a.	646.50	378.00	390.5	15.2%
Int. Bank for Reconstruction and Dev.	—	—	206.5	n.a.	—	206.50	206.50	n.a.
World Bank: Global Environment Facility	139.58	139.58	—	n.a.	139.58	139.58	139.58	0.0%
World Bank: Int'l. Development Association	1,097.01	1,097.01	1,097.01	—	1,097.01	1,097.01	1097.01	0.0%
Asian Development Fund	47.40	47.40	47.40	—	47.40	47.40	47.40	0.0%
African Development Bank - capital	32.42	32.42	—	n.a.	—	—	0.00	-100.0%
African Development Fund	171.30	171.30	171.30	0.00	171.30	171.30	171.30	0.0%
International Fund for Agricultural Development	30.00	30.00	—	n.a.	30.00	30.00	30.00	0.0%
Title VI. Export Assistance	-81.75	-335.6	-725.39	116.15%	-62.30	76.20	-22.80	-93.2%
Export-Import Bank (net)	-139.00	74.55	-612.5	516.82%	65.70	65.70	-34.30	-65.5%
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-250.80	-235.80	—	n.a.	—	—	0.00	-100.0%
Development Finance Institution	—	—	-69.00	n.a.	-203.00	-69.00	-68.00	n.a.

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Request	FY2020 House (H.R. 2740)	FY2020 Senate Committee (S. 2583)	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY2019 Enacted vs. FY2020 Enacted
Trade & Development Agency	79.50	79.50	12.11	-84.77%	75.00	79.50	79.50	0.0%
State, Foreign Ops & Related Programs, TOTAL	**54,210.67 (12,018.00)**	**54,696.54 (8,000.00)**	**42,882.51 —**	**-21.14%**	**56,551.66 (8,000.00)**	**55,475.38 (8,282.46)**	**55,422.64 (8,282.46)**	**+1.3%**
Add Ons/ Rescissions, net	-33.77	-319.62	—	n.a.	—	-316.48 (282.46)	-578.74	81.1%
State-Foreign Ops Total, Net of Rescissions	**54,176.90 (12,018.00)**	**54,376.90 (8,000.00)**	**42,882.51 —**	**-20.67%**	**56,551.66 (8,000.00)**	**55,158.90 (8,000.00)**	**54,843.90 (8,000.00)**	**+0.9%**

Sources: FY2018 Actuals and the FY2020 request are from the FY2020 SFOPS CBJ; FY2019 enacted data are from P.L. 116-6, Division F.; H.R. 2740, S. 2583, and P.L. 116-94, Division G in the 116th Congress. FY2020 enacted is from P.L. 116-62.

Notes: Figures in brackets are subsumed in the larger account above and are not counted against the total. Figures in parentheses are amount designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) and are subsumed in the larger account number above them. "Enduring" funding is also sometimes referred to as "base" or "ongoing" funding in budget documents. Numbers may not add due to rounding. "n.a." = not applicable.

Appendix B. International Affairs Budget

The International Affairs budget, or Function 150, includes funding that is not in the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriation: foreign food aid programs (P.L. 480 Title II Food for Peace and McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition programs) are in the Agriculture Appropriations, and the Foreign Claim Settlement Commission and the International Trade Commission are in the Commerce, Justice, Science appropriations. In addition, the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriation measure includes funding for certain international commissions that are not part of the International Affairs Function 150 account.

Table B-1. International Affairs Budget
FY2018 Actual, FY2019 Enacted, and FY2020 Request and Enacted

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)

	FY2018 Actual	FY2019 Enacted (P.L. 116-6)	FY2020 Request	% change FY19 Enacted vs FY20 Request	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94)	% change FY19 Enacted vs FY20 Enacted
State-Foreign Operations, excluding commissions[a]	54,388.39	54,220.71	42,750.88	-21.15%	55,246.34	+1.9%
Commerce-Justice-Science						
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	2.41	2.41	2.34	-2.90%	2.34	-2.9%
Int'l Trade Commission	93.70	95.00	91.10	-4.11%	99.40	+4.6%
Agriculture						
P.L. 480	1,716.00	1,716.00	—	-100.00%	1,725.00	+0.5%
McGovern-Dole	207.63	210.26	—	-100.00%	220.00	+4.6%
Total International Affairs (150)	**56,408.13**	**56,244.38**	**42,844.32**	**-23.82%**	**57,293.08**	**+1.8%**

Source: Congressional Budget Justification, Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Years 2017, 2018, and FY2019, and the FY2019 addendum; P.L. 114-254; P.L. 115-31; H.R. 3362; H.R. 3268; S. 1780, P.L. 115-141, P.L. 116-6, P.L. 116-94; U.S. International Trade Commission FY2019 Budget Justification, and CRS calculations.

a. Includes mandatory spending from the Foreign Service retirement account, and does not align with budget justification figures that only count discretionary spending. Funding for certain international commissions appropriated in the State-Foreign Operations bill are excluded here because they fall under function 300 of the budget, not function 150 (International Affairs).

Appendix C. SFOPS Organization Chart



Source: Created by CRS from annual SFOPS legislation.

Author Information

Cory R. Gill
Analyst in Foreign Affairs

Emily M. Morgenstern
Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy

Marian L. Lawson
Specialist in Foreign Assistance Policy

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.