

CRS Issue Brief for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

United Nations Peacekeeping: Issues for Congress

Updated March 30, 2006

Marjorie Ann Browne
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Current Funding Situation

Basic Information

Other Peacekeeping Issues

A Peacekeeping Response to International Humanitarian Distress

The Role of U.N. Peacekeeping in Monitoring Elections

U.S. Financing for U.N. Peacekeeping

Proposals for Strengthening U.N. Peacekeeping

The United States and Peacekeeping Proposals

Congressional Perspectives: 1991-2005

LEGISLATION

United Nations Peacekeeping: Issues for Congress

SUMMARY

A major issue facing the United Nations, the United States, and Congress concerning United Nations peacekeeping is the extent to which the United Nations has the capacity to restore or keep the peace in the changing world environment. Associated with this issue is the expressed need for a reliable source of funding and other resources for peacekeeping and improved efficiencies of operation.

For the United States, major congressional considerations on U.N. peacekeeping stem from executive branch commitments made in the U.N. Security Council. The concern with these commitments, made through votes in the Council, is the extent to which they bind the United States, both militarily and financially, to fund and to participate in some way in an operation. This includes placing U.S. military personnel under the control of foreign commanders.

Since 1948, the United Nations (U.N.) has launched 60 peacekeeping operations, of which 15 are currently active. U.N. estimated peacekeeping expenditures went down from \$3.4 billion in calendar year 1995 to \$1.2 billion in 1997. Ongoing U.N. peacekeeping expenditures were estimated at \$2.2 billion for the year starting on July 1, 2000, and \$2.63 billion for the year starting on July 1, 2002. U.S. payments in calendar year 2000 were \$518.6 million and \$1.3 billion in CY2001.

Peacekeeping has come to constitute more than just the placement of military forces into a cease-fire situation with the consent of

all the parties. Military peacekeepers may be disarming or seizing weapons, aggressively protecting humanitarian assistance, and clearing land mines. Peacekeeping operations also now involve more non-military tasks such as maintaining law and order (police), election monitoring, and human rights monitoring.

Proposals for strengthening U.N. peacekeeping and other aspects of U.N. peace and security capacities have been adopted in the United Nations, by the Clinton Administration, and by Congress. They are being implemented. Most authorities have agreed that if the United Nations is to be responsive to post-Cold War world challenges, both U.N. members and the appropriate U.N. organs will have to continue to improve U.N. structures and procedures in the peace and security area.

On February 6, 2006, President Bush requested \$1,135,327,000 for FY2007 contributions to U.N. peacekeeping assessed accounts and \$200.5 million to fund U.S. assistance to international peacekeeping efforts of special concern. On February 16, 2006, Bush requested, in a FY2006 Supplemental, \$69.8 million for CIPA and \$123 million for PKO. On November 22, 2005, President Bush signed the State Department Appropriations Act, 2006 (P.L. 109-108, H.R. 2862) that provided the requested amount minus \$376,752,000 in recisions for peacekeeping assessments. Issues for the 109th Congress include whether the peacekeeping cap of 25% on assessed payments will be increased to 27.1%.

MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On February 16, 2006, President Bush had requested an additional \$69.8 million for payment in FY2006 of U.S. contributions to assessed U.N. peacekeeping operations (CIPA), especially for the Sudan. On March 16, 2006, the House passed H.R. 4939, including in the FY2006 supplemental, an additional \$129.8 million for the CIPA account. The House Appropriations Committee had increased the President's request by \$60 million.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The role of the United Nations (U.N.) in facilitating dispute settlement and establishing peacekeeping operations to monitor cease-fires and participate in other duties as assigned by the U.N. Security Council increased markedly in the late 1980s. Between April 1988 and April 1994, a total of 20 peacekeeping operations were set up, involving 16 different situations. Since May 1994, however, the pace of Council creation of new U.N. controlled peacekeeping operations dropped noticeably. This occurred as a result of the U.S. decision, in Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD 25), signed May 1994, to follow strict criteria for determining its support for an operation. (See text at [<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd25.htm>]). This U.S. decision was accompanied by a Security Council statement adopting similar criteria.

If the situations at the start of 1988 and more recent years are compared, the following picture emerges:

- When 1988 started, only five U.N. peacekeeping operations existed, with four in the Middle East region. At the end of 2004, the U.N. supported 16 operations worldwide.
- When 1988 started, the annual estimated U.N. peacekeeping cost was \$268.2 million; the CY1994 estimate was \$3.5 billion; \$3.4 billion in CY1995; \$1.5 billion for CY1996; \$1.2 billion for CY1997; \$907 million in CY1998; and \$1.1 billion in CY1999.
- U.S. contributions for assessed peacekeeping accounts in 1988 totaled \$36.7 million. Actual CY1994 U.S. payments to U.N. peacekeeping accounts were \$991.4 million; \$359 million in CY1996; \$518.6 million in CY2000; \$1.3 billion (included arrears payments) in CY2001; and \$703.4 million in CY2003.
- When 1988 started, the U.S. military participated, as observers, in one U.N. operation, the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine (36 officers). As of December 31, 1995, a total of 2,851 U.S. military personnel served under U.N. control in 7 operations. As of December 31, 2003, 518 U.S. personnel served in 7 operations and as of the end of 2004, 429 U.S. personnel served in 7 operations.

Current Funding Situation

On February 6, 2006, the Bush Administration requested, in its FY2007 budget, \$1,135,327,000 to pay U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations in the State Department's Contributions to International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account. The CIPA request contained \$44.303 million for the two war crimes tribunals (Yugoslavia and Rwanda) that are not peacekeeping operations. Bush also requested \$200.5 million in voluntary contributions for the FY2006 Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) account under the Foreign Operations Act. This account would finance the U.S. contribution to the Multilateral Force and Observers in the Sinai (MFO), a non-U.N. peacekeeping operation, and U.S. support of regional and international peacekeeping efforts in Africa, Asia, and Europe.

On February 16, 2006, President Bush requested, in a FY2006 supplemental, an additional \$69.8 million for CIPA and \$123 million for PKO, provided that such sums [of the PKO funds] as may be necessary may be transferred to and merged with CIPA for peacekeeping operations in Sudan. On March 16, the House passed H.R. 4939, in response to the President's request, providing \$129.8 million for the CIPA account and \$183 million for the PKO account.

On November 22, 2005, the President had signed H.R. 2862 which included, in the State Department Appropriations Act, FY2006, the requested \$1,035,500,000 for the CIPA account, of which 15 percent shall be available until September 30, 2007 (P.L. 109-108, Signed November 22, 2005). The actual amount available, after a rescission adjustment, was \$1,022,275,000. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, FY2006, was enacted, with \$175 million for the PKO account (P.L. 109-102, November 14, 2005). Earlier in 2005, the President signed H.R. 1268 (P.L. 109-13, May 11, 2005), a FY2005 Supplemental that provided \$680 million for CIPA for FY2005 (\$50 million of this was transferred to the PKO account, leaving \$630 million available).

FY1997-FY2001 U.N. peacekeeping requests were at an assessment level of 25%, per Section 404 (b)(2), P.L. 103-236, rather than at the level assessed by the United Nations. The scale of assessments for U.N. peacekeeping is based on a modification of the U.N. regular budget scale, with the five permanent U.N. Security Council members assessed at a higher level than for the regular budget. Since 1992, U.S. policy was to seek a U.N. General Assembly reduction of the U.S. peacekeeping assessment to 25%, meaning an increase of other countries' assessments. Since October 1, 1995, by congressional requirement, U.S. peacekeeping payments had been limited to 25%. This limit, or cap, on U.S. payments added to U.S. arrearages for peacekeeping.

**Table 1. U.N. Peacekeeping Assessment Levels
for the United States, CY1992-2005**

Year	U.N. Assessment	Recognized by U.S.	Year	U.N. Assessment	Recognized by U.S.
1992	30.387% (30.4%)	30.4%	1999	30.3648% (30.4%)	25%
1993	31.739% (31.7%)	30.4%	2000	30.2816% (30.3%)	25%
1994	31.735% (31.7%)	30.4%	2001	28.134% (28.13%)	25% /// 28.15%
1995	31.151% (31.2%)	30.4%; Oct. 1: 25%	2002	27.3477% (27.35%)	27.90%

Year	U.N. Assessment	Recognized by U.S.	Year	U.N. Assessment	Recognized by U.S.
1996	30.9652% (30.9%)	25%	2003	26.927% (26.93%)	27.40%
1997	30.862% (30.9%)	25%	2004	26.690% (26.69%)	27.40%
1998	30.5324% (30.5%)	25%	2005	26.4987% (26.5%)	27.1%

In late December 2000, the U.N. General Assembly reduced the U.S. regular budget assessment level to 22%, effective January 1, 2001, and, in effect, reduced the U.S. assessment for peacekeeping contributions progressively to 25%, possibly by 2004 or 2005. In response, Congress passed S. 248 (signed, October 5, 2001, P.L. 107-46), which amended the 1999 enacted legislation authorizing payment of U.S. arrears on its contributions to the United Nations, once certain conditions had been met. One of the conditions required Assembly reduction of the U.S. peacekeeping assessment level to 25%. S. 248 changed that condition figure to 28.15%.

In 2002 (Sec. 402, P.L. 107-228), Congress raised the 25% cap for peacekeeping payments that had been set by P.L. 103-236 to a range of 28.15% for CY2001 through 27.4% for CY2003 and CY2004. (**Table 1** under “Recognized by U.S.” reflects these changes.) This would enable current U.S. peacekeeping assessments to be paid in full. Section 411 of Division B of P.L. 108-447, signed December 8, 2004, continued the cap for assessments made during CY 2005 at 27.1%.

However, FY2006 legislation did not include a provision on the cap, which returned to 25% for CY2006. The Senate on April 6, 2005, had accepted an amendment in S. 600, FY2006-2007 Foreign Relations Authorization, that would drop the assessment cap limitation changes, returning the cap to 25%. The Foreign Relations Committee, in S.Rept. 109-35, had recommended a permanent change to 27.1%. The Senate did not complete action on S. 600. On December 13, 2005, Senator Biden introduced S. 2095 that would set the cap for assessments made for CY2005 and CY2006 at 27.1%. The President’s February 6, 2006, budget request included legislative language that would for assessments made during CY 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008, set the cap at 27.1%.

Since 1997, pursuant to a provision in the State Department Appropriations Act, 1997, in P.L. 104-208 (Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997), Congress has required the Secretary of State to notify it 15 days before U.S. support of a U.N. Security Council resolution setting up a new or expanding a current peacekeeping operation. The notification is to include “the estimated cost and length of the mission, the vital national interest that will be served, and the planned exit strategy.” A reprogramming request, indicating the source of funding for the operation, is also required. Tradition has sometimes resulted in the practice of a committee or subcommittee chairman “placing a hold” on the proposed reallocation in the reprogramming request, if it is not acceptable to him or her.

Table 2 shows FY2005 allocations, the FY2006 request and appropriation estimates, and the FY2007 request. (**Table 4** shows FY1988-FY2005 data.)

**Table 2. U.N. Peacekeeping-Assessed Contributions
FY2005 Allocations and FY2006 and FY2007 Requests**
(in millions of \$)

Operation	FY2005 Allocations	FY2006 Request	FY2006 Estimates	FY2007 Request
UNDOF	11.064	8.020	11.241	11.241
UNIFIL	14.745	18.042	24.228	24.228
MINURSO (W.Sahara)	10.992	8.325	11.749	5.000
UNMIK (Kosovo)	73.933	54.692	66.221	50.000
UNFICYP (Cyprus)	7.369	4.739	6.570	0.000
UNOMIG (Georgia)	9.041	6.156	9.416	9.416
UNAMSIL (Sierra Leone)	54.562	3.700	0.000	0.000
UNMISET (E. Timor)	10.583	0.000	0.000	0.000
MONUC (Congo)	284.593	207.279	302.077	152.745
UNMEE (Ethiopia/Eritrea)	46.282	38.800	44.260	39.296
UNMIL (Liberia)	235.421	159.213	198.473	150.000
ONUB (Burundi)	90.941	89.919	79.606	0.000
UNMIS (Sudan)	131.945	250.000	375.100	441.873
UNOCI (Cote d'Ivoire)	101.459	71.935	99.716	84.225
MINUSTAH (Haiti)	133.342	88.911	128.177	123.000
Subtotals	1,216.272	1,003.731	1,356.834	1,091.024
War crimes tribunals	42.193	31.769	42.193	44.303
TOTALS	1,258.465 ^a	1,035.500	1,399.027 ^b	1,135.327

a. Includes \$145.010 million in FY2005 adjustment (recision) and \$680 million appropriated in the FY2005 Supplemental (P.L. 109-13), of which \$50 million was transferred to the PKO account (\$630 million).

b. Includes \$376.752 million in adjustment (recisions). This is the amount expected to be required. The real figure available is **\$1,022,276,000**.

Basic Information

United Nations peacekeeping might be defined as the placement of military personnel or forces in a country or countries to perform basically non-military functions in an impartial manner. These functions might include supervision of a cessation of hostilities agreement or truce, observation or presence, interposition between opposing forces as a buffer force, maintenance and patrol of a border, or removal of arms in the area. The U.N. Security Council normally establishes peacekeeping operations in keeping with certain basic principles, which include agreement and continuing support by the Security Council; agreement by the parties to the conflict and consent of the host government(s); unrestricted access and freedom of movement by the operation within the countries of operation and within the parameters of its mandate; provision of personnel on a voluntary basis by U.N. members; noninterference by the operation and its participants in the internal affairs of the host government; and avoidance of the use of armed force to carry out the mandate.

Since 1948, the United Nations has established 60 peacekeeping operations, 15 of which are currently active. Between 1991 and 1998, the rate of creation of operations followed this pattern (five: 1991, four: 1992, six: 1993, two: 1994, four: 1995, three: 1996, four: 1997, and three: 1998), showing an increase and subsequent reduction as the Council sought to ensure that peacekeeping was appropriate for the crisis. (For further data, see Appendix 1.)

Section 7 of the U.N. Participation Act (UNPA) of 1945, as amended (P.L. 79- 264), authorized the President to detail up to 1,000 members of the U.S. armed forces to the United Nations in a noncombatant capacity. (See CRS Report RL31120, *Peacekeeping: Military Command and Control Issues*, by Edward F. Bruner and Nina M. Serafino, for discussion of foreign command issues.) Throughout U.N. history, the United States has provided various goods and services, including logistics, and has detailed its military to U.N. peacekeeping tasks, but in small numbers. Before 1990, the major U.S. provision of forces were the individual U.S. military officers participating as observers in the UNTSO. The President has also used the authority in section 628 of the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) of 1961, to provide U.S. armed forces personnel to U.N. peacekeeping operations. Under this section, such personnel may be detailed or sent to provide “technical, scientific or professional advice or service” to any international organization.

As of February 28, 2006, an estimated 372 U.S. personnel served under U.N. control in seven operations and in one special political mission. Other than the civilian police in four operations, these were U.S. military personnel. See **Table 3**. The United States currently contracts with an outside firm to provide U.S. civilian police, either active duty on a leave of absence, former, or retired. They are hired for a year at a time and paid by the contractor. These contracts are financed from Foreign Operations Act accounts. A total of 73,034 personnel from 107 countries served in 15 U.N. peacekeeping operations.

Table 3. U.S. Personnel under U.N. Control

(As of February 28, 2006)

Operation	Total
UNTSO (Middle East)	3 (obs.)
UNMIK (Kosovo)	252 (police)
UNOMIG (Georgia)	2 (obs.)
UNMIL (Liberia)	46 (4 (troop), 5 (obs.), 37 (police))
UNMEE (Ethiopia & Eritrea)	7 (obs.)
MINUSTAH (Haiti)	54 (50 (police), 4 (troop))
UNMIS (Sudan)	1 (police)
[UNOTIL <i>political mission</i> (E. Timor)]	[7 (police)]
TOTAL	372

Other Peacekeeping Issues

A Peacekeeping Response to International Humanitarian Distress. Since 1991, internal instabilities and disasters in the Persian Gulf region and in Africa, and conditions in the former Yugoslavia have prompted demands for the use of U.N. peacekeeping to expedite peaceful settlement in internal conflict situations or to ensure the

delivery of humanitarian assistance to starving and homeless populations within their countries. Some observers have suggested that the principle of nonintervention, incorporated in Article 2, paragraph 7 of the U.N. Charter, had been modified by Security Council Resolution 688 (1991), in which the Council “insist(ed) that Iraq allow immediate access by international humanitarian organizations to all those in need of assistance in all parts of Iraq.” Others cited Council Resolution 687 (1991), the cease-fire resolution, which imposed on Iraq a number of requirements that might be viewed as intervention into the territorial sovereignty and independence of that country.

While the Security Council had, in the past, been reluctant to approve humanitarian assistance as the major or primary function of a peacekeeping operation, it has now moved away from that position. The Council established protection for humanitarian operations in Somalia as part of the major mandate for its operation there (UNOSOM) and added humanitarian protection to an expanded mandate for the operation (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On December 3, 1992, the Security Council took unprecedented action, under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter, in authorizing the Secretary-General and Member States cooperating “to use all necessary means to establish as soon as possible a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.” The result was the Unified Task Force (UNITAF), a U.N.-authorized operation under a U.S.-led unified command. This was not a U.N. peacekeeping operation, but cooperated with the U.N. operation in Somalia (UNOSOM). UNITAF ended on May 4, 1993.

The Role of U.N. Peacekeeping in Monitoring Elections. With increasing frequency, some authorities have called for the United Nations to supervise and monitor elections in various countries. In the past, the United Nations had not responded affirmatively to such requests. In fact, in June 1989 Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, when considering Nicaragua’s request for U.N. participation in its electoral process, characterized U.N. acceptance of election supervision in an independent country as “unprecedented.”

However, recent examples exist of such U.N. election supervision, with a U.N. peacekeeping component to ensure security, authorized and established by the U.N. Security Council. In the case of Namibia (UNTAG, 1989-1990), Western Sahara (MINURSO, 1991-), and Cambodia (UNTAC, 1992-1994), the election is an act of self-determination, as part of an overall conflict settlement arrangement. This referendum or election is similar to the traditional role of the U.N. in the decolonization process.

In two other instances, the U.N. took on elections monitoring in an independent U.N. member state. In both cases, the action was authorized and created by the U.N. General Assembly, not by the U.N. Security Council. The U.N. Observer Mission in Nicaragua (ONUSON) involved U.N. civilian observers monitoring the election process in Nicaragua in 1989-1990 and did not include military or security forces. It was, however, part of the efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement in Central America. The case of election monitoring in Haiti in 1990-1991 did not include a role clearly identified as U.N. peacekeeping, but the United Nations Observer Group for the Verification of the Elections in Haiti (ONUSOH) included a security component that consisted of 64 security observers, 36 of whom were drawn from U.N. peacekeeping operations.

U.S. Financing for U.N. Peacekeeping

There are three major ways by which U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations have been funded. First, Congress currently finances U.S. contributions to these operations through the Department of State authorization and appropriation bills (under Contributions to International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) in the International Organizations and Conferences account). These are the peacekeeping operations for which the U.N. General Assembly creates a separate assessed account against which every U.N. member state is obligated to pay a specific percent of the expenses of the operation. Arrearages to peacekeeping operations exist only in connection with these assessed accounts.

Second, Congress formerly funded one U.N. operation — the U.N. Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) — from the foreign operations authorization and appropriation bills (under Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) in the Military Assistance account). The U.S. contribution was funded this way because the Cyprus force was financed from voluntary contributions from U.N. member nations. On May 27, 1993, the Security Council changed the basis of funding for the force on Cyprus, from solely voluntary to voluntary plus assessed. Future funding for U.S. contributions to UNFICYP has moved, in the Administration's request, from the Foreign Operations, Military Assistance, PKO account to the State Department, CIPA account. Finally, Congress funds the U.S. contribution to some U.N. observer peacekeeping operations as part of its regular budget payment to the United Nations. There is no separate U.N.-assessed account for these groups. This is currently how the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) and the U.N. Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) are funded.

Because U.N. peacekeeping requirements may arise out of sequence with the U.S. budget planning cycle, the President and Congress have had to devise extraordinary methods for acquiring initial funding for U.S. contributions to the operations. Over the past several years, these included reprogramming from other pieces of the international affairs budget, such as Economic Support Fund money obligated in past years for specific countries but not disbursed. Another approach used was the transfer of funds to the international affairs budget from the Department of Defense for funding U.N. peacekeeping operations.

In addition, in 1994 and 1995, President Clinton proposed that U.S. assessed contributions for peacekeeping operations, for which Chapter VII of the Charter is specifically cited in the authorizing Security Council resolution, be financed under the Defense Department authorization/appropriations bills. He proposed that the U.S. assessed contribution for any other U.N. peacekeeping operations for which a large U.S. combat contingent is present also be financed from Defense Department money. Congress did not support this proposal.

Proposals for Strengthening U.N. Peacekeeping

As peacekeeping became an option of choice in seeking a resolution of conflict situations in the post-Cold War world, proposals were made for strengthening the U.N. response to all aspects of this peace and security phenomenon. In June 1992, for example, then U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali issued a report, "An Agenda for Peace;

Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping,” which offered several recommendations relating to military force, peace enforcement, and peacekeeping. The report can be found on the U.N. website at [<http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html>].

On August 23, 2000, a special Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, convened by U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, issued a report presenting its recommendations aimed at improving the U.N.’s peace and security capabilities. Annan had asked the Panel to “assess the shortcomings of the existing system and to make frank, specific and realistic recommendations for change.” (See text of the nearly 70-page report at [http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/].) Annan requested the Deputy Secretary-General to follow up on implementing the report’s recommendations. Followup on implementation has continued, both in the Security Council and the General Assembly.

The United States and Peacekeeping Proposals

The Clinton Administration initially supported collective security through the U.N. as a centerpiece among its foreign policy objectives. Later, President Clinton, in a September 1993 speech to the U.N. General Assembly, called on the Security Council to review closely each proposal for an operation before determining whether to establish it, saying that “the United Nations simply cannot become engaged in every one of the world’s conflicts.” He supported “creation of a genuine U.N. peacekeeping headquarters with a planning staff, with access to timely intelligence, with a logistics unit that can be deployed on a moment’s notice, and a modern operations center with global communications.” Clinton urged that U.N. operations be adequately and fairly funded, saying he was “committed to work with the United Nations” in reducing the U.S. assessment for peacekeeping. In May 1994, Clinton signed Presidential Decision Directive 25 on Reforming Peace Operations. The policy recommended 11 steps to strengthen U.N. management of peacekeeping operations and offered U.S. support for strengthening the planning, logistics, information, and command and control capabilities of the United Nations. The policy also supported reducing the U.S. peacekeeping assessment from 31.7% to 25%.

In a May 16, 2000, statement to a U.N. General Assembly committee, U.S. Ambassador Richard Holbrooke presented reform proposals aimed at strengthening U.N. capacities for U.N. peacekeeping and at changing the basis for financing U.N. peacekeeping. (See USUN Press Release #62 (00) at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations website.) An August 24, 2000, a statement by the State Department spokesman “commended” the work of the U.N. Panel on Peace Operations, noting that “the United States has been one of the earliest and most insistent voices calling for improvement in planning, the pace of deployment, and overall effectiveness in peacekeeping.”

Congressional Perspectives: 1991-2005

Congress demonstrated its support for U.N. peacekeeping in a number of ways during 1991 and 1992. U.S. contributions for the U.N. Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission were appropriated (P.L. 102-55). Funds for U.S. contributions for U.N. peacekeeping operations and also for the portion of U.S. arrearages to be paid from FY1992 money were authorized

and appropriated in 1991 (P.L. 102-138; P.L. 102-140) and additional funds were made available in 1992 for the rapidly increasing number of peacekeeping operations (P.L. 102-266; P.L. 102-311; P.L. 102-368; and P.L. 102-395). This funding was important as demands for new U.N. actions worldwide increased.

During 1992, some in Congress focused on finding new sources of funding for U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping obligations while others explored new directions for the United Nations in the area of peace and security. Senator Simon's bill, for example, suggested that the United States finance its peacekeeping contributions from the defense budget function, as a larger and more reliable source. Proponents of this proposal pointed to the extent to which U.N. peacekeeping advances U.S. national security interests. Section 1342 of the Defense Authorization Act, P.L. 102-484, authorized the Secretary of Defense to obligate up to \$300 million from defense appropriations to, among other things, fund U.S. peacekeeping contributions if the funding is not available from the State Department's CIPA account. Congress, in P.L. 102-484, asked the President for a report on the proposals made in "An Agenda for Peace." President Bush sent that report to Congress on January 19, 1993.

In 1993, in contrast, Congress did not provide all the funding requested by the President for financing U.S. contributions to U.N. peacekeeping. Congress appropriated \$401.6 million of the \$619.7 million requested in the CIPA account in the State Department Appropriations Act, FY1994 (P.L. 103-121, October 27, 1993). The Foreign Operations Act included \$75,623,000 of the \$77,166,000 requested for Peacekeeping Operations under the Military Assistance account (P.L. 103-87, September 3, 1993). Finally, Congress did not appropriate the \$300 million requested in the Department of Defense budget for DOD peacekeeping support.

Further, Congress's concerns in this area were expressed in a series of requirements included in the conference report on State Department appropriations. They included:

- Recommend that the Administration review thoroughly the current process of committing to peacekeeping operations.
- Expect the Administration to notify the U.N. that the U.S. will not accept an assessment greater than 25% for any new or expanded peacekeeping commitments after the date of enactment of this act.
- Expect the State Department in its FY1995 budget submission to include an annual three-year projection of U.S. peacekeeping costs and submit a detailed plan identifying U.S. actions needed to correct policy and structural deficiencies in U.S. involvement with U.N. peacekeeping activities.
- Expect the Secretary of State to notify both appropriations committees 15 days in advance, where practicable, of a vote by the U.N. Security Council to establish any new or expanded peacekeeping operation.
- Expect the notification to include the total estimated cost, the U.S. share, the mission and objectives, duration and estimated termination date, and the source of funding for the U.S. share.

Similar concerns and requirements were placed in statutory language in the Defense Appropriations Act, FY1994 (Section 8153, P.L. 103- 139, November 11, 1993) and the National Defense Authorization Act, FY1994 (Title XI, P.L. 103-160, November 30, 1993).

Table 4. U.S. Contributions to U.N. Peacekeeping as Requested and Enacted, FY1988-FY2005

(in millions of \$)

Fiscal Year	Requested	Supplemental	Enacted	Cyprus
1988	—	—	29.400	7.312
1989	29.000	—	141.000	7.312
1990	—	—	81.079	8.837
1991	247.400	—	133.521	8.836
1992	201.292	350.000	464.202	8.374
1993	460.315	293.000	460.315	9.000
1994	619.736	670.000	401.607 670.000	—
1995	533.304	Rejected 672.000	533.304	—
1996	445.000	—	359.000	—
1997 ^a	425.000	—	352.400	—
1998 ^b	286.000	—	256.632	—
1999 ^c	231.000	—	231.000	—
2000	235.000	Rejected 107.000	498.100	—
2001	738.666	—	844.139	—
2002 ^d	844.139	23.034	844.139	—
2003	725.981	—	673.710	—
2004	350.200	245.000	695.056	—
2005	650.000	780 Req; 680 Appro	1,113.455	—

Note: Except for the U.N. Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping are funded from CIPA account, State Department. U.S. money for UNFICYP was originally financed by voluntary contributions, funded through the Foreign Operations Act.

- a. "Requested" includes \$142.4 million for arrears payment; "Enacted" includes \$50 million for arrears.
- b. Both "Requested" and "Enacted" include \$46 million for arrears payment.
- c. \$11.55 million of "Enacted" was transferred to the CIO account, leaving \$219.450 million.
- d. \$43 million requested, March 21, 2002, in Emergency FY2002 Supplemental Appropriation. P.L. 107-206 provided \$23,034,000. Included in the Enacted figure is \$42.206 million, which was transferred from the CIPA to the CIO account, leaving \$801.933 million for allocation.

In 1994, the State Department appropriations bill (P.L. 103-317, August 26, 1994) included the requested \$533.3 million in the FY1995 CIPA account and \$670 million for the FY1994 CIPA supplemental appropriations. The foreign operations appropriations legislation (P.L. 103-306, August 23, 1994) also contained the requested \$75 million for peacekeeping and peace support and a provision allowing a transfer of \$850,000 to IMET for training of other countries' troops for U.N. peacekeeping duty. The FY1995 National Defense Authorization bill (H.R. 4301) and the FY1995 DOD Appropriations Bill (H.R. 4650) were enacted without the \$300 million requested to finance U.S.-assessed contributions to three U.N. operations.

Congress, in early 1996, responded to the President's February 1995 request by appropriating \$359 million (\$445 million requested) for FY1996 CIPA funding (P.L.

104-134, April 26, 1996) and \$70 million (\$100 million requested) for the PKO account (P.L. 104-107, February 12, 1996). Congress rejected the President's request for \$672 million in FY1995 emergency supplemental funding in the CIPA account. Congress also rejected the Administration's proposal that part (\$65 million) of the U.S. assessed contributions to two U.N. peacekeeping operations in which U.S. military personnel participated, Haiti (UNMIH) and Macedonia (UNPREDEP), be funded from Defense Department appropriations.

Congress, in 1996, provided \$352.4 million for U.S. assessments to U.N. peacekeeping accounts in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY1997 (P.L. 104-208). This included \$50 million for U.S. peacekeeping arrears accumulated in 1995. Release of the arrears funding depended on an Administration certification that two of three U.N. non-peacekeeping-related actions occur: (1) savings of \$100 million in biennial expenses of five U.N. divisions; (2) reduction in the number of U.N. staff at December 31, 1997, by at least 10% of the number employed on January 1, 1996; (3) adoption of a budget outline for 1998-1999 lower than the current budget level of \$2.608 billion. In addition, conferees expected that up to \$20 million in the account would be available for contingencies related to African crises. Use of these funds was subject to Committee review procedures.

Furthermore, Congress stipulated that none of the funds in the CIPA account shall be spent for any new or expanded U.N. peacekeeping mission unless the appropriate committees are notified, at least 15 days before a U.N. Security Council vote. The notification should provide the estimated cost, length of mission, and planned exit strategy. A reprogramming of funds is to be submitted, including the source of funds for the mission and a certification that American manufacturers and suppliers are given opportunities equal to those given to foreign sources to provide equipment, services, and materials for U.N. peacekeeping activities. Congress appropriated \$65 million for the PKO account, but stipulated that none of the funds shall be obligated or expended, except as provided through regular notification procedures of the Appropriations committees.

In 1997, Congress appropriated \$256 million (\$286 million requested) for the FY1998 CIPA (including \$46 million for prior year payments/arrears) and \$77.5 million (\$90 million requested) for the FY1998 PKO account. Release of \$46 million for arrears payments was contingent on passage of an authorization package linking arrears payments to specific U.N. reforms. Release of part of the PKO funds, for the MFO, was contingent on the Secretary of State filing a report on the status of efforts to replace the Director-General of the MFO (letter sent March 18, 1998).

In 1998, Congress appropriated the requested \$231 million for U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations (CIPA) and \$76.5 million (\$83 million requested) for international peacekeeping activities (PKO). Congress, however, did not include funds (\$921 million) sought in a FY1998 supplemental to pay U.N. and international organization arrears in FY1999 (\$475 million) and FY2000 (\$446 million).

In 1999, Congress appropriated \$500 million for payment of U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping accounts in the State Department Appropriations Act and \$153 million for voluntary contributions to international peacekeeping activities in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, both of which were incorporated by reference into the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000, P.L. 106-113.

Congress also sent the President in H.R. 3194 (106th Congress), the State Department Authorization Act for FY2000-FY2001 (H.R. 3427), which authorized \$500 million for the CIPA account for FY2000 and “such sums as may be necessary for FY2001” and contained a number of peacekeeping-related provisions. One provision required an annual report to the United Nations on all U.S. costs (“assessed, voluntary, and incremental”) incurred in support of all U.N. Security Council passed peace activities and required the President to request the United Nations to compile and publish a report on the costs incurred by all U.N. members in support of U.N. peacekeeping activities. Another provision amended the U.N. Participation Act requiring the President to obtain timely U.N. reimbursement for U.S. goods and services valued over \$3 million per fiscal year, per operation, provided to the United Nations. Another section codified in the U.N. Participation Act language previously enacted on consultations and reports on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations. Lastly, this legislation provided for U.S. arrears payments of \$819 million to the United Nations for regular budget and peacekeeping accounts for FY1998, FY1999, and FY2000. In addition, section 913 provided for the forgiveness of \$107 million in amounts owed by the United Nations to the United States in reimbursements for peacekeeping troops. The primary benchmarks relating to peacekeeping included a 25% ceiling on peacekeeping assessments and no funding for or development of a U.N. standing army.

In 2000, Congress appropriated \$846 million for the FY2001 CIPA account, in response to the President’s request of \$738.6 million for FY2001 and a FY2000 supplemental of \$107 million. Congress did not approve the supplemental for FY2000. In June 2000, the House Appropriations Committee, in recommending a smaller appropriation, expressed its “gravest concern” over what it called “the Administration’s tendency to...extend moribund missions and to establish and expand missions irrespective of Congressional input or the availability of funding to pay for them.” The \$134 million requested for the FY2001 PKO account was reduced in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill to \$127 million (P.L. 106-429).

On October 5, 2001, the President signed legislation amending the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000-2001 (P.L. 107-46). This bill revised a condition prohibiting the obligation of appropriated funds for payment of U.S. arrearages for assessed contributions to the United Nations until the share of the budget for each assessed U.N. peacekeeping operation does not exceed 28.15% for any single U.N. member. On November 28, 2001, the President signed H.R. 2500, appropriating funds for the State Department, including the amount requested for the FY2002 CIPA account (P.L. 107-77). The law includes a provision requiring that 15% (\$126,620,850) of the \$844,139,000 appropriated for CIPA remain available until September 30, 2003. On January 10, 2002, the President signed H.R. 2506, providing \$135 million (\$150 million requested) in voluntary contributions for the FY2002 PKO account under the Foreign Operations Act.

On March 21, 2002, President Bush, in his Emergency FY2002 Supplemental Appropriations request (H.Doc. 107-195), included \$43 million for the CIPA account, “to meet projected increased costs for U.N. peacekeeping operations. The United States has a clear national interest in resolving the multi-state conflict and encouraging the evolution of stable democracies in countries in which U.N. peacekeeping missions are operational.” Congress provided \$23,034,000 for “increased assessments” for the U.N. operation in the Congo in H.R. 4775, which was signed on August 2, 2002 (P.L. 107-206).

On September 30, 2002, the President signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2002-2003 (P.L. 107-228), in which Congress authorized \$844 million for U.S. assessed contributions in CIPA and amended provisions relating to 25% assessment level condition and cap on payment of U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations. On February 20, 2003, the President signed the FY2003 Consolidated Appropriations Resolution (P.L. 108-7), which provided \$673,710,000 for the CIPA account (\$725.9 million requested) and \$120,250,000 for the PKO account (\$108.8 million requested). The conferees provided that, as requested by the President, 15% of the amount in the CIPA account (approx. \$101 million) be available through September 30, 2004. This was due to “demonstrated unpredictability of the requirements ...from year to year and the nature of multi-year operations” with “mandates overlapping the [U.S.]...fiscal year.”

On April 24, 2003, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in recommending S. 925, authorized, for FY2004, the requested \$550.2 million to pay U.S. assessed contributions to U.N. peacekeeping accounts. The Committee set the assessment limit for U.S. peacekeeping contributions beyond CY2004 at 27.4%. The Committee also asked the Secretary of State to assess U.N. implementation of the Brahimi Panel recommendations on U.N. peacekeeping capabilities reform and U.S. support of U.N. progress in this area (S.Rept. 108-39). On July 16, 2003, the House passed H.R. 1950, authorizing \$550.2 million, as requested, for the CIPA account and setting the peacekeeping assessment cap for CY2005 and CY2006 at 27.1%. An authorization bill was not enacted in 2003.

On July 23, 2003, the House passed H.R. 2799, appropriating for FY2004, the requested \$550.2 million for CIPA. The Senate Appropriations Committee, on September 5, 2003, recommended \$482,649,000 for the CIPA account (S. 1585). Committee and floor recommendations for the PKO account ranged from \$84.9 million (S. 1426) to \$85 million (H.R. 2800) to \$110 million (H.R. 1950). The FY2004 Consolidated Appropriations bill, signed on January 23, 2004 (P.L. 108-199), Div. B, provided \$550,200,000 (including \$454,842,000 in new direct appropriations and \$95,358,000 in prior year unobligated balances) for the CIPA account and in Div. C, Foreign Operations, \$74,900,000 for the PKO account. On November 6, 2003, the President had signed the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Defense and for Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for FY2004 (P.L. 108-106) which added \$245 million to the CIPA account for assessed costs of U.N. peacekeeping in Liberia and \$50 million to the PKO account to support multilateral peacekeeping needs in Iraq and Afghanistan.

For FY2005, Congress provided \$490 million for CIPA and \$104 million for PKO (FY2005 Consolidated Appropriations Act, P.L. 108-447, December 8, 2004). The \$490 million was reduced to \$483,544,832 by an across-the-board cut of 0.80% and a Division B cut of 0.54%. The \$104 million for the PKO account was cut 0.80% to \$103,168,000. The peacekeeping assessment cap for CY2005 was set at 27.1% in P.L. 108-447.

LEGISLATION

S. 2095 (Biden)

A bill to ensure payment of U.S. assessments for U.N. peacekeeping operations. Introduced December 13, 2005.

Appendix 1. U.N. Peacekeeping Operations: A Chronological List

Name of Operation	Acronym and Service Dates	Location
*U.N. Truce Supervision Organization in Palestine	UNTSO 1948-	Middle East
*U.N. Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan	UNMOGIP 1949-	Jammu, Kashmir and Pakistan
U.N. Emergency Force I	UNEF I 1956-1967	Gaza; Egyptian side in Sinai
U.N. Observer Group in Lebanon	UNOGIL June-Dec. 1958	—
U.N. Operation in the Congo	ONUC 1960-1964	—
U.N. Security Force in West New Guinea	UNSF Oct. 1962-Apr. 1963	West Irian
U.N. Yemen Observer Mission	UNYOM July 1963-Sept. 1964	—
*U.N. Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus	UNFICYP 1964-	—
Mission of Represent. of the Sec'y- Gen'l in the Dominican Republic	DOMREP May 1965-Oct. 1966	—
U.N. India/Pakistan Observer Mission	UNIPOM Sept. 1965-Mar. 1966	India-Pakistan border
U.N. Emergency Force II	UNEF II 1973-1979	Suez Canal sector; Sinai Peninsula
*U.N. Disengagement Observer Force	UNDOF 1974-	Israel-Syria: Golan Heights
*U.N. Interim Force in Lebanon	UNIFIL 1978-	Southern Lebanon
U.N. Good Offices Mission in Afghanistan and Pakistan	UNGOMAP Apr. 1988-Mar. 1990	—
U.N. Iran-Iraq Military Observer Mission	UNIIMOG 1988-1991	—
U.N. Angola Verification Mission	UNAVEM Jan. 1989-May 1991	—
U.N. Transition Assistance Group	UNTAG Apr. 1989-Mar. 1990	Namibia and Angola
U.N. Observer Group in Central America	ONUCA Nov. 1989-Jan. 1992	Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua
U.N. Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission	UNIKOM Apr. 1991-Oct. 6, 2003	—
U.N. Observer Mission in El Salvador	ONUSAL May 1991-Apr. 1995	—
U.N. Angola Verification Mission II	UNAVEM II May 1991-Feb. 1995	—
*U.N. Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara	MINURSO Apr. 1991-	—
U.N. Advance Mission in Cambodia	UNAMIC Oct. 1991-Mar. 1992	—
U.N. Protection Force	UNPROFOR Feb. 1992; March 1995-Jan. 1996	Former Yugoslavia: Croatia, Bosnia, "Macedonia"; B&H
U.N. Transitional Authority in Cambodia	UNTAC Feb. 1992-Oct. 1994	—
U.N. Operation in Somalia I	UNOSOM Apr. 1992-Apr. 1993	—
U.N. Operation in Mozambique	ONUMOZ Dec. 1992-Jan. 1995	—
U.N. Operation in Somalia II	UNOSOM II May 1993-March 1995	—
U.N. Observer Mission Uganda-Rwanda	UNOMUR June 1993-Sept. 1994	Uganda
*U.N. Observer Mission in Georgia	UNOMIG Aug. 1993-	—
U.N. Observer Mission in Liberia	UNOMIL Sept. 1993-Sept. 1997	—
U.N. Mission in Haiti	UNMIH Sept. 1993-June 1996	—
U.N. Assistance Mission for Rwanda	UNAMIR Oct. 1993-March 1996	—
U.N. Aouzou Strip Observer Group	UNASOG May 4-June 13, 1994	Chad and Libya

Name of Operation	Acronym and Service Dates	Location
U.N. Mission of Observers in Tajikistan	UNMOT Dec. 1994-May 15, 2000	—
U.N. Angola Verification Mission III	UNAVEM III Feb. 1995-June 1997	—
U.N. Confidence Restoration Operation in Croatia	UNCRO March 1995-Jan. 1996	—
U.N. Preventive Deployment Force	UNPREDEP March 1995-Feb. 1999	“Macedonia”
U.N. Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Includes Intl. Police Task Force (IPTF))	UNMIBH Dec. 1995-Dec. 31, 2002	Bosnia & Herzegovina
U.N. Transitional Administration for E. Slavonia, Baranja & W. Sirmium	UNTAES Jan. 1996-Jan.1998	Croatia
U.N. Mission of Observers in the Prevlaka	UNMOP Jan. 1996-Dec. 15, 2002	Croatia
U.N. Support Mission in Haiti	UNSMIH June 1996-July 1997	—
U.N. Verification Mission in Guatemala	MINUGUA Jan. 20-May 1997	—
U.N. Observer Mission in Angola	MONUA July 1997-Feb. 1999	—
U.N. Transition Mission in Haiti	UNTMIH Aug.-Nov. 1997	—
U.N. Civilian Police Mission in Haiti	MIPONUH Dec.1997-March 2000	—
U.N. Civilian Police Support Group - Croatia	UNPSG Jan.-Oct. 15, 1998	—
U.N. Mission in the Central African Republic	MINURCA March 27, 1998-Feb. 15, 2000	—
U.N. Observer Mission in Sierra Leone	UNOMSIL July 1998-Oct. 1999	—
*U.N. Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo	UNMIK June 10, 1999-	—
*U.N. Observer Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo	MONUC Aug. 6, 1999-	—
U.N. Mission in Sierra Leone	UNAMSIL Oct. 22, 1999-Dec. 31, 2005	—
U.N. Transitional Administration in East Timor	UNTAET 1999-2002	—
* U.N. Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea	UNMEE Sept. 15, 2000-	—
U.N. Mission of Support in East Timor	UNMISSET May 20, 2002-May 20, 2005	—
* U.N. Mission in Liberia	UNMIL Sept. 19, 2003-	—
* U.N. Mission in Cote d’Ivoire	UNOCI April 4, 2004-	—
* U.N. Operation in Burundi	ONUB June 1, 2004-	—
* U.N. Stabilization Mission in Haiti	MINUSTAH June 1, 2004-	—
* U.N. Mission in the Sudan	UNMIS March 24, 2005-	—

* Operation is still in existence

Appendix 2. U.N. Peacekeeping: Status of U.S. Assessed Contributions

For Calendar Year 2003 (As of December 31, 2003) (in U.S. dollars)

Name of Operation	Arrears as of 12/31/02	2003 Assessments	Payments in 2003	Outstanding as of 12/31
UNDOF(Middle East)	9,547,922	11,087,940	11,087,940 CR	9,547,922
UNIFIL(Lebanon)	43,086,385	28,366,514	28,366,514 CR	43,086,385
UNIKOM (Iraq, Kuwait)	5,352,181	2,599,555	2,599,555	5,352,181
MINURSO (W. Sahara)	39,909,601	11,657,886	9,720,230 CR	41,847,257
UNFICYP (Cyprus)	11,185,065	6,617,318	6,617,318 CR	11,185,065
UNOMIG (Georgia)	5,832,236	8,760,719	8,760,719 CR	5,832,236
UNMIBH (Bosnia & Herz.)	42,467,541	11,054,381	15,162,108 CR	38,359,814
UNAMSIL (Sierra Leone)	29,644,235	164,283,155	164,875,853 CR	29,051,537
UNMIK (Kosovo)	32,605,948	90,608,432	90,608,432 CR	32,605,948
UNTAET (E. Timor)	31,853,058	66,991,349	66,991,349 CR	31,853,058
MONUC (DR Congo)	18,106,721	163,365,971	170,998,749 CR	10,473,943
UNMEE (Ethiopia/Eritrea)	4,617,849	57,450,720	57,450,720 CR	4,617,849
TOTALS	497,326,681	622,843,940	794,235,696 CR	497,326,681
Regular Budget	190,331,651	341,475,110	263,845,890	267,960,871

Sources: United Nations. Status of Contributions, as of Dec. 31, 2002, and Dec. 31, 2003.

Notes: The Outstanding column includes a total of \$204,773,144 owed to 16 ended operations that are not listed separately under Name of Operation: UNTAC (Cambodia): \$11,465,637; ONUMOZ (Mozambique): \$6,680,111; MONUA (Angola): \$41,309,040; UNOSOM II (Somalia): \$20,340,516; UNOMIL(Liberia): \$1,090,869; UNMOT(Tajikistan): \$219,791; UNAMIR (Rwanda): \$4,257,231; UNTMIH (Haiti): \$4,604,632; MIPONUH (Haiti): \$14,780,745; MINURCA (Central Af. Rep): \$35,538,048; UNPROFOR (Yugoslavia): \$45,333,637; UNTAES + CPSG (Croatia): \$10,713,712; UNPREDEP ("Macedonia"): \$2,203,908; UNAMET (E. Timor): \$6,090,877); and MINUGUA (Guatemala): \$144,390.

Payments and outstanding contributions to 18 (11 current + 7 ended) operations reflect U.N. credits (CR-credits included) and (OCR-only credits) from unencumbered balances to the United States of \$90,816,102.

2003 assessments figure is for bills received during CY2003.