Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2021 Budget and Appropriations

Updated March 18, 2021

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
R46367

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

SUMMARY

Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2021 Budget and Appropriations

R46367

March 18, 2021

Cory R. Gill
Analyst in Foreign Affairs

Marian L. Lawson
Section Research Manager

Emily M. Morgenstern
Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy

Each year, Congress considers 12 distinct appropriations measures to fund federal programs and activities. One of these is the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPS) bill, which includes funding for U.S. diplomatic activities, cultural exchanges, development and security assistance, and participation in multilateral organizations, among other international activities. On February 10, 2020, the Trump Administration submitted to Congress its SFOPS budget proposal for FY2021, totaling $44.12 billion (including $158.90 million in mandatory State Department retirement funds). None of the requested SFOPS funds were designated as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds.

The Administration's FY2021 request was about 3% higher than its FY2020 request for SFOPS accounts but nearly 24% below the FY2020 SFOPS funding level enacted by Congress (including COVID-19 supplemental funds, which were enacted after the FY2021 request was submitted). Within these totals, funding was divided among two main components:

- **Department of State and Related Agency** accounts. These funds, provided in Title I of the SFOPS appropriation, primarily support Department of State diplomatic and security activities and would have been reduced by 18.9% from FY2020-enacted levels. Noteworthy cuts were proposed for the Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs (-57.6%), International Organizations (-31.8%) accounts, and the Diplomatic Programs account (-12.6%), which funds many of the State Department's day-to-day operations.
- The **Foreign Operations** accounts, funded in Titles II-VI of the SFOPS bill, fund most foreign assistance activities. These accounts would have seen a total reduction of 25.7%, with particularly steep cuts proposed for global health programs (-37.5%), peacekeeping operations (PKO, -36.6%), multilateral aid (-28.9%), and humanitarian assistance (-28.3%, not including food aid programs funded through the agriculture appropriation).

The House passed an FY2021 SFOPS bill, H.R. 7608, Division A, on July 24, 2020. The bill would have provided a total of $66.03 billion in net budget authority for SFOPS accounts ($66.10 billion pre-rescissions). No FY2021 SFOPS legislation was introduced in the Senate.

On December 21, both chambers passed the Omnibus and COVID Relief and Response Act, H.R. 133, which included SFOPS appropriations in Division K. The enacted legislation included a net total of $60.98 billion ($61.51 billion pre-rescission) for SFOPS accounts, 38.2% more than the Administration's request and 6.6% more than FY2020 funding. Of these funds, $8.25 billion were designated as OCO. President Trump signed the bill into law (P.L. 116-260) on December 27, 2020.

In March 2021, Congress enacted and President Biden signed into law the American Rescue Plan Act, P.L. 117-2. Title X of the $1.9 trillion legislation to prevent and respond to the impacts of COVID-19 included an additional $10 billion in FY2021 SFOPS emergency funding, though the account breakout of those funds is not entirely clear. This legislation brought the enacted FY2021 SFOPS funding total to $70.98 billion, after rescissions, a 24% increase over FY2020 funding.

An account-by-account comparison of the FY2021 SFOPS request, FY2021 SFOPS legislation, and FY2020 SFOPS funding is presented in **Appendix A**. **Appendix B** provides a similar comparison, focused specifically on the International Affairs budget. **Appendix C** depicts the organization of the SFOPS appropriation.

This report is designed to track SFOPS appropriations, comparing funding levels for accounts and purposes across enacted FY2020 SFOPS appropriations, FY2021 Administration requests, and FY2021 SFOPS legislation. It does not provide significant analysis of international affairs policy issues. For in-depth analysis and contextual information on international affairs issues, consult the wide range of CRS reports on specific subjects, such as global health, diplomatic security, and U.S. participation in the United Nations.

Contents

Figures

Tables

Appendixes

Contacts

Update Note

American Rescue Plan Act

In March 2021, Congress enacted and President Biden signed into law the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). The $1.9 trillion legislation, which was developed by authorizing committees using the budget reconciliation process rather than the appropriations process, included an additional $10 billion in FY2021 emergency-designated funding for SFOPS activities intended to prevent, prepare for, or respond to COVID-19 (P.L. 117-2, Title X). Funding was provided for several key purposes:

- $204 million for Department of State Operations
- $41 million for USAID Operations
- $3,750 million for Department of State global health activities, including $3,500 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria
- $905 million for USAID global health activities, including a contribution to a multilateral vaccine development partnership to support epidemic preparedness
- $3,090 million for USAID activities related to international disaster relief, rehabilitation and reconstruction, health, and emergency food security
- $930 million to address economic and stabilization needs related to the virus
- $500 million designated for humanitarian response
- $580 million for multilateral assistance

It is not clear how all of these funds will be allocated by account.[1] For this reason, total ARPA funding is added into the Appendix A funding table at the end, and is not incorporated at the account level of that table or in the other account-specific sections of this report. As more information becomes available, this report will be updated to reflect these details.

Overview

On February 10, 2020, the Trump Administration proposed its FY2021 budget for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPS) accounts, totaling $44.12 billion (including $158.90 million in mandatory retirement funds).[2] SFOPS funding typically represents about 1% of the annual federal budget and supports a wide range of U.S. activities around the world, including the operations of U.S. embassies; diplomatic activities; educational and cultural exchanges, international development, security, and humanitarian assistance; and U.S. participation in multilateral organizations. **Figure 1** shows funding for different SFOPS components based on FY2020 budget authority estimates, relative to each other and to the broader federal budget.

[1] Funding provided through Title X of P.L. 117-2 was not listed by account. The majority of the funds, $8.675 billion, were listed as global response funds in a section citing the Economic Support Fund section of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as the general authority. However, the ESF appropriations account is not typically used for the health and disaster relief activities being provided for in the law, and it is not clear if these funds are intended to flow through that account.

[2] The payment covers the U.S. government's contribution to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System and the Foreign Service Pension System for USAID and the Department of State. It is the only mandatory spending in the SFOPS appropriation.

The SFOPS budget aligns closely but not exactly with Function 150 (International Affairs) of the federal budget. The primary exception is funding for international food aid programs, which are part of Function 150 but funded through the agriculture appropriation. SFOPS also includes funding for international commissions in the Function 300 budget (see **Appendix B**).

Figure 1. SFOPS as a Portion of the Federal Budget, FY2020 Est.



Sources: FY2021 Budget; Historic Table 5.1; FY2020 SFOPS appropriations legislation; CRS calculations.

Note: Reflects estimated budget authority, FY2020, except for International Affairs detail figures, which reflect enacted appropriations for FY2020.

The Administration's request was about 3% higher than the FY2020 request for SFOPS accounts but nearly 24% below the FY2020 SFOPS funding level enacted by Congress, including supplemental funds to help combat the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) epidemic globally, which were enacted after the FY2021 request was submitted.[3] The Trump Administration consistently requested far less SFOPS funding than Congress appropriated. This is a reversal from the Obama Administration, when Congress typically provided less total SFOPS funding than was requested, though the gap narrowed over time during Obama's terms (**Table 1**).

Table 1. SFOPS Requests and Actual Funding, FY2013-FY2021

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)

	FY2013	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021
Request	56.41	51.96	55.01	54.83	60.21	40.21	41.66	43.10	44.12
Actual	51.91	50.89	54.39	54.52	59.78	54.18	54.38	57.21	70.98
Difference	-8.0%	-2.1%	-1.1%	-0.6%	-0.7%	+34.7%	+30.5%	+32.7%	+60.9%

Sources: Annual SFOPS Congressional Budget Justifications (CBJs) prepared by the Department of State and U.S. Agency of International Development; P.L. 116-6; P.L. 116-94; P.L. 116-123; P.L. 116-136; P.L. 116-260; P.L. 117-2.

Note: FY2020 actuals represent the enacted appropriation, including the coronavirus supplemental. FY2021 total includes the ARPA, P.L. 117-2.

If enacted, the requested SFOPS funding level would have been the lowest in over a decade (**Figure 2**).

[3] For more information on international affairs funding for COVID-19 response, see CRS In Focus IF11496, *COVID-19 and Foreign Assistance: Issues for Congress*, by Nick M. Brown, Marian L. Lawson, and Emily M. Morgenstern, and CRS Report R46319, *Novel Coronavirus 2019 (COVID-19): Q&A on Global Implications and Responses*, coordinated by Tiaji Salaam-Blyther.

Figure 2. SFOPS Funding, FY2010-FY2021

(In billions of U.S. dollars)



Sources: Annual SFOPS CBJs; P.L. 116-94; P.L. 116-123; P.L. 116-136; P.L. 116-260; P.L. 117-2; CRS calculations.

The Budget Control Act, OCO, and COVID-19 Funds

Since FY2012, the appropriations process has been shaped by the discretionary spending caps put in place by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA; P.L. 112-25). FY2021 is the last year covered by the Act. Congress has managed the constraints imposed by the BCA in part by repeatedly amending the BCA to raise the caps, most recently with 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 BCA caps are in effect.[4]

In addition to raising the caps, Congress has worked around the BCA limits by designating a portion of annual SFOPS appropriations as "Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO)" or "emergency" funding, both of which are excluded from BCA discretionary budget limits. Congress began appropriating OCO in the SFOPS budget in FY2012, having previously provided OCO funds for the Department of Defense (DOD). Originally used to support shorter-term, contingency-related programming in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan that was not considered part of the "base" or "core" budget, OCO's use expanded considerably in level and scope between FY2012 and FY2017. Global SFOPS OCO funding peaked at $20.80 billion in FY2017 (nearly 35% of SFOPS funds that year), at which point it was used to support 18 different SFOPS accounts, ranging from USAID operating expenses and the Office of Inspector General to International Disaster Assistance and Foreign Military Financing. This broad use has led many observers to question whether the OCO designation makes a meaningful distinction between core and contingency activities, with some describing OCO (in both SFOPS and Defense appropriations) as a slush fund.[5]

[4] 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.

[5] 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 Emily M. Morgenstern.

The Trump Administration last requested OCO funds for SFOPS for FY2018, though it continued to request OCO funds in the DOD budget. Nevertheless, Congress designated $8.00 billion of enacted SFOPS funding in both FY2019 and FY2020 as OCO.

In addition to OCO funds, Congress has periodically used funding designated as "emergency" to address a range of unanticipated needs, including response to Ebola and Zika virus outbreaks, and countering a surge in ISIS activity. In FY2020, Congress appropriated $2.37 billion in supplemental emergency SFOPS funding to address needs related to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic abroad. Similarly, the $10 billion in FY2021 SFOPS funds provided through the ARPA budget reconciliation bill were designated as emergency funds. Like OCO-designated funding, emergency-designated funding does not count toward the BCA discretionary spending caps and may therefore be used as an alternative to the OCO designation. Before the use of OCO in SFOPS, supplemental emergency appropriations were the primary mechanism for funding contingency activities.

Both categories of BCA-exempt funding were used by Congress in the FY2020 SFOPS bill, though neither were requested by the Trump Administration. The House-passed FY2021 legislation continued this practice, including $8.00 billion in OCO funds and an additional $10.02 billion designated as emergency funding. The enacted FY2021 appropriation, P.L. 116-206, included $8.25 billion designated as OCO and an additional $5.27 billion in designated emergency funding for Consular and Border Security Programs, Sudan, Global Health Programs, the Economic Support Fund, and Debt Restructuring.

Congressional Action on FY2021 SFOPS Legislation

Congressional action on SFOPS and other FY2021 appropriations was delayed by disruption of congressional activity related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Congress held some hearings on the FY2021 budget request before most hearings were postponed in March 2020. House appropriators resumed work in July, approving a FY2021 SFOPS bill on July 9, 2020, which was approved by the full House on July 24, 2020 as part of a 4-bill appropriations package (H.R. 7608, Division A). The Senate SFOPS Subcommittee did not consider FY2021 legislation. Having enacted no FY2021 appropriations by the start of the new fiscal year on October 1, 2020, Congress enacted a series of continuing resolutions to continue funding government agencies at the FY2020 level until P.L. 116-260, the Omnibus and COVID Relief and Response Act (which include SFOPS appropriations as Division K) was signed into law on December 27, 2020.[6]

Table 2. Status of FY2021 SFOPS Appropriations

(In billions of U.S. dollars)

	302(b) Allocations		Committee Action		Floor Action		Conference Agreement		
Chamber	**House**	**Senate**	**House**	**Senate**	**House**	**Senate**	**House**	**Senate**	**Final**
Date	7/9/20		7/9/20		7/24/20		12/21	12/21	12/27
Total $	$48.01		$66.03		$66.03		$60.98	$60.98	$60.98

Source: H.R. 7608; House 302(b) allocation table, available at: https://appropriations.house.gov/sites/democrats.appropriations.house.gov/files/Alloc1.pdf; P.L. 116-260.

[6] The continuing resolutions were P.L. 116-159, P.L. 116-215, P.L. 116-225, and P.L. 116-226, and P.L. 116-246.

Notes: The 302(b) allocation of budget authority does not include emergency or OCO funds. Funding totals account for rescissions. Does not include funding in the ARPA, P.L. 117-2.

House Legislation. The House-passed bill, H.R. 7608, Division A, would have provided a total of $66.10 billion in total new budget authority for SFOPS accounts ($66.03 billion net after rescissions), nearly 50% more than the Trump Administration's total request and 15% more than the enacted FY2020 appropriation (including supplementals). Of that amount, $18.02 billion (27%) was designated as emergency or OCO funding, including $10.02 billion in emergency funding related to COVID-19.

P.L. 116-260. The omnibus FY2021 appropriations legislation passed by both the House and Senate on December 21, 2020, and signed into law on December 27, 2020, included SFOPS appropriations in Division K. The bill provided $61.59 billion in new budget authority ($60.98 billion after rescission), including $17.29 billion for State Department Operations and related accounts, and $44.22 billion for Foreign Operations accounts.

State Department Operations and Related Agency Highlights

The FY2021 request would have cut funding for the Department of State and Related Agency appropriations accounts to $14.03 billion, down 18.9% from an enacted FY2020 level of $17.31 billion (including $588 million in COVID-19 supplemental funds).[7] The Trump Administration's request, submitted before COVID-19 was declared a global pandemic, did not include funds to support the State Department's response to the pandemic. To date, Congress has provided all State Department operations funding for COVID-19-related matters through two FY2020 supplemental appropriations acts (P.L. 116-123 and P.L. 116-136), Title IX of the FY2021 SFOPS appropriations law (Division K of P.L. 116-260), and Section 10001 of ARPA (P.L. 117-2; see "American Rescue Plan Act" text box).

The Trump Administration's stated priorities for funding provided via Department of State and Related Agency accounts in FY2021 included

- supporting the Indo-Pacific Strategy;
- countering Chinese, Russian, and Iranian malign influence;
- protecting U.S. government personnel, facilities, and data assets; and
- maintaining American leadership in international organizations while asking other nations to increase their support.[8]

H.R. 7608, the House legislation, would have provided about $17.56 billion for the State Department and Related Agency accounts. This would have marked an increase of 1.4% from the FY2020 enacted level and a 25.2% increase from the Trump Administration's request. Of the funds provided in the House legislation, $959.40 million would have comprised additional funding for State Department operations related to COVID-19.

The omnibus appropriations law, P.L. 116-260, included $17.29 billion for the Department of State and Related Agency accounts. While this funding total constituted a -0.1% decline from the

[7] Congress provided $264 million in COVID-19 supplemental funds the Diplomatic Programs account pursuant to P.L. 116-123, the Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2020. Subsequently, Congress provided an additional $324 million COVID-19 supplemental funds for the same account pursuant to the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act (P.L. 116-136).

[8] Letter transmitted from Secretary of State Michael R. Pompeo to Congress, February 10, 2020.

FY2020 enacted level and a 1.6% cut relative to the House bill, it exceeded the Trump Administration's FY2021 request by 23.2%. Some of this funding increase relative to the Administration's request was due to emergency funding for State Department operations provided in Title IX of the SFOPS appropriation. Such funding was provided for consular operations to offset losses of consular fee and surcharge revenues resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic (see the "COVID-19 and State Department Operations" text box) and, separately, to compensate victims of the 1998 bombings of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

In March 2021 Congress appropriated an additional $204 million for Department of State operations, to remain available until the end of FY2022, through ARPA. Funds were not divided among regular appropriations accounts. Instead, Congress made this funding available for the State Department to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus domestically or internationally, which shall include maintaining Department of State operations."[9] **Table 3** provides a comparative breakout of the Trump Administration's State Department and Related Agency request, by selected accounts.

Table 3. State Department and Related Agency: Selected Accounts

(In billions of current U.S. dollars; includes OCO funds)

Account	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
Diplomatic Programs	9.25	9.71	8.49	-12.6%	10.14	9.32	-4.1%
Worldwide Security Protection	*4.10*	*4.10*	*3.70*	-9.8%	*4.10*	*4.12*	*0.6%*
Embassy Security, Construction & Maintenance	1.98	1.98	1.68	-14.8%	1.98	1.95	-1.3%
Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs	0.70	0.73	0.31	-57.6%	0.74	0.74	1.3%
International Organizations[0]	2.91	3.00	2.05	-31.8%	2.96	2.96	-1.3%
U.S. Agency for Global Media	0.81	0.81	0.64	-21.4%	0.64	0.80	-0.9%
State and Related Agency Total, pre ARPA (includes Function 300 funding and other commissions)	**16.54**	**17.31**	**14.03**	**-18.9%**	**17.56**	**17.29**	**-0.1%**
ARPA Emergency Funds	-	-	-	-	-	0.20	-
State and Related Agency Total, with ARPA	**16.54**	**17.31**	**14.03**	**-18.9%**	**17.56**	**17.49**	**1.0%**

[9] See Section 10001 of P.L. 117-2.

Sources: FY2020 and FY2021 SFOPS CBJs P.L. 116-6; P.L. 116-94; P.L. 116-123; P.L. 116-136; P.L. 117-2; H.R. 7608; P.L. 116-260; CRS calculations.

Notes: Percentage changes may not reflect numbers included in this table due to rounding. State and Related Agency totals include additional funding for accounts not listed above.

FY2020 enacted includes funds from the first and third supplemental appropriations for the novel coronavirus (P.L. 116-123 and P.L. 116-136, respectively).

FY2021 House legislation figures for the Diplomatic Programs account and the State and Related Agency Total includes funding designated for the novel coronavirus in Title VIII of H.R. 7608.

The aggregate FY2021 enacted figure includes funds designated in Title IX for the Consular and Border Security Programs account and for Sudan claims (the Sudan claims figure of $150 million is also reflected in the Diplomatic Programs total)

Includes Contributions to International Organizations and Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities accounts, the main funding vehicles for 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 pertaining to multilateral assistance (in P.L. 116-260).

COVID-19 and State Department Operations

Since the outbreak of COVID-19, the Department of State has coordinated the evacuations of thousands of U.S. personnel and private citizens abroad and taken measures intended to protect its personnel around the world. The Coronavirus Preparedness and Response Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-123) appropriated an additional $264 million to the Diplomatic Programs account, to remain available through FY2022, for purposes that included maintaining consular operations, reimbursing evacuation expenses, and emergency preparedness. This law also amended P.L. 116-94 to allow the State Department to transfer an additional $90 million in previously appropriated funds for emergency evacuations. The CARES Act (P.L. 116-136) appropriated an additional $324 million to the Diplomatic Programs account for similar purposes stipulated in P.L. 116-123, while providing additional transfer authorities to fund evacuations. The FY2021 SFOPS appropriations law included $300 million appropriated through Title IX for consular operations, including the adjudication of passport and visa applications and services for American citizens abroad. The law also authorized the State Department to transfer funds appropriated elsewhere to fund consular operations, following consultation with Congress.[10] ARPA (P.L. 117-2) appropriated an additional $204 million for State Department operations generally. While consular operations are usually funded through consular fees and surcharges, including passport and visa fees, these revenues have declined considerably amid global travel restrictions imposed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Selected Programs and Priorities

Consistent with its previous requests, the majority of the funding the Trump Administration requested 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 FY2021, such programs comprised approximately 87.1% of the Trump Administration's request and 82.3% of the enacted appropriations Congress provided for these accounts. Some of the Trump Administration's priorities within these areas, as identified by the Department of State in its Congressional Budget Justification, 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

[10] See Section 7069(c) of P.L. 116-260.

- most domestic and overseas State Department personnel salaries;
- foreign policy programs administered by State Department regional bureaus, the Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, and others;
- public diplomacy programs; and
- the operations of the department's strategic and managerial units, including the Bureaus of Administration, Budget and Planning, and Legislative Affairs as well as the Office of the Chief of Protocol.[11]

The Trump Administration's FY2021 request for Diplomatic Programs totaled $8.49 billion, around 12.6% less than the $9.71 billion Congress provided for this account in FY2020 (this amount included $588 million Congress provided for Diplomatic Programs in FY2020 supplemental COVID-19 funds; see text box on the previous page for more detail). The Administration's request sought $138 million for the Global Engagement Center (GEC), which is responsible for leading interagency efforts to recognize, understand, expose, and counter foreign state and non-state propaganda and disinformation efforts aimed at undermining U.S. interests, including those carried out from Russia, China, and Iran.[12] The Administration maintained that this request, which would have significantly increased funding for the GEC from recent year levels that ranged from around $60-75 million, would have allowed the GEC to meet "the growing challenge of countering foreign propaganda and disinformation."[13]

The Trump Administration's request also included an intended realignment of personnel and funding from the Bureau of Global Talent Management (formerly the Bureau of Human Resources); the Bureau of Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance; and the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues to establish a new Bureau for Cyber Security and Emerging Technologies (CSET). The State Department first notified Congress of its intent to create this new bureau in June 2019. It was intended to be responsible for supporting "foreign policies and initiatives to promote U.S. cyber and emerging technology policies and deter adversaries from malicious and destabilizing behavior in their use and application of such technologies."[14] Some observers, including some Members of Congress, criticized elements of the State Department's plan for CSET, arguing that additional cyber-related matters such as global internet governance and digital economy issues should have been included in the bureau's remit.[15]

The House legislation, H.R. 7608, included $10.14 billion for Diplomatic Programs, $955 million of which was designated "to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus," including with regard to evacuation expenses, emergency preparedness, and maintaining consular operations. This figure would have totaled 4.4% more than the FY2020 enacted level for this account and 19.4% more than the Administration's request. The report accompanying this legislation (H.Rept. 116-444) noted support for the GEC's work and stated that the GEC's operating plan submitted to

[11] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification: Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Year 2021*, February 10, 2020, pp. 10-18.

[12] U.S. Department of State, "Global Engagement Center," https://www.state.gov/bureaus-offices/under-secretary-for-public-diplomacy-and-public-affairs/global-engagement-center/.

[13] Testimony of Special Envoy & Coordinator for the Global Engagement Center Lea Gabrielle before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development, March 5, 2020, https://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/030520_Gabrielle_Testimony.pdf.

[14] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 11.

[15] Sean Lyngaas, "State Department proposes new $20.8 million cybersecurity bureau," *Cyberscoop*, June 5, 2019, at https://www.cyberscoop.com/state-department-proposes-new-20-8-million-cybersecurity-bureau/.

Congress should describe its coordination with DOD regarding the proposed use of all FY2021 funding.[16] The House bill did not directly address the CSET bureau.

The enacted omnibus appropriation included $9.32 billion for Diplomatic Programs. This figure marked a decline of 4.1% relative to the FY2020 enacted level yet totaled 9.8% more than the Trump Administration's FY2021 request. It also amounted to 8.1% less than what would have been provided had the House bill been enacted. The joint explanatory statement accompanying P.L. 116-260 stated that the law provided funding up to the FY2020 level for the GEC.[17] This language indicates that Congress rejected the State Department's request to increase GEC funding from the FY2020 level of $62 million. Like the House bill, the final appropriations law did not include any specific language regarding the use of appropriated funds to stand up the new CSET bureau. While former Secretary of State Mike Pompeo formally approved the creation of CSET on January 7, 2021, despite ongoing congressional concerns described above, the Biden Administration may choose to review the CSET bureau's mission and scope of responsibility.[18]

Diplomatic Security

For FY2021, the Trump Administration requested around $5.38 billion for the State Department's key diplomatic security accounts: $3.70 billion for the Worldwide Security Protection (WSP) allocation within the Diplomatic Programs account and $1.68 billion for the Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance (ESCM) account. The Administration's request represented a decrease of 11.4% from the FY2020 enacted funding level (see **Table 4**).

Table 4. Diplomatic Security Annual Appropriations, FY2019-FY2021

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

Account	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
Worldwide Security Protection	4.10	4.10	3.70	-9.8%	4.10	*4.12*	0.6%
Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance	1.98	1.98	1.68	-14.8%	1.98	1.95	-1.3%
Diplomatic Security (total)	**6.08**	**6.08**	**5.38**	**-11.4%**	**6.08**	**6.07**	**0%**[a]

Sources: FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; H.R. 7608; P.L. 116-260; CRS calculations. Does not include funds provided in P.L. 117-2 (ARPA).

[16] U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2021*, report to accompany H.R. 7608, 116th Cong., 1nd sess., H.Rept. 116-444, (Washington, DC: GPO, 2020). pp. 14-15.

[17] Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying Division K of P.L. 116-260, p. 8.

[18] U.S. Department of State, "Secretary Pompeo Approves New Cyberspace Security and Emerging Technologies Bureau," January 7, 2021, https://2017-2021.state.gov/secretary-pompeo-approves-new-cyberspace-security-and-emerging-technologies-bureau//index.html.

Notes: Percentage changes may not reflect numbers included in this table due to rounding. Annual appropriations data do not reflect available carryover funds.[19]

a. Aggregate funding appropriated to the diplomatic security accounts in both FY2020 and FY2021 totaled $6,071,348,000. However, rounding the disaggregated funding levels for the WSP allocation and the ESCM account, which slightly differed across these two fiscal years, made it appear that the aggregate funding levels were not identical.

The Trump Administration proposed that Congress decouple WSP from Diplomatic Programs and establish a standalone WSP account (see text box). WSP funds the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS), which is responsible for implementing the department's security programs to protect U.S. embassies and other overseas posts, diplomatic residences, and domestic State Department offices. In addition, WSP supports many of the State Department's security and emergency response programs, including those pertaining to operational medicine and security and crisis management training.[20] The ESCM account funds the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations (OBO), which is responsible for providing U.S. diplomatic and consular missions overseas with secure, functional, and resilient facilities and managing nonmilitary U.S. government property abroad.[21]

The Trump Administration's WSP-funded priorities for FY2021 included the hiring of an additional 110 special agents at DS, which the Administration maintained was necessary to address critical overseas vacancies. In addition, the Administration sought funding to deploy High Definition Secure Video Systems (HDSVS) at overseas posts worldwide. The Administration stated these systems would provide enhanced monitoring capabilities, including greater video resolution and enhanced nighttime visibility.[22]

The Trump Administration's ESCM request included $866.67 million for the State Department's share of the Capital Security Cost Sharing and Maintenance Cost Sharing Programs (CSCS/MCS), which fund the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of the United States' overseas diplomatic posts. The Administration maintained that this request, when combined with funds contributed by other agencies with overseas personnel and visa fee revenues, would fund these programs at the $2.20 billion level recommended by the Benghazi Accountability Review Board.[23] Construction projects the Administration sought to fund through this request included a new embassy

Proposed Standalone WSP Account

The Worldwide Security Protection (WSP) subaccount 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. Similar to the FY2020 request, the FY2021 proposal requested that Congress 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 FY2022 (October 1, 2021). The Trump Administration maintained that creating this account will increase the transparency of WSP expenditures by more clearly disaggregating funding for diplomatic programs from that for security-related activities. Congress refrained from implementing the Administration's request in the FY2021 SFOPS appropriations law.

[19] 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.

[20] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 14.

[21] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification, Appendix 1: Department of State Diplomatic Engagement, Fiscal Year 2021*, February 10, 2020, p. 328.

[22] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 14.

[23] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification, Appendix 1: Department of State Diplomatic*

compound in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, and new consulate compounds in Adana, Turkey, and Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.[24]

The House legislation (H.R. 7608), if enacted, would have provided a total of $6.08 billion for the State Department's diplomatic security accounts. This figure was equal to the FY2020 enacted level for these accounts and totaled 13.0% more than the Trump Administration's request (see **Table 4**).[25] H.Rept. 116-444 stated that this funding included resources to deploy HDSVS at overseas posts worldwide and hire 110 new DS agents, as requested by the Administration.[26] The House legislation did not seek to implement the Administration's request for a standalone WSP account.

The enacted FY2021 appropriations law provided $4.12 billion for WSP and $1.95 billion for ESCM, for a total of approximately $6.07 billion in diplomatic security funding. This aggregate funding level exceeded the Trump Administration's request by about 12.9% and was equal to both the funding level that would have been provided in the House bill and the FY2020 appropriation. While the aggregate funding levels were equal, the FY2021 enacted appropriation provided more funding for WSP and less funding for ESCM than the House bill and the FY2020 appropriation. Like the House bill, the enacted appropriation did not provide for the creation of a standalone WSP account, as requested by the Administration. The joint explanatory statement accompanying this law maintained the language provided in H.Rept. 116-444 regarding funding for the deployment of HDSVS and the hiring of additional DS agents. The joint explanatory statement also recommended a State Department contribution of $1.07 billion to the CSCS and MCS programs, which totaled 23.0% more than the intended contribution included in the Administration's request.[27] However, as in previous years, the Department of State and other stakeholders were authorized to determine the annual funding level and contributions for all agencies.[28]

Assessed Contributions to International Organizations and Peacekeeping Missions

The Contributions to International Organizations (CIO) account is the funding vehicle for the United States' payments of its assessed contributions (membership dues) to over 40 organizations. These include the United Nations (U.N.) and its specialized agencies (among them, the World Health Organization, or WHO), inter-American organizations such as the Organization of American States, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), among others.[29] U.S.

Engagement, pp. 1-2.

[24] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification, Appendix 1: Department of State Diplomatic Engagement,* p. 331.

[25] While H.R. 7608 and P.L. 116-94 provide identical overall funding levels for the diplomatic security accounts, H.R. 7608 provides $200,000 more in OCO funding for ESCM, with a corresponding $200,000 decrease in ESCM base budget funding.

[26] House Committee on Appropriations, *State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2021*, p. 13.

[27] Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying Division K of P.L. 116-260, p. 16.

[28] For example, see Section 7004(b) of P.L. 116-260. The State Department submits its planned contributions to the CSCS and MCS programs, and the total funding levels for these programs, as part of the annual Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance account operating plans that it is required by law to provide to Congress pursuant to annual appropriations laws. For example, see Sec. 7061 of P.L. 116-260.

[29] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, pp. 40-41. On April 14, 2020, President Donald Trump announced that the United States would suspend funding to the World Health Organization (WHO), pending a

funding to international organizations is also provided through the various SFOPS multilateral assistance accounts, as described in the "Foreign Operations Highlights" section of this report. Separately, the United States pays its assessed contributions to most U.N. peacekeeping missions through the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Operations (CIPA) account.[30]

For FY2021, the Trump Administration requested a combined $2.05 billion for these accounts. If enacted, this funding level would have marked a 31.8% cut from that provided by Congress for FY2020. **Table 5** shows recent funding levels for each account.

Table 5. U.S. Payments of Assessments to International Organizations and Peacekeeping Missions, FY2019-FY2021

(In billions of current U.S. dollars; includes OCO funds)

Account	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
Contributions to International Organizations	1.36	1.47	0.97	-34.4%	1.51	1.51	2.2%
Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities	1.55	1.53	1.08	-29.3%	1.46	1.46	-4.6%
Total	**2.91**	**3.00**	**2.05**	**-31.8%**	**2.97**	**2.97**	**-1.3%**

Sources: FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; H.R. 7608; P.L. 116-260; CRS calculations. Does not include funds provided in P.L. 117-2 (ARPA).

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

Similar to previous budget requests, the Trump Administration's CIO request prioritized paying assessments to international organizations "whose missions substantially advance U.S. foreign policy interests" while proposing funding cuts to those organizations whose work it said either did not directly affect U.S. national security interests or rendered unclear results.[31] With these intentions in mind, the Administration proposed to decrease payments to the U.N. regular budget and specialized agency funding by around one-third.[32] The request intended to maintain near-recent-year levels of U.S. funding for other organizations, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).[33]

For CIPA, the Trump Administration's FY2021 request reflected its commitment to reduce costs for U.N. peacekeeping missions by reevaluating their respective mandates, design, and implementation. The Administration stated that its request, when combined with the application

60- to 90-day review, because of WHO's "role in severely mismanaging and covering up the spread of the coronavirus." For more information, see CRS Insight IN11369, *U.S. Funding to the World Health Organization (WHO)*, by Luisa Blanchfield and Tiaji Salaam-Blyther.

[30] Successive Administrations have also requested funds for the U.N. Support office in Somalia (UNSOS) under the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account. However, Congress generally has appropriated funds for UNSOS through the Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) account.

[31] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 40.

[32] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 41.

[33] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 41.

of U.N. peacekeeping credits (excess funds from previous U.N. peacekeeping missions), would have allowed the United States to provide 25% of all assessed global funding for U.N. peacekeeping missions, which is equal to the statutory cap established by Congress.[34] However, the current U.S. assessment for U.N. peacekeeping (last negotiated in 2018) is 27.9%, meaning that around $345 million of anticipated U.S. assessed funding would have been carried over into arrears.[35] This practice has resulted in the accumulation of over $1 billion in U.S. peacekeeping arrearages since FY2017.[36]

If enacted, the House legislation would have provided $2.97 billion for CIO and CIPA, a decrease of 1.0% from the FY2020 enacted figure and an increase of 44.9% from the Trump Administration's request (see **Table 5**). For CIO, it sought to ensure that not less than $118.95 million was made available to the World Health Organization (WHO) and not less than $53.91 million was made available to NATO. While the Trump Administration notified Congress of its intent to withdraw from the WHO, the House legislation would have prevented the use of any funds made available by the act for this purpose.[37] With regard to CIPA, the House legislation included authority to allow the Secretary of State to exceed the 25% statutory cap with respect to payment of U.S. assessed contributions to peacekeeping missions. This was intended to limit the further accumulation of arrears.[38]

The FY2021 appropriations law provided a combined total of $2.96 billion for CIO and CIPA, which is 44.8% more than the Trump Administration's request and identical to the amount in the House proposal. The enacted law did not include the aforementioned House bill provisions providing line item funding to the WHO and NATO and prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to withdraw the United States from the WHO. This may owe in part to then-President-elect Biden's pledge to retract the United States' intent to withdraw from the WHO.[39] The law also provided the funding necessary to pay the full U.S. assessment to the U.N. regular budget.[40] For CIPA, the joint explanatory statement noted that sufficient funds were provided for United States contributions to peacekeeping missions at the 25% statutory cap.[41] The law permitted the payment of peacekeeping arrears with appropriated funds, provided that the State Department consult with Congress prior to using appropriated funds for this purpose.

[34] See Section 404 of P.L. 103-236.

[35] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 43.

[36] Over the years, the gap between the actual U.S. peacekeeping assessment and the 25% statutory cap led to 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 to fund outstanding U.S. balances. For several years, these actions allowed the United States to pay its peacekeeping assessments in full. However, since FY2017 Congress has declined to raise the cap, and in mid-2017, the Trump Administration began the ongoing practice of allowing the application of peacekeeping credits up to, but not beyond, the 25% cap. For more information, see CRS In Focus IF10597, *United Nations Issues: U.S. Funding of U.N. Peacekeeping*, by Luisa Blanchfield.

[37] See Section 9015 of H.R. 7608.

[38] House Committee on Appropriations, *State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2021*, p. 31.

[39] After his inauguration, President Biden implemented this pledge. See letter from President Joseph R. Biden, Jr. to Mr. António Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations, January 20, 2021, https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/01/20/letter-his-excellency-antonio-guterres/. See also Jamey Keaten, "Biden's US revives support for WHO, reversing Trump retreat," *Associated Press*, January 21, 2021.

[40] Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying Division K of P.L. 116-260, p. 18.

[41] Joint Explanatory Statement Accompanying Division K of P.L. 116-260, p. 10.

Foreign Operations Highlights

The foreign operations accounts in the SFOPS appropriation compose the majority of U.S. foreign assistance included in the international affairs budget; the remainder is enacted in the agriculture appropriation, which provides funding for the Food for Peace Act, Title II and McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition programs.[42] The Trump Administration's FY2021 foreign operations request totaled $30.09 billion, representing a 3.7% increase from the Administration's FY2020 request and a 25.7% decrease from FY2020-enacted levels. Total foreign assistance requested for FY2021, including the food assistance funds provided in the agriculture appropriation, would have represented a 29.1% reduction from FY2020-enacted levels.

The Trump Administration's budget request articulated five primary goals for U.S. foreign assistance that were meant to align with the National Security Strategy and the State-USAID Joint Strategic Plan:

- prioritize global strategic challenges, including countering Chinese, Russian, and Iranian influence;
- support strategic partners and allies, including Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Colombia, and Venezuela;[43]
- enhance commitment to long-term development;
- strengthen key areas of U.S. leadership, to include global health and humanitarian assistance; and
- advance U.S. national security and economic interests.[44]

These goals were also meant to guide the Trump Administration's regional thematic priorities (see "Country and Regional Assistance"), as well as how funds would be allocated across assistance types. The Administration's FY2021 budget request proposed cuts in nearly all assistance types (**Table 6**). The only exception was export promotion assistance, which would have seen a significant increase, largely due to proposed funding for the new U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (DFC), and an estimated increase in offsetting collections from the Export-Import Bank.[45]

The House legislation, H.R. 7608, included a total of $48.64 billion for foreign operations, an increase of 19.5% from FY2020 enacted levels and a 61.7% increase from the Trump Administration's request. This steep increase over FY2020 funding could largely be attributed to the $9.06 billion in emergency funding appropriated to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus" abroad.[46]

The omnibus appropriation, P.L. 116-260, provided $44.22 billion for foreign operations, an 8.7% increase from FY2020 enacted levels and a 47.0% increase from the Trump Administration's

[42] For more information on international food assistance programs, see CRS Report R45422, *U.S. International Food Assistance: An Overview*, by Alyssa R. Casey.

[43] According to the Trump Administration, support for Venezuela would include "bilateral democracy and health assistance for Venezuelans, as well as assistance for Venezuelans fleeing their country and for the communities hosting them." Further, the Administration maintained that it includes flexibility in programming to "support a democratic transition and related needs in Venezuela should circumstances warrant." U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 75.

[44] Documents provided by the State Department at budget roll-out briefings, February 10, 2020.

[45] U.S. Department of State, *Congressional Budget Justification*, p. 108.

[46] H.R. 7608.

FY2021 request. Some of the increase may be attributed to emergency funding appropriated in Title IX of SFOPS, which was designated for COVID-19 response, including for vaccine procurement and distribution, and assistance to Sudan.

In March 2021, Congress provided an additional $9.80 billion in foreign operations funding through ARPA to address COVID-19 abroad. Funds were not divided among regular appropriations accounts; rather sections cited certain authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and designated funds for a range of activities. According to the legislation, foreign operations funds are intended to support global health programs, international disaster relief, and contributions to multilateral COVID-19 responses, among others.

Table 6. Foreign Operations, by Type, FY2019-FY2021

(In billions of U.S. dollars)

Type	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
USAID Administration	1.67	1.76	1.59	-9.5%	1.79	1.71	-2.71%
Global Health Programs	8.87	9.53	6.00	-37.1%	11.66	13.20	38.50%
Non-Health Development Assistance (includes Treasury TA, excludes ind. agencies)	8.10	8.13	6.15	-24.3%	11.47	8.89	9.35%
Humanitarian Assistance	7.82	8.74	6.27	-28.3%	10.08	7.83	-10.39%
Independent Agencies	1.37	1.47	1.21	-17.9%	1.41	1.39	-5.46%
Security Assistance	9.15	9.01	7.73	-14.2%	9.02	9.00	-0.11%
Multilateral Assistance	1.85	2.08	1.48	-28.9%	3.32	2.04	-1.99%
Export Promotion	-0.16	-0.02	-0.34	1379.3%	-1.00	0.16	-797.37%
Foreign Operations Total, pre ARPA	**40.39**	**40.70**	**30.09**	**-26.1%**	**48.64**	**44.22**	**8.67%**
ARPA Emergency Funds	-	-	-	-	-	9.80	-
Foreign Operations Total, with ARPA	**40.39**	**40.70**	**30.09**	**-26.1%**	**48.64**	**54.02**	**11.05%**

Sources: P.L. 116-260**;** H.R. 7608; FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; P.L. 116-123; P.L. 116-136; P.L. 117-2; CRS calculations.

Notes: FY2020-enacted includes funds from the first and third supplemental appropriations for the novel coronavirus (P.L. 116-123 and, respectively). Export promotion totals are negative because offsetting collections from the Export-Import Bank and the Development Finance Corporation are anticipated to exceed appropriations, as they have in past years, resulting in a net budget gain.

Key Sectors

Consistent with prior year funding and the FY2020 enacted levels, proposed funding for global health programs, humanitarian assistance, and security assistance comprised approximately two-thirds of the $30.09 billion FY2021 foreign operations budget request (**Figure 3**).

Figure 3. Foreign Operations, by Type, FY2021 Request



Source: FY2021 SFOPS CBJ.

Global Health Programs

The total FY2021 request for the Global Health Programs (GHP) account was nearly $6.00 billion, representing a 5.4% reduction from the FY2020 budget request and a 37.5% reduction from the FY2020-enacted level, including supplemental appropriations. When compared with FY2020-enacted levels before enactment of supplemental funding for COVID-19, all but one GHP subaccount would have been reduced under the budget proposal (**Table 7**).

Requested cuts to GHP subaccounts ranged from 8.0% for malaria programs to 100% for USAID's HIV/AIDS and vulnerable children subaccounts. The Trump Administration asserted that despite its proposed reduction to HIV/AIDS funding, the requested level would have been sufficient to maintain treatment for all current recipients. The proposal also reflected the Administration's effort to limit U.S. contributions to the Global Fund—an international financing mechanism for efforts to combat AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria—to 25% of all donations, rather than the 33% limit that the United States has provided since the George W. Bush Administration.

Table 7. Global Health Programs, by Subaccount, FY2019-FY2021

(In millions of U.S. dollars)

Subaccount	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
State HIV/AIDS	4,370.0	4,370.0	3,180.3	-27.2%	4,370.0	4,370.0	0.0%
Global Fund	1,350.0	1,560.0	657.7	-57.8%	1,560.0	1,560.0	0.0%
USAID HIV/AIDS	330.0	330.0	0.0	-100.0%	330.0	330.0	0.0%
USAID Malaria	755.0	770.0	708.5	-8.0%	755.0	770.0	0.0%
USAID Maternal and Child Health	835.0	851.0	659.6	-22.5%	850.0	855.5	0.5%

Subaccount	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
USAID Family Planning/ Reproductive Health[a]	556.5	524.0	237.0	-54.8%	585.5	524.0	0.0%
USAID Nutrition	145.0	150.0	90.0	-40.0%	145.0	150.0	0.0%
USAID Tuberculosis	302.0	310.0	275.0	-11.3%	310.0	319.0	2.9%
Pandemic Influenza/Other[b] ***[of which supplemental]***	100.0	535.0 *[435.0]*	115.0	-78.5%	125.0	190.0	-64.5%
Neglected Tropical Diseases	102.5	102.5	75.0	-26.8%	102.5	102.5	0.0%
Vulnerable Children	24.0	25.0	0.0	-100.0%	24.0	25.0	0.0%
COVID-19	—	—	—	—	2,500.0[c]	4,000.0[d]	—
GHP Total	**8,870.0**	**9,527.5**	**5,998.1**	**-37.5%**	**11,657.0**	**13,196.0**	**38.5%**

Source: P.L. 116-260**;** H.R. 7608; FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; P.L. 116-123; CRS calculations. Does not include funds provided in P.L. 117-2 (ARPA).

a. FY2019 actual reflects a $32.5 million transfer from the International Organizations and Programs (IO&P) account.

b. FY2020 enacted includes funds from the first supplemental appropriation for the novel coronavirus (P.L. 116-123).

c. The FY2021 House measure includes $2.50 billion in emergency GHP funding to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus." These funds would be administered by USAID. Of the appropriated funds, Congress designated $150.0 million for the Emergency Response Fund, $750.0 million for GAVI, and $800.0 million for the Global Fund (P.L. 116-123).

d. FY2021 enacted includes $4.00 billion in emergency GHP funding to "prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, including for vaccine procurement and delivery."

As noted above, the Trump Administration's FY2021 request did not include funds for COVID-19, because the request was prepared prior to the outbreak. Congress enacted, and the President signed into law, one supplemental appropriations act that included global health funding for COVID-19 preparedness and response in March 2020 (P.L. 116-123). The Trump Administration did not submit a request for additional FY2021 funds to combat the virus.[47]

The House legislation, H.R. 7608, would have represented a 22.4% increase over FY2020 enacted levels and nearly doubled the Trump Administration's proposed global health funding level. However, much like the overall funding for foreign operations, this steep increase over FY2020 funding was largely a result of the House's $2.5 billion in emergency GHP funds to address COVID-19 abroad.

The final FY2021 GHP levels represented a 38.5% increase over FY2020 enacted levels. Most GHP subaccounts maintained or saw modest increases from FY2020 enacted levels. The overall increase is therefore primarily a result of $4 billion in emergency funding for COVID-19 that was not allocated by subaccount and is largely directed for vaccine procurement and distribution.

[47] For more information on the U.S. response to COVID-19, see CRS In Focus IF11421, *COVID-19: Global Implications and Responses*, by Sara M. Tharakan et al.

Through ARPA, Congress provided at least $4.66 billion for global health activities, including a contribution to the Global Fund. However, Congress provided these funds citing Economic Support Fund (ESF) authorities. It is unclear if the funds will be channeled through the ESF appropriations account or transferred to the GHP account prior to their obligation.

Humanitarian Assistance

The FY2021 budget request for humanitarian assistance was nearly $6.27 billion, roughly equivalent to the FY2020 request but down 40.1% from the FY2020-enacted level of $10.46 billion.[48] In successive years, the Trump Administration requested levels of humanitarian assistance far lower than those enacted the prior year, 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. On a bipartisan basis, for many years, Congress consistently supported global humanitarian efforts through appropriation levels well above the budget request (**Figure 4**).

Figure 4. Humanitarian Assistance Budget Requests and Enacted Funding, by Account, FY2013-FY2021

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)



Sources: P.L. 116-260; FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; P.L. 116-123; P.L. 116-136; CRS calculations. Does not include funds provided in P.L. 117-2 (ARPA).

Notes: "Request" and "Actual" totals sourced from the most recent U.S. Department of State Congressional Budget Justification in which they appeared. This figure includes Food for Peace Act, Title II funds, which are part of the agriculture appropriation, to illustrate the full scope of humanitarian assistance.

[48] Total FY2020-enacted funding includes supplemental funds enacted in two COVID-19 supplemental appropriations and Food for Peace Act, Title II funds, which are part of the Agriculture appropriation.

Accounts: MRA = Migration and Refugee Assistance, IDA = International Disaster Assistance, ERMA = Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance, FFP = Food for Peace Act, Title II, and IHA = International Humanitarian Assistance.

In addition to the proposed $6.27 billion in new funding for humanitarian assistance, the Trump Administration's request assumed $2.80 billion in carryover funding from past-year humanitarian assistance. The Administration asserted that the FY2021 request, combined with the estimated carryover, totaled close to $9.00 billion, which would allow the United States "to program well above the second highest level ever, and is sufficient to address the needs for Syria, Yemen, and other crisis areas."[49]

The House legislation included $11.85 billion in humanitarian assistance, including $2.25 billion in emergency funding to address COVID-19 in humanitarian contexts and $1.78 billion in Food for Peace Act, Title II funds. This level represented a 13% increase from FY2020 enacted levels and an 89.0% increase from the Trump Administration's proposal.

The omnibus legislation included $9.57 billion in humanitarian assistance, including $1.74 billion in Food for Peace Act, Title II funds. This level represents a modest increase (0.2%) over FY2020 enacted levels, not including supplemental funds that had been enacted to address COVID-19 abroad.

ARPA included at least $4.39 billion in humanitarian assistance, including $800 million for Food for Peace Act, Title II activities. Of those funds, Congress provided $3.09 billion using ESF authorities but designated those funds for "international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, for health activities, and to meet emergency food security needs." It is unclear whether the funds will be channeled through the ESF appropriations account or transferred to humanitarian accounts such as IDA prior to their use.

Proposed Humanitarian Account Consolidation

For FY2021, as in FY2020, the Trump Administration proposed to fund all humanitarian assistance through a single International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) account managed through USAID's new Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA). The Administration justified the restructuring as necessary "to optimize humanitarian assistance, prioritize funding, and use funding as effectively and efficiently as possible."[50] The proposal would effectively have moved the administration of overseas refugee and migration assistance funding—currently funded through the Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA) and Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance (ERMA) accounts—from the State Department to USAID.[51] In FY2020, enacted funding for these accounts totaled $3.78 billion. The budget request would have eliminated the ERMA account and significantly reduced funding to MRA, with none for overseas needs. Within USAID, the BHA is in the process of combining the functions of the Offices of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance and Food for Peace. The budget request would have eliminated the International Disaster Assistance (IDA) account (FY2020-enacted funding totaled $4.95 billion),

[49] FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, p. 80.

[50] In FY2020, the Trump Administration proposed a "senior dual-hat leader" under the authority of the Secretary of State but reporting to both the Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator, which appears to have been replaced by "leveraging the comparative strengths of the Department of State and USAID under the authority of the Secretary of State." FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, p. 80.

[51] There was no funding requested in the Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA) account for overseas humanitarian needs. However, the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) would have retained $299.21 million in MRA funding to support U.S. refugee admissions, Humanitarian Migrants to Israel, and PRM administrative expenses, as well as other activities such as policy oversight and diplomatic engagement. Transfer authority would reportedly have allowed funding to move from IHA to MRA should the MRA funds be insufficient.

as well as Food for Peace Act, Title II emergency food assistance funding, the latter of which is currently appropriated through the agriculture appropriation but administered by USAID (FY2020-enacted funding totaled $1.73 billion). Funds previously requested in these accounts would have been consolidated into the IHA account.

The House legislation did not adopt the Trump Administration's IHA proposal. The accompanying report, H.Rept. 116-444, noted that the "Committee does not support the consolidation of all overseas humanitarian assistance into a single account." Instead, the bill would have appropriated funds in the traditional account structure.

Security Assistance

The Trump Administration requested $7.73 billion in international security assistance for FY2021, an increase of 4.3% from the FY2020 request and 14.3% below the FY2020-enacted level. The greatest cuts to security assistance accounts would have been to Peacekeeping Operations (PKO, -36.6%) and International Military Education and Training (IMET, -27.4%) (**Figure 5**).[52]

Figure 5. Security Assistance, by Account, FY2019-FY2021

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)



Sources: P.L. 116-260; H.R. 7608 FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; CRS calculations.

Notes: FMF = Foreign Military Financing; IMET = International Military Education and Training; PKO = Peacekeeping Operations; NADR = Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs; INCLE = International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement.

Consistent with prior year requests and appropriations, the majority of security assistance ($5.19 billion) would have been for Foreign Military Financing (FMF) to the Middle East, including $3.30 billion in grants to Israel. As in the Trump Administration's past three budget proposals, the

[52] FY2021 PKO request figures include funds for the U.N. Support office in Somalia (UNSOS), which successive Administrations have requested under the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account, but Congress generally has appropriated through the Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) account.

FY2021 request sought flexibility 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 this authority would both "expand the tools available to the United States to help NATO and Major-Non NATO allies[53] purchase more American-made defense equipment and related services" and "increase burden sharing by asking these partners to contribute more national funds to foreign military sales cases."[54]

The House legislation included $9.02 billion in security assistance, which was essentially level with FY2020 enacted funding but represented a 16.6% increase from the Trump Administration's proposal. The enacted omnibus legislation provided $9.00 billion in security assistance, a slight decrease from FY2020 enacted funding but a 10.9% increase from the Administration's request.

Development Assistance and Export Promotion

The remaining third of the FY2021 foreign operations request proposed to allocate funds to non-health development sectors as well as to independent agencies, multilateral assistance, and export promotion agencies.

Development Assistance

The FY2021 budget request would have reduced funding from FY2020-enacted levels in a number of development sectors (**Table 8**). Environment-focused aid, for example, would have been cut by 86.3%, while funding for education and water and sanitation would have declined by 61.2%. As with the FY2020 request, the FY2021 request included a significant increase from prior year-enacted funding levels for women's economic empowerment programming, largely due to a proposed $200.00 million for the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative (W-GDP).[55]

The House legislation, H.R. 7608, if enacted, would have kept level or increased all development sectors when compared to FY2020 enacted levels and would have represented an increase in all sectors when compared to the Trump Administration's request, with the exception of gender-related and trafficking in persons programs. When compared to FY2020 enacted levels, the greatest increases in funding would have been to environmental and gender programming.

The omnibus legislation, P.L. 116-260, kept level or increased funding for all development sectors when compared to FY2020 enacted appropriations. The largest increases were to gender and trafficking in persons programs, which saw 69.5% and 47.8% increases, respectively, from FY2020 enacted levels (**Table 8**). Within the funds designated for gender programs, Congress fulfilled the Trump Administration's request for $200.00 million for W-GDP.[56]

[53] Major non-NATO allies are designated by the President, in accordance with 22 U.S.C. §2321k.

[54] FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, p. 99.

[55] The Trump Administration launched the W-GDP Initiative in February 2019. The Initiative aims to "reach 50 million women in the developing world by 2025 through U.S. government activities, private-public partnerships, and a new, innovative fund" (https://www.whitehouse.gov/wgdp/).

[56] Congress designated FY2020 and FY2021 funds for W-GDP using a ceiling: in FY2021 Congress designated "up to" $200 million for this purpose, in contrast with the "no less than" directive used for the other allocations noted in Table 8. This language offers administering agencies the flexibility to determine (in consultation with the Appropriations Committees) the actual amount of funding as long as it does not exceed adheres to the funding ceiling. In practice, this also means that the FY2021 actual level for W-GDP could end up being less than the actual amount provided in FY2020.

Congress provided additional funding for development assistance in ARPA. As explained above, Congress cited ESF authorities for the majority of the foreign operations funds. However, the stated priorities for those funds largely align with other appropriations accounts (e.g., $905 million is directed toward "United States Agency for International Development for global health activities to prevent, prepare for, and respond to coronavirus, which shall include a contribution to a multilateral vaccine development partnership to support epidemic preparedness.") As such, it is unclear whether or not the ARPA funds will be obligated and expended through the ESF appropriations account.

Table 8. Select Development Sectors, FY2019-FY2021

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)

Sector	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted	FY2021 Request	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 request	FY2021 House	FY2021 Enacted	% change, FY20 enacted to FY21 enacted
Democracy Programs (excluding NED)	2,400.0	2,400.0	1,551.4	-35.4%	2,400.5	2,417.0	0.7%
Education (basic and higher)	1,035.0	1,110.0	430.5	-61.2%	1,210.0	1,185.0	6.7%
Food Security	1,000.6	1,005.6	506.1	-49.7%	1,005.6	1,010.6	0.5%
Environment	500.7	906.7	124.6	-86.3%	1,306.0	986.7	8.8%
Economic Growth	n.a.	n.a.	2,194.0	n.a.	—	—	n.a.
Water and Sanitation	435.0	450.0	174.5	-61.2%	450.0	450.0	0.0%
Gender	215.0	330.0	525.7	59.3%	460.0	560.0	69.7%
Trafficking in Persons	67.0	67.0	77.4	15.5%	67.0	99.0	47.8%
Micro and Small Enterprise	265.0	265.0	144.2	-45.6%	265.0	265.0	0.0%
Diplomatic Progress Fund	n.a.	n.a.	200.0	n.a.	—	—	n.a.

Sources: P.L. 116-260; H.R. 7608**;** FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; P.L. 116-94; CRS calculations. Does not include funds provided in P.L. 117-2 (ARPA).

Note: n.a. = not applicable.

Proposed Economic Support and Development Fund

Under the FY2021 request, most development accounts—Development Assistance (DA); ESF; Assistance to Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia (AEECA); and the Democracy Fund (DF)—would have been combined into a single new Economic Support and Development Fund (ESDF). The Trump Administration asserted that this consolidated account would streamline the deployment of resources, increasing efficiency in foreign assistance. Because the consolidated account would have incorporated both core and shared USAID accounts, it was unclear what portion of the new account USAID would manage or implement. The Administration made a similar request in the FY2018, FY2019, and FY2020 budget requests, but Congress did not enact the proposals.

The FY2021 budget request nestled the Relief and Recovery Fund (RRF) and a proposed new Diplomatic Progress Fund (DPF)—both previously requested as separate budget items—under

the proposed ESDF account. According to the justification, the DPF would "allow the State Department and USAID to respond to new opportunities arising from progress in diplomatic and peace efforts around the world."[57] While Congress provided funds for the RRF in previous fiscal years, Congress did not accept the Trump Administration's proposal for the DPF.

The House legislation did not include ESDF, but rather continued the use of DA, ESF, AEECA, and DF. In addition, pursuant to the Global Fragility Act (Title V, Division J, P.L. 116-94) the House replaced the RRF with a new Prevention and Stabilization Fund (PSF). However, the funding level for the new PSF was $100.00 million, half of what was appropriated in FY2020 for the RRF. The House prohibited funding for the Trump Administration's proposed DPF.

As with the House legislation, the omnibus appropriation did not include ESDF and included $100.00 million for the PSF. Further, there was no mention of the Trump Administration's proposed DPF in the final legislation.

Independent Agencies

The Trump Administration's FY2021 request would have reduced funding to the Peace Corps (-19.5%) and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (-11.6%). The request also proposed eliminating the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) and the U.S African Development Foundation (USADF), and incorporating staff and small grant activities of the two foundations into USAID's new Bureau for Development, Democracy, and Innovation.[58] The Administration maintained that this consolidation would allow USAID to "capitalize on the existing expertise, capacity, relationships, and tools that USADF and IAF provide, including their regional and market segment emphases, in order to reinforce U.S. government bilateral development efforts."[59] To implement the shuttering of the IAF and USADF, the Administration requested $3.85 million and $4.66 million, respectively.

The House legislation would have provided level or increased funding for all independent agencies when compared to FY2020 enacted funding before FY2020 supplemental funding was passed for COVID-19.[60] The legislation also did not adopt the Trump Administration's proposal to eliminate the IAF and USADF. Rather, the House provided increased funding for the two agencies, including $10.00 million in emergency COVID-19 funding for each agency.

The omnibus appropriation provided level or increased funding for independent agencies when comparing to FY2020 enacted levels before supplemental appropriations were passed.[61] Congress also appropriated increased and level funds for the IAF and USADF, respectively.

Multilateral Assistance

SFOPS multilateral assistance accounts provide for U.S. payments to multilateral development banks and international organizations that pool funding from multiple donors to finance

[57] FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, p. 77.

[58] The Trump Administration was not the first to propose elimination of the Inter-American Foundation. In 1999, Congress passed legislation (P.L. 106-113, later amended by P.L. 106-429) that authorized the President during FY2000-FY2001 to abolish the Inter-American Foundation. However, the President did not exercise the authority during FY2000-FY2001.

[59] FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, pp. 85-86.

[60] The Peace Corps received $88 million in FY2020 supplemental appropriations (P.L. 116-136) to address COVID-19 abroad.

[61] Ibid.

development activities.[62] The Trump Administration's FY2021 request would have reduced these accounts by 28.9% from FY2020-enacted levels. As in the Trump Administration's three previous requests, the proposal would have eliminated funding 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 $390.50 million for IO&P in FY2020. The Administration also proposed eliminating funds for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). For the GEF, the Administration asserted that carryover funds from FY2019 and FY2020 appropriations were sufficient to meet the U.S. pledge to the GEF's seventh replenishment.[63]

The House legislation, if enacted, would have provided a total of $3.32 billion in multilateral assistance accounts, representing a 59.6% increase compared to FY2020 enacted levels and a 124.3% increase from the Trump Administration's request. This increase is largely due to the inclusion of $1.28 billion in emergency COVID-19 funding for the IO&P account.

The omnibus appropriation provided a total of $2.04 billion in multilateral assistance accounts, representing a 2.0% decrease from FY2020-enacted levels. The largest decrease was to funds for the International Development Association, which saw an 8.8% decrease from its FY2020 enacted appropriation. All other accounts were kept level or experienced a slight decrease with the exception of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, which saw an 8.3% increase from its FY2020 enacted funding.

Through ARPA, Congress provided an additional $580 million in multilateral assistance funding, citing the IO&P authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. Congress directed the funds "include support for the priorities and objectives of the United Nations Global Humanitarian Response Plan COVID–19 through voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs administered by such organizations."

Export Promotion

The FY2021 request included an increased investment in the U.S. Development Finance Corporation (DFC), established in 2019 to implement the BUILD Act.[64] However, the Trump Administration proposed eliminating funding for the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA)—the request included $12.11 million for the agency's "orderly closeout"—and an 8.3% reduction from FY2020-enacted levels for the Export-Import Bank of the United States' Operations account.[65] As in previous years, the Administration assumed that all export promotion expenditures would be offset by collections. In the FY2021 request, the Administration assumed $711.20 million and $496.00 million in offsetting collections from the Export-Import Bank and the DFC, respectively.

The House legislation would have provided level or increased funding for export promotion accounts when compared to both FY2020 enacted levels and the Trump Administration's request. The only exception was the DFC corporate capital account's administrative expenses subaccount, which would have received a 10.1% increase in funding when compared to FY2020 enacted levels but a 2.0% decrease when compared to the Administration's proposal. As in previous years,

[62] For more information on U.S. payments to multilateral development banks, see CRS Report RS20792, *Multilateral Development Banks: U.S. Contributions FY2000-FY2020*, by Rebecca M. Nelson.

[63] FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, p. 104.

[64] For more on the DFC's structure and operations, see CRS In Focus IF11436, *U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (DFC)*, by Shayerah Ilias Akhtar and Nick M. Brown.

[65] FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, p. 106.

the House assumed that all export promotion expenditures would be offset by collections. The House legislation also did not accept the Administration's proposal to shutter USTDA, and instead funded the agency at the same level as FY2020.

The enacted omnibus appropriation provided level funding for the Export-Import Bank's administrative expenses when compared to the FY2020 enacted level and increased funding for the Bank's Office of Inspector General. The legislation assumed that the Bank's expenditures would be offset by collections and would return $113.5 million to the Treasury. The legislation also provided increased funding for the DFC, particularly within its Corporate Capital Account, and assumed only some offsetting collections. As with the House legislation, the omnibus funded USTDA at the same level as FY2020.

Country and Regional Assistance

The Trump Administration organized much of its country and regional assistance into six thematic priorities (**Figure 6**). These priorities were also meant to reflect the broader foreign operations goals outlined in "Foreign Operations Highlights."

Figure 6. Regional Thematic Priorities, FY2021 Request



Source: Created by CRS using the Trump Administration's FY2021 budget rollout documents presented on February 10, 2020.

Note: This map does not capture all bilateral assistance included in the FY2021 request. Other countries would receive assistance but are not in the Trump Administration's calculations for these thematic priorities.

Top country recipients under the FY2021 request remained consistent with prior year funding allocations. Israel, Egypt, and Jordan would have remained the top three recipients of foreign assistance—though Egypt would move ahead of Jordan when compared with FY2019 actual funding—largely due to the proposed levels of military aid for those three countries. Other countries that the Trump Administration maintained were strategically significant, including Afghanistan and Ukraine, also remained top country recipients in the FY2021 request, as did

several African countries that would have received high levels of global health and development aid (**Table 9**).

Regionally, the Middle East and Africa would have received the largest shares of aid in the FY2021 request—together comprising about 71.5% of total aid allocated by country or region—consistent with FY2019 year actuals (**Figure 7**). Proposed funding for Europe and Eurasia and, separately, the Indo-Pacific, come to 3.9% and 9.2%, respectively. Notably, the distribution of assistance within regions varied significantly. For example, Africa received a majority of GHP funding (58.1% in FY2019 and a proposed 66.7% for FY2021), but accounted for a small proportion of INCLE funding (5.2% in FY2019 and a proposed 4.1% for FY2021). In comparison, the Western Hemisphere region accounted for a small percentage of GHP (2.5% in FY2019 and a proposed 2.2% for FY2021) and a large proportion of INCLE funds (37.7% in FY2019 and a proposed 44.8% for FY2021).

Table 9. Top Aid Recipients by Country, FY2019 Actual and FY2021 Request

(In millions of current U.S. dollars)

FY2019 Actual		FY2021 Request	
Israel	$3,300.0	Israel	$3,300.0
Jordan	$1,525.0	Egypt	$1,400.0
Egypt	$1,419.3	Jordan	$1,300.0
South Africa	$735.0	Nigeria	$472.1
Nigeria	$658.5	Mozambique	$456.5
Uganda	$487.4	Colombia	$412.9
Afghanistan	$476.5	Afghanistan	$371.8
Iraq	$451.5	Kenya	$330.4
Ukraine	$445.7	Tanzania	$328.7
Zambia	$442.9	Ukraine	$316.9

Sources: FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; FY2019 653(a) allocation charts provided by the State Department.

Note: This reflects only assistance that is requested at the country or regional level, not funds for global activities or humanitarian funds.

Figure 7. Proportional Aid, by Region, FY2019 Actual and FY2021 Request

(In billions of current U.S. dollars)



Source: FY2021 SFOPS CBJ.

The House legislation and report (H.R. 7608/H.Rept. 116-444) did not provide comprehensive regional allocations, but did specify assistance levels for several countries and regions. These included $3.31 billion for Israel, $1.53 billion for Jordan, $1.43 billion for Egypt, and $519.89 million for the Central America region, of which $420.79 million would have been directed to be used for the Northern Triangle countries (El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras). The legislation also included $457.25 million for Colombia, $453.00 million for Ukraine, and $290.00 million for the Countering Russian Influence Fund. The House bill would have maintained the use of a Countering Chinese Influence Fund but did not specify a funding level.

As with the House legislation, the omnibus and its joint explanatory statement did not provide comprehensive regional allocations. However, allocations were specified for some countries and regions. These included $3.31 billion for Israel, $1.65 billion for Jordan, $1.43 billion for Egypt, and $505.93 million for the Central America region. The legislation also designated $461.38

million for Colombia, $453.00 million for Ukraine, $290.00 million for the Countering Russian Influence Fund, and $300.00 million for the Countering Chinese Influence Fund. Finally, the legislation also made available monies for two new funds—a Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund and a People-to-People Partnership for Peace Fund—but did not specify funding levels for either.

Appendix A. SFOPS Funding, by Account

Table A-1. Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2019 Actual, FY2020 Enacted, and FY2021 Request, House-passed bill, and Enacted

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

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
Title I. State, Broadcasting & Related Agencies, TOTAL	16,536.59 (4,064.57)	17,312.18 (4,778.01)	14,034.56	-18.93%	17,562.65 (4,866.94)	17,290.19 (4,357.54)	-0.13%
Administration of Foreign Affairs, Subtotal	12,408.55 (2,979.67)	12,943.96 (3,693.11)	11,110.21	-14.17%	13,389.08 (4,064.71)	12,948.79 (3,555.31)	4.80%
Diplomatic Programs	9,253.95 (2,942.77)	9,713.69 (3,214.12)[bc]	8,489.89	-12.60%	10,143.20 (3,581.12)[d]	9,320.01 (2,376.12)[e]	-4.05%
(of which Worldwide Security Protection)	[4,095.90] (2,626.12)	[4,095.90] (2,626.12)	[3,695.41]	-9.78%	[4,095.90] (2,626.12)	[4,120.90] (2,226.12)	0.61%
Consular and Border Security Programs	—	—	—	—	—	300.00[e f]	—
Capital Investment Fund	92.77	139.50	256.70	84.01%	137.50	250.00	79.21%
Office of Inspector General	145.73 (54.90)	145.73 (54.90)	141.42	-2.96%	150.13 (59.30)[d]	145.73 (54.90)	0.00%
Ed. & Cultural Exchanges	700.95	730.70	310.00	-57.57%	741.70	740.30	1.31%
Representation Expenses	8.03	7.21	7.41	2.79%	7.42	7.42	2.81%
Protection of Foreign Missions & Officials	30.89	30.89	25.90	-16.15%	30.89	30.89	0.00%
Embassy Security, Construction & Maintenance	1,975.45	1,975.45 (424.09)	1,683.76	-14.78%	1,975.45	1,950.45 (824.29)	-1.27%
(of which Worldwide Security Upgrades)	[1,198.25]	[1,205.65] (424.09)	[941.66]	-21.90%	[1,205.65] (424.29)	[1,181.40] (824.49)	-2.01%

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
Emergency-Diplomatic & Consular Services	7.89	7.89	7.89	0.00%	7.89	7.89	0.00%
Repatriation Loans	1.30	1.30	1.30	0.00%	1.30	2.50	92.31%
Payment American Institute Taiwan	31.96	31.96	26.31	-17.68%	31.96	31.96	0.00%
International Chancery Center	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.00%	2.74	2.74	269.18%
Foreign Service Retirement (mandatory)	158.90	158.90	158.90	0.00%	158.90	158.90	0.00%
International Orgs, Subtotal	2,911.17 (1,084.90)	3,000.19 (1,084.90)	2,045.42	-31.82%	2,962.24 (802.23)	2,962.24 (802.23)	-1.26%
Contributions to Int'l Orgs	1,360.27 (96.24)	1,473.81 (96.24)	966.22	-34.44%	1,505.93 (96.24)	1,505.93 (96.24)	2.18%
Contributions, Int'l Peacekeeping	1,550.90 (988.66)	1,526.38 (988.66)	1,079.20	-29.30%	1,456.31 (705.99)	1,456.31 (705.99)	-4.59%
International Commissions, Subtotal (Function 300)	141.44	162.80	144.11	-11.48%	174.50	176.62	8.49%
Int'l Boundary/U.S.-Mexico	77.53	85.07	98.77	16.10%	98.77	98.77	16.10%
American Sections	13.26	15.01	10.66	-28.96%	15.01	15.01	0.00%
Int'l Fisheries	50.65	62.72	34.68	-44.71%	60.72	62.85	0.20%
Agency for Global Media, Subtotal	807.90	810.40	637.25	-21.37%	637.25	802.96	-0.92%
Broadcasting Operations	798.20	798.70	632.73	-20.78%	632.73	793.26	-0.68%
Capital Improvements	9.70	11.70	4.52	-61.37%	4.52	9.70	-17.09%
Related Programs, Subtotal	252.78	381.34	83.59	-78.08%	385.28	385.28	1.03%
Asia Foundation	17.00	19.00	—	-100.00%	20.00	20.00	5.26%
U.S. Institute for Peace	38.63	45.00	15.74	-65.02%	45.00	45.00	0.00%
Center for Middle East-West Dialogue	0.19	0.25	0.25	2.04%	0.25	0.25	2.04%

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
Eisenhower Exchange Programs	0.19	0.27	0.21	-22.59%	0.21	0.21	-22.59%
Israeli-Arab Scholarship Program	0.07	0.12	0.12	-4.03%	0.12	0.12	-4.03%
East-West Center	16.70	16.70	—	-100.00%	19.70	19.70	17.96%
Nat'l Endowment for Democracy	180.00	300.00	67.28	-77.58%	300.00	300.00	0.00%
Other Commissions, Subtotal	14.75	13.50	13.97	-3.46%	14.30	14.30	5.89%
Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad	0.68	0.68	0.64	-4.89%	0.64	0.64	-4.89%
Int'l Religious Freedom	4.50	4.50	4.50	—	4.50	4.50	0.00%
Security & Cooperation in Europe	2.58	2.58	2.58	—	2.91	2.91	12.76%
Cong.-Exec. Commission on People's Republic of China	2.00	2.25	2.25	—	2.25	2.25	0.00%
U.S.-China Economic and Security Review	3.50	3.50	4.00	14.29%	4.00	4.00	14.29%
Western Hem. Drug Policy Commission	1.50	0.00	—	—	—	—	—
Foreign Operations, TOTAL	**38,463.96 (3,935.43)**	**40,475.46 (5,869.46)**	**30,088.86**	**-25.66%**	**48,639.81 (13,151.61)**	**44,224.25 (9337.58)**	**9.26%**
Title II. Admin of Foreign Assistance	1,674.48 (158.07)	1,759.05 (96.00)	1,591.75	-9.51%	1,786.03 (108.00)	1,711.45	-2.71%
USAID Operating Expenses	1,372.88 (158.07)	1,472.25 (95.00)[c]	1,311.87	-10.89%	1,469.53 (105.00)[d]	1,377.75	-6.42%
USAID Capital Investment Fund	225.00	210.30	205.00	-2.52%	238.00	258.20	22.78%
USAID Inspector General	76.60	76.50 (1.00)[b]	74.88	-2.12%	78.50 (3.00)[d]	75.50	-1.13%
Title III: Bilateral Economic Assistance	25,948.70 (3,222.78)	27,642.99 (4,936.34)	19,623.49	-29.01%	34,615.92 (10,925.34)	31,308.95 (8,435.46)	13.26%

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
Global Health Programs (GHP), State + USAID	8,869.95	9,527.45 (435.00)[b]	5,998.00	-37.05%	11,656.98 (2,500.00)[d]	13,195.95 (4,000.00)[e]	38.50%
(of which USAID)	[3,149.95]	[3,597.45]	[2,160.10]	-39.95%	[3,226.98] (2,500.00)[d]	[7,265.95] (4,000.00)[e]	129.76%
(of which State)	[5,720.00]	[5,930.00]	[3,837.87]	-35.28%	[5,930.00]	[5,930.00]	0.00%
Development Assistance	3,000.00	3,400.00	—	n.a.	4,700.00 (900.00)[d]	3,500.00	2.94%
International Disaster Assistance	4,385.31 (584.27)	4,953.36 (2,291.98)[bc]	—	n.a.	5,520.36 (2,858.98)[d]	4,395.36 (1,914.04)	-11.27%
Transition Initiatives	92.04 (62.04)	92.04	112.00	21.68%	92.04	92.04	0.00%
Complex Crises Fund	30.00	30.00	—	-100.00%	30.00	30.00	0.00%
Development Credit Authority—Admin	10.00	—	—	—	—	—	—
Development Credit Authority Subsidy	[55.00]	—	—	—	—	—	—
Economic Support Fund	3,692.86 (1,172.34)	3,295.00 (250.00)[b]	—	n.a.	4,944.41 (1,500.00)[d]	3,851.96 (700.00)[e]	16.90%
Economic Support and Development Fund	—	—	5,925.60	n.a.	—	—	n.a.
Democracy Fund	227.20	273.70	—	n.a.	323.70	290.70	6.21%
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia	760.33	770.33	—	n.a.	1,270.33 (500.00)[d]	770.33	0.00%
Migration & Refugee Assistance	3,432.00 (1,404.12)	3,782.00 (1,871.36)[c]	299.21	-92.09%	4,557.00 (2,646.36)[d]	3,432.00 (1,701.42)	-9.25%
International Humanitarian Assistance	—	—	5,968.00	n.a.	—	—	n.a.
Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance	1.00	0.10	—	n.a.	0.10	0.10	0.00%

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
Independent Agencies, Subtotal	1,368.00	1,474.00 (88.00)	1,209.71	-17.93%	1,410.00 (20.00)	1,393.50	-5.46%
Peace Corps	410.50	498.50 (88.00)[c]	401.20	-19.52%	410.50	410.50	-17.65%
Millennium Challenge Corporation	905.00	905.00	800.00	-11.60%	905.00	912.00	0.77%
Inter-American Foundation	22.50	37.50	3.85	-89.73%	51.50 (10.00)[d]	38.00	1.33%
U.S. African Development Foundation	30.00	33.00	4.66	-85.88%	43.00 (10.00)[d]	33.00	0.00%
Department of the Treasury, Subtotal	30.00	45.00	111.00	146.67%	111.00	357.00 (120.00)	693.00%
Department of the Treasury Technical Assistance	30.00	30.00	33.00	10.00%	33.00	33.00	10.00%
Debt Restructuring	—	15.00	78.00	420.00%	78.00	324.00 (120.00)[e]	2060.00%
Title IV. Int'l Security Assistance	9,153.08 (554.59)	9,013.95 (837.12)	7,729.66	-14.25%	9,015.20 (837.12)	9,004.03 (902.12)	-.011%
International Narcotics Control & Law Enforcement	1,497.47	1,391.00	1,010.28	-27.37%	1,391.00	1,385.57	-0.39%
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining	864.55	895.75	753.55	-15.87%	897.00	889.25	-0.73%
Peacekeeping Operations	488.67 (325.21)	457.35 (325.21)	290.00	-36.59%	457.35 (325.21)	440.76 (325.21)	-3.63%
International Military Education & Training	110.78	112.93	104.93	-7.08%	112.93	112.93	0.00%
Foreign Military Financing	6,191.61 (229.37)	6,156.92 (511.91)	5,570.90	-9.52%	6,156.92 (511.91)	6,175.52 (576.91)	0.30%

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
Title V. Multilateral Assistance	1,849.20	2,082.28	1,481.24	-28.86%	3,322.47 (1,281.15)	2,040.82	-1.99%
International Organizations & Programs	331.50	390.50	—	-100.00%	1,671.65 (1,281.15)[d]	387.50	-0.77%
Int'l Bank for Reconstruction and Development	—	206.50	206.50	0.00%	206.50	206.50	0.00%
World Bank: Global Environment Facility	139.58	139.58	—	-100.00%	139.58	139.58	0.00%
World Bank: Int'l Development Association	1,097.01	1,097.01	1,001.40	-8.72%	1,001.40	1,001.40	-8.72%
Asian Development Fund	47.40	47.40	47.40	0.00%	47.40	47.40	0.00%
African Development Bank-Capital	32.42	—	54.65	n.a.	54.65	54.65	n.a.
African Development Fund	171.30	171.30	171.30	0.00%	171.30	171.30	0.00%
International Fund for Agricultural Development	30.00	30.00	—	-100.00%	30.00	32.50	8.33%
Title VI. Export Assistance	-161.49	-22.80	-337.27	1,379.26%	-99.80	159.00	-797.37%
Export-Import Bank (net)	100.05	-34.30	-689.05	1908.90%	-114.30	-113.50	230.90%
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-341.04	—	—	—	—	—	—
Development Finance Corporation	—	-68.00	339.68	599.53%	-65.00	193.00	-383.82%
Trade & Development Agency	79.50	79.50	12.11	-84.77%	79.50	79.50	0.00%
SFOPS TOTAL, pre-ARPA	**55,000.55 (8,000.00)**	**57,787.64 (10,647.46)**	**44,123.42**	**-23.65%**	**66,102.45 (18,018.55)**	**61,514.43 (13,695.12)**	**6.45%**
Rescissions, net	-324.62	-578.74 (-282.46)	—	—	-75.00	-530.12 (-425.12)	-8.40%
SFOPS TOTAL, Net of Rescissions, pre-ARPA	**54,675.93 (8,000.00)**	**57,208.90 (10,365.00)**	**44,123.42**	**-22.87%**	**66,027.45 (18,018.55)**	**60,984.31 (13,270.00)**	**6.60%**

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-123, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608)	FY2021 Enacted[a] (P.L. 116-260)	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
ARPA Emergency Funds[g]	—	—	—	—	—	(10,000.00)	—
State, Foreign Operations & Related Programs, TOTAL, with ARPA	**54,675.93 (8,000.00)**	**57,208.90 (10,365.00)**	**44,123.42**	**-22.87%**	**66,027.45 (18,018.55)**	**70,984.31 (23,270.00)**	**24.08% 124.51%**

Sources: FY2019 Actuals and the FY2021 request are from the FY2021 SFOPS CBJ; FY2020 enacted data are from P.L. 116-94, Division G, P.L. 116-123, and P.L. 116-136; FY2021 enacted are from P.L. 116-260. ARPA figures are from P.L. 117-2, Title X.

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) or supplemental emergency funding 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.

a. Account totals do not include funding from P.L. 117-2, the ARPA, which are added in as a lump sum at the bottom of the table.

b. Includes funding for the first novel coronavirus (COVID-19) supplemental appropriation, P.L. 116-123. That legislation appropriated $264 million for Diplomatic Programs, $1 million for the USAID Inspector General, $435 million for Global Health Programs-USAID, $300 million for International Disaster Assistance, and $250 million for the Economic Support Fund. All of these funds were designated as being for an emergency requirement. As such, like OCO funds, they do not count against BCA discretionary spending caps.

c. Includes funding for the third novel coronavirus supplemental appropriations, P.L. 116-136. That legislation included $324 million for Diplomatic Programs, $95 million for USAID Operating Expenses, $258 million for International Disaster Assistance, $250 million for Migration and Refugee Assistance, and $88 million for the Peace Corps.

d. Includes emergency funding designated for the novel coronavirus in Title VIII of H.R. 7608.

e. Includes emergency funding designated for the novel coronavirus, section 7 of the Sudan Claims Resolution Act, and payment to the International Monetary Fund for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries debt relief for Sudan in Title IX of the final appropriation.

f. The Consular and Border Security Programs account is typically funded through fees and surcharges pursuant to Section 7081 of P.L. 115-31, rather than annual appropriations. However, collections derived from such fees and surcharges declined considerably due to the COVID-19 pandemic, prompting Congress to provide a direct appropriation for this account.

g. For more information on the funding included in the American Rescue Plan Act, see the Text Box on page 3.

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 (SFOPS) appropriation; in particular, international food assistance programs (Food for Peace Act (FFPA), Title II 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, FY2019 Actual, FY2020 Enacted, and FY2021 Request, House-passed bill, and Enacted

(In millions of U.S. dollars)

	FY2019 Actual	FY2020 Enacted (P.L. 116-93, P.L. 116-94, P.L. 116-136)	FY2021 Request	% Change, FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Request	FY2021 House (H.R. 7608, H.R. 7667)	FY2021 Enacted (P.L. 116-260 + P.L. 117-2)	% Change FY2020 Enacted vs. FY2021 Enacted
State-Foreign Operations, excluding commissions[a]	**54,534.49**	**56,946.10**	**43,979.32**	**-22.77%**	**65,852.95**	**70,668.11**	**24.10%**
Commerce-Justice-Science	**99.48**	**101.74**	**107.37**	**5.53%**	**107.37**	**105.37**	**3.57%**
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	2.41	2.34	2.37	1.33%	2.37	2.37	1.33%
Int'l Trade Commission	97.08	99.40	105.00	5.63%	105.00	103.00	3.62%
Agriculture	**1,926.26**	**1,945.00**	—	**n.a.**	**2,010.00**	**2,770.00**	**42.42%**
FFPA Title II	1,716.00	1,725.00	—	n.a.	1,775.00	1,740.00	0.87%
McGovern-Dole	210.26	220.00	—	n.a.	235.00	230.00	4.55%
ARPA emergency funds[b]	—	—	—	n.a.	—	800.00	n.a.
Total International Affairs (150)	**56,560.23**	**58,992.84**	**44,086.68**	**-25.27%**	**67,970.32**	**73,543.48**	**24.67%**

Sources: FY2019 Actuals and the FY2021 request are from the FY2021 SFOPS CBJ, FY2021 Foreign Claims Settlement Commission CBJ, and FY2021 U.S. International Trade Commission CBJ; FY2020 enacted data are from P.L. 116-93, Division B, P.L. 116-94, Divisions B and G, P.L. 116-123, and P.L. 116-136. FY2021 enacted is from P.L. 116-260 and P.L.117-2.

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

b. International food assistance funding was provided in the Agriculture title of the APRA (P.L. 117-2), in section 1007.

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
Section Research Manager

Disclaimer