



**Congressional
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

The Budget Control Act, Sequestration, and the Foreign Affairs Budget: Background and Possible Impacts

Susan B. Epstein
Specialist in Foreign Policy

December 20, 2013

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

R42994

Summary

Congress has an interest in the cost and effectiveness of foreign affairs activities that promote U.S. interests overseas. The Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA, P.L. 112-25), as amended by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-240/H.R. 8, signed into law on January 2, 2013) required across-the-board reductions (sequestration) in most federal defense and nondefense discretionary programs, projects, and activities including those in foreign affairs for FY2013, and additional spending reductions each year through FY2021. These automatic cuts for FY2013 were ordered on March 1, 2013. Of ongoing interest will be the impact of these cuts and potential future reductions in State Department operations, foreign aid programs, and their ability to protect Americans and promote U.S. interests overseas.

Currently, for FY2014 the government is operating under a continuing resolution (CR, P.L. 113-46) that provides stop-gap funding through January 15, 2014. Subsequent legislation will be necessary to extend, or provide full-year, funding past this date.

In December 2013, the House and Senate agreed to the Bipartisan Budget Act (BBA, H.J.Res. 59), which is expected to ease spending reductions for FY2014 and FY2015. Even with the BBA in law, Congress must pass FY2014 appropriations that are within the revised statutory limits to avoid sequestration.

In addition to the FY2014 budget, the Administration's FY2015 budget request will be of interest when it is submitted to Congress in 2014. It will indicate President Obama's foreign affairs priorities and plans for meeting the BCA caps in FY2015.

According to a February 22, 2013 Pew Research Center survey, Americans surveyed support cuts in foreign aid spending more than any other government activity mentioned. Although still not the majority, 48% of those polled prefer a decrease in foreign aid, while 49% prefer it remain at the current level or is increased. When asked about the Department of State, 34% said they prefer the Department of State funding be decreased, while 60% support maintaining current State Department funding or increasing it. At the same time, when asked, most Americans believe that international spending comprises 10% of the budget, although it is actually around 1%.

This report discusses sequestration and the foreign affairs (150) budget function and presents FY2013 estimates by account. For background on the current foreign affairs budget, see CRS Report R43043, *State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2014 Budget and Appropriations*. This report will be updated as changes occur.

Contents

Background.....	1
Sequestration of the Department of State and Foreign Operations Appropriations.....	2
How the FY2013 Foreign Affairs Sequestration Was Implemented.....	2
Foreign Affairs Exemptions.....	4
FY2013 Sequestration Funding and Impact	4

Tables

Table 1. State Department, Foreign Operations and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2011-FY2013 Post-Sequestration Estimate	7
---	---

Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	10
---------------------------------	----

Background

Across-the-board funding reductions (sequestration) have reduced most discretionary appropriations and direct spending within the federal budget in FY2013. While much of the congressional debate on sequestration has focused on defense budget cuts, some Members of Congress, Secretary of State John Kerry, and foreign aid advocates are concerned about the effect sequestration could have over time on foreign affairs (150 budget function). They express concern about a possible lack of funding for activities that promote U.S. interests overseas. That could include providing humanitarian assistance, promoting regional stability abroad, as well as economic and security support for U.S. strategic partners, export promotion and market development programs that benefit American job creation. In contrast, other Members and many polled Americans, according to a Pew survey, consider foreign affairs funding, particularly foreign aid, as spending that should be cut to reduce the deficit.¹

The Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA, P.L. 112-25), signed into law on August 2, 2011, was the result of negotiations between the President and Congress to raise the debt ceiling by at least \$2.1 trillion and reduce spending by that amount over a 10-year period between FY2012 and FY2021.² It established the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction to develop legislation to reduce the deficit for Congress and the President to enact by January 15, 2012. The committee failed to do this by November 23, 2011, and Congress did not approve a deal by its deadline of December 23, 2011. This failure triggered an automatic spending reduction process consisting of a combination of sequestration in 2013 and lower statutory limits on discretionary spending through FY2021 to meet the required \$1.2 trillion in total savings.³

Section 302 of the BCA amended the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), requiring the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to allocate half of the total reduction to discretionary appropriations and direct spending accounts within function 050 (defense) and half to all others in order to meet the \$1.2 trillion reduction. Spending limits for each were established for FY2013 through FY2021. The spending reductions are to be achieved for direct spending (mandatory spending) through a combination of sequestration and the regular appropriation process. For discretionary spending like the foreign affairs budget, reductions were achieved through sequestration in FY2013 and through downward adjustment of statutory limits to be met in the appropriation process for FY2014 to FY2021. If spending caps are not met within the appropriations process in FY2014 and beyond, sequestration again would occur.

The BCA originally required about \$109 billion in automatic budget reductions to be applied equally between defense and nondefense spending and to each program, project, and activity (PPA) within every non-exempt budget account on January 2, 2013. It also designated that OMB would calculate and implement the sequestration using specific procedures provided in the BCA.

¹ Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, *As Sequester Deadline Looms, Little Support for Cutting Most Programs*, February 22, 2013. <http://www.people-press.org/2013/02/22/as-sequester-deadline-looms-little-support-for-cutting-most-programs/#partisandifferences>.

² For more detail, see CRS Report R41965, *The Budget Control Act of 2011*, by Bill Heniff Jr., Elizabeth Rybicki, and Shannon M. Mahan.

³ H.J.Res. 59, as passed by Congress in December 2013, would raise the overall budget spending limit for FY2014 from the previous combined defense and nondefense BCA statutory level of \$967 billion to \$1.012 trillion for FY2014 and the estimated combined statutory level of \$995 billion to \$1.014 trillion for FY2015.

The Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012 (STA, P.L. 112-155; signed August 7, 2012) required OMB to submit a report to Congress no later than 30 days after enactment of the act outlining the potential impact of sequestration triggered by the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction. *The OMB Report Pursuant to the Sequestration Transparency Act of 2012*, September 14, 2012, presents the methodology, identifies sequestrable and exempt funds, and estimates sequestration at the account-level.⁴

Sequestration of the Department of State and Foreign Operations Appropriations

The State-Foreign Operations (SFOP) appropriations, typically representing about 1% to 1.5% of the total federal budget in recent years, supports most programs and activities within the international affairs budget account, known as the 150 budget function. SFOP appropriations include foreign economic and security assistance, contributions to international organizations and multilateral financial institutions, State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) operations, public diplomacy, and international broadcasting programs. A few 150 function activities, such as foreign food aid (P.L. 480), are not included.

How the FY2013 Foreign Affairs Sequestration Was Implemented

The Budget Control Act of 2011, as amended by the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-240/H.R. 8, signed into law January 2, 2013), required \$85.3 billion in automatic cuts to be applied equally (\$42.65 billion for each) between defense and nondefense accounts in FY2013.⁵ It defined defense as spending under the 050 budget function and nondefense as spending under most other budget functions. Foreign affairs appropriations was considered nondefense. OMB calculated that, based on the CR funding levels, a 5% reduction for nondefense discretionary funding and a 5.1% reduction for nondefense mandatory programs was necessary between March and September 30, 2013.⁶

The approximately 5% reduction was to be applied to the annualized level of the budgetary resources provided under the FY2013 CR. The Continuing Resolution Appropriation, 2013 (CR, P.L. 112-175), provided appropriations for foreign affairs spending at the FY2012 appropriation act levels plus an increase of .0612% for most accounts through March 27, 2013.⁷ On March 21, 2013, Congress approved legislation (H.R. 933) to fund the federal government through the end of the fiscal year. The Consolidated and Further Continuing appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6, signed into law on March 26, 2013), funded the State Department, Foreign Operations and Related Programs through the CR mostly at the same rate as in FY2012, with a few anomalies spelled out in the law. Sequestration, together with an additional 0.032% across-the-board

⁴ For more detail on program exemptions and rules, see CRS Report R42050, *Budget "Sequestration" and Selected Program Exemptions and Special Rules*, coordinated by Karen Spar.

⁵ For more detail, see CRS Report R42949, *The American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012: Modifications to the Budget Enforcement Procedures in the Budget Control Act*, by Bill Heniff Jr.

⁶ The Office of Management and Budget, *OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Sequestration for Fiscal Year 2013*, March 1, 2013, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/fy13ombjsequestrationreport.pdf.

⁷ Appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations was not increased by 0.612% for FY2013.

rescission required by Division G, Section 3004, of the new CR if appropriations exceeded spending limits, reduced FY2013 Department of State and Foreign Operations discretionary funding by an estimated 2% from the enacted level.

The BCA required that all sequestration cuts be made at the PPA level. According to State Department officials, for State Department operations, reductions were calculated at the PPA levels as defined in the most recent appropriations and authorization acts or related report language.⁸ For foreign operations, the FY2012 appropriation act defined some PPAs, particularly foreign aid programs. In some cases that is the account level or the country allocation level. Section 7023 of P.L. 112-74, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, states that for Foreign Operations

“program, project, and activity” shall be defined at the appropriations Act account level and shall include all appropriations and authorizations Acts funding directives, ceilings, and limitations with the exception that for the following accounts: “Economic Support Fund” and “Foreign Military Financing Program”, “program, project, and activity” shall also be considered to include country, regional, and central program level funding within each such account; for the development assistance accounts of the United States Agency for International Development “program, project, and activity” shall also be considered to include central, country, regional, and program level funding, either as:

- (1) justified to the Congress; or
- (2) allocated by the executive branch in accordance with a report, to be provided to the Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, as required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

According to State Department’s F Bureau, sequestration was applied at the *account level* for International Disaster Assistance, Transition Initiatives (TI), Complex Crises Fund (CCF), USAID’s Capital Investment Fund (CIF), USAID’s Inspector General (IG), Administrative expenses of the Development Credit Authority (DCA), U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance (ERMA), International Military Education and Training (IMET), Assistance for Europe, Eurasia, and Central Asia (AEECA), and the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF).

Sequestration was applied at *the account level and to funding directives* for Peacekeeping Operations (PKO), International Organizations and Programs (IO&P), USAID Operating Expenses (USAID OE), Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs (NADR), Democracy Fund (DF) split between State and USAID, Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA), and International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE).

⁸ E-mail communication on February 21, 2013, with Department of State Office of Budget Analysis who cited the following: Section 251A(10) of Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 states that the required reductions “shall be implemented in accordance with section 256(k).” Section 256(k)(2) provides as follows: Except as otherwise provided, the same percentage sequestration shall apply to all programs, projects, and activities within a budget account (with programs, projects, and activities as delineated in the appropriation Act or accompanying report for the relevant fiscal year covering that account, or for accounts not included in appropriation Acts, as delineated in the most recently submitted President’s Budget). Thus, each budget account must be analyzed separately to determine its component PPAs. For discretionary spending, the inquiry requires agencies to conduct a detailed analysis of their appropriation act(s) for the relevant fiscal year and, if applicable, any legislative report accompanying that act.

Sequestration was applied at the *country allocation level and to funding directives* for Development Assistance (DA), Economic Support Fund (ESF), Global Health Programs (GHP), and Foreign Military Financing (FMF).

Under sequestration, the Department of State and USAID had the authority to reprogram certain funds to protect a particular country or activity, subject to regular notification procedures. That meant, however, that other PPAs within those accounts had to be further reduced. Transfer authority was also available as defined by Section 7009, Title VII, Division I of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, P.L. 112-74.⁹ In addition, Section 3004 of the FY2013 CR (P.L. 113-6) required an additional 0.032% across-the-board rescission to all foreign affairs discretionary accounts in order to meet the BCA spending limits.

Foreign Affairs Exemptions

According to OMB's September 2012 report, certain foreign affairs funds are exempt from sequestration. Exemptions within the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs appropriations include¹⁰

- **mandatory funds**, such as the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund;
- **intragovernmental payments**, such as other agencies' contributions to the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program (CSCS), the Working Capital Fund, or the International Cooperative Administrative Support Services (ICASS), because those funds would be sequestered at the paying agency; and
- **voluntary payments**, such as the sale of property back to host countries; user fees, such as for passports; or rent paid by other entities to use the International Chancery Center.

FY2013 Sequestration Funding and Impact

OMB's early calculations suggested the need for about a 5% sequestration reduction for nondefense discretionary funding in FY2013; however, the second CR for FY2013 (P.L. 113-6), which provided full-year appropriations, combined with sequestration and rescissions, resulted in about a 1.9% reduction from the overall FY2012 level foreign affairs funding level. The FY2013 State Department operations and related agency total was reduced by 0.9% and the foreign operations total was reduced by 2.4%, compared with FY2012 levels. (See **Table 1** below.) Department of State officials say that within the FY2013 CR, Congress and the Administration agreed to increase some funding accounts with respect to the Syria crisis, Middle East transitions, and embassy security.¹¹

At the account level, spending changes in relation to FY2012 levels varied. While funding for many foreign affairs accounts declined by about 5.1%, some declined by much more, including Conflict Stabilization Operations (-73.4%), Transition Initiatives (-42.5%), Complex Crises Fund

⁹ Telephone conversation with the Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance (F Bureau), Department of State, February 20, 2013.

¹⁰ Telephone conversation with the State Department's Bureau of Budget and Planning, February 13, 2013.

¹¹ Email communication with Department of State budget officials on December 6, 2013.

(-24%), and Peacekeeping Operations (-28.5%). In contrast, FY2013 funding increased for other accounts, including State Department's Embassy, Security, Construction, and Maintenance (+70.6%), International Disaster and Famine Assistance (+41.6%), Migration and Refugee Assistance (+36.9%), International Narcotics Control and Law enforcement (+18.5%), World Bank Global Environment Facility (+39.0%), International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (+54.2%), Inter-American Development (+43.1%), and State's Contributions to International Peacekeeping.

As compared with FY2011 actual funding levels, the post-sequestration estimates represent a significant increase. State Department officials caution against comparing FY2013 post-sequestration funding with FY2011 funding levels, however, since FY2011 levels were uniquely low and it was the only fiscal year in the past decade that did not include supplementals or Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds. State-Foreign Operations FY2013 post-rescission and sequestration overall funding represents a 6.5% increase over FY2011 actuals. State Department operations and related agencies funding was 12.1% higher than in FY2011, and Foreign Operations funding was 3.8% higher. In addition, certain specific accounts continue after sequestration to be greater than what they were in FY2011. For example, State's Diplomatic and Consular Programs FY2013 post-sequestration/post-rescission funding was nearly 11% greater than it was in FY2011. Foreign Military Financing FY2013 post-reduction funding was higher than FY2011 levels by 11.5%; Peacekeeping Operations was higher by 19.7%, and the Global Food Security Fund was 28.4% over FY2011 funding.

According to the Department of State, a primary concern regarding sequestration is how it will affect long-term foreign affairs programs and foreign policy goals. They state that

Our ability to influence and shape world events, protect U.S. interests, increase job-creating opportunities for American business, prevent conflict, and defeat terrorism before it reaches our shores depends on robust and strategically allocated operations and assistance levels. By indiscriminately cutting our funding levels, sequestration challenges these fundamental goals of the U.S. government.¹²

Foreign aid proponents, in particular, respond that most U.S. foreign aid benefits the United States in promoting national security, exports, American jobs to support those exports, and regional stability around the world. They contend that foreign aid achieves a lot for a small amount of funds that represent about 1% of the total U.S. government budget.¹³ By restricting funding and the ability of the U.S. government to be engaged with many countries trying to transition toward democracy would likely leave a void that could be filled by unfriendly countries.

Others concerned with balancing the budget question the importance of foreign aid programs at a time when they say the deficit is hurting the U.S. economy and the priority should be directed more toward funding for defense and domestic programs.

Despite differing views of the importance of foreign affairs spending (specifically foreign aid) and whether cuts happen via the appropriations process or sequestration, the ability for current

¹² Ibid.

¹³ While State-Foreign Operations appropriations typically represents about 1.5% of the total federal budget, the foreign aid portion typically represents less than 1% of the federal budget.

and future Administrations to do more overseas with less will be crucial as budget reductions continue to FY2021 and perhaps beyond.

Table I. State Department, Foreign Operations and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2011-FY2013 Post-Sequestration Estimate

(millions of current U.S. \$)

	FY2011 actual ^a	FY2012 actual (P.L. 112-74)			Post-sequestration/post rescission estimate for FY2013			% change 2013 vs. 2012	% change 2013 vs. 2011
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Core	OCO	Total		
Title I. State Department Administration of Foreign Affairs, Subtotal	11,384.83	9,048.90	4,513.34	13,562.25	8,965.97	4,488.29	13,454.26	-0.8%	+18.2%
Diplomatic & Consular Program	8,717.07	6,557.88	4,306.36	10,864.25	6,484.28	3,178.99	9,663.27	-11.1%	+10.9%
Capital Investment Fund	59.38	59.38	—	59.38	56.37	—	56.37	-5.1%	-5.1
Embassy Security, Construction & Maintenance	1,630.95	1,537.00	115.70	1,652.70	1,581.79	1,237.54	2,819.33	+70.6%	+72.9%
Conflict Stabilization Operations	35.20	21.82	8.50	30.32	—	8.08	8.08	-73.4%	-77.0%
Ed. & Cultural Exchanges	599.55	583.20	15.60	598.80	553.68	14.82	568.50	-5.1%	-5.2%
Office of Inspector General	104.79	61.90	67.18	129.08	59.58	56.94	116.52	-9.7%	+11.2%
Representation Allowances	7.84	8.03	—	8.03	6.93	—	6.93	-13.7%	-11.6%
Protection of Foreign Missions & Officials	27.94	27.75	—	27.75	25.63	—	25.63	-7.6%	-8.3%
Emergency-Diplomatic & Consular Services	19.35	9.07	—	9.07	8.83	—	8.83	-2.6%	-54.4%
Repatriation Loans	1.57	1.67	—	1.67	1.37	—	1.37	-18.0%	-12.7%
International Center	0.51	0.52	—	0.52	0.49	—	0.49	-5.8%	-4.1%
Payment American Institute Taiwan	21.78	21.78	—	21.78	20.04	—	20.04	-8.0%	-8.0%
Foreign Service Retirement (mandatory)	158.90	158.90	—	158.90	158.9	—	158.9	n.a.	n.a.
International Organizations, Subtotal	3,462.58	3,277.88	101.30	3,379.18	3,290.22	96.21	3,386.43	-0.2%	-2.2%
Contributions to Int'l Orgs	1,578.65	1,449.70	101.30	1,551.00	1,376.33	96.21	1,472.54	-5.1%	-6.7%
Contributions to International Peacekeeping	1,883.93	1,828.18	—	1,828.18	1,913.89	—	1,913.89	+4.7%	+1.6%
International Commissions	132.64	124.16	0.00	124.16	112.96	—	112.96	-9.0%	-14.8%
Int'l Boundary/ U.S.-Mexico	69.66	76.17	—	76.17	68.78	—	68.78	-9.7%	-1.3%
American Sections	12.58	11.69	—	11.69	11.31	—	11.31	-3.3%	-10.1%
International Fisheries	50.40	36.30	—	36.30	32.87	—	32.87	-9.4%	-34.8%
International Broadcasting, Subtotal	738.76	747.13	4.40	751.53	713.49	—	713.49	-5.1%	-3.4%
Broadcasting Operations	732.31	740.10	4.40	744.50	706.82	—	706.82	-5.1%	-3.5%
Capital Improvements	6.45	7.03	—	7.03	6.67	—	6.67	-5.1%	+3.4%
Related Appropriations, Subtotal	198.00	183.77	8.41	192.18	182.47	—	182.47	-5.1%	-7.8%
Asia Foundation	17.86	17.00	—	17.00	16.14	—	16.14	-5.1%	-9.6%
U.S. Institute of Peace	39.40	30.59	8.41	39.00	37.03	—	37.03	-5.1%	-6.0%
Center for Middle East-West Dialogue-Trust & Program	1.30	0.84	—	0.84	0.80	—	0.80	-4.8%	-38.5%
Eisenhower Exchange Programs	0.30	0.50	—	0.50	0.48	—	0.48	-4.0%	+60.0%

	FY2011 actual ^a	FY2012 actual (P.L. 112-74)			Post-sequestration/post rescission estimate for FY2013			% change 2013 vs. 2012	% change 2013 vs. 2011
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Core	OCO	Total		
Israeli Arab Scholarship Program	0.42	0.38	—	0.38	0.36	—	0.36	-5.3%	-14.3%
East-West Center	20.96	16.70	—	16.70	15.86	—	15.86	-5.0%	-24.3%
National Endowment for Democracy	117.76	117.76	—	117.76	111.80	—	111.80	-5.1%	-5.1%
Other Commissions	13.00	11.84	0.00	11.84	10.58	—	10.58	-10.6%	-18.6%
Preservation of America's Heritage	0.60	0.63	—	0.63	0.57	—	0.57	-9.5%	-5.0%
Int'l Religious Freedom	4.30	3.00	—	3.00	2.77	—	2.77	-7.7%	-35.6%
Security & Cooperation Europe	2.60	2.72	—	2.72	2.31	—	2.31	-15.1%	-11.2%
Cong.-Exec. on People's Republic of China	2.00	2.00	—	2.00	1.80	—	1.80	-10.0%	-10.0%
U.S.-China Economic and Security Review	3.50	3.49	—	3.49	3.13	—	3.13	-10.3%	-10.6%
State/Broadcasting/Related Agencies, TOTAL	15,929.81	13,393.68	4,627.45	18,021.14	13,275.69	4,584.50	17,860.19	-0.9%	+12.1%
Title II. U.S. Agency for International Development	1,528.44	1,268.50	259.50	1,528.00	1,204.35	246.45	1,450.80	-5.1%	-5.1%
USAID Operating Expenses	1,347.30	1,092.30	255.00	1,347.30	1,037.07	242.18	1,279.25	-5.1%	-5.1%
Conflict Stabilization Operations	4.99	—	—	—	—	—	—	n.a.	n.a.
USAID Capital Investment Fund	129.74	129.70	—	129.70	123.13	—	123.13	-5.1%	-5.1%
USAID Inspector General	46.41	46.50	4.50	51.00	44.15	4.27	48.42	-5.1%	+4.3%
Title III. Bilateral Economic Assistance, Subtotal	21,205.03	18,358.74	3,836.06	22,194.80	17,224.84	4,908.61	22,133.45	-0.3%	+4.4%
Global Health Programs (GHP), State + USAID	7,832.31	8,172.66	—	8,172.66	8,061.49	—	8,061.49	-1.4%	+2.9%
Development Assistance	2,519.95	2,519.95	—	2,519.95	2,717.67	—	2,717.67	+7.8%	+7.8%
International Disaster & Famine Assistance	863.27	825.00	270.00	1,095.00	799.46	750.93	1,550.39	+41.6%	+79.6%
Transition Initiatives	54.89	50.14	43.55	93.69	47.61	6.22	53.83	-42.5%	-1.9%
Complex Crises Fund	39.92	10.00	40.00	50.00	9.49	28.50	37.99	-24.0%	-4.8%
Development Credit Authority—subsidy	8.28	8.30	—	8.30	7.88	—	7.88	-5.1%	-4.8%
Economic Support Fund	5,931.71	2,994.75	3,151.96	6,146.71	2,573.59	3,008.94	5,582.53	-9.2%	-5.9%
Assistance for Europe; Eurasia & Central Asia (AEECA)	695.74	626.72	—	626.72	0.00	—	0.00	n.a.	n.a.
Democracy Fund	114.77	114.77	—	114.77	108.96	—	108.96	-5.1%	-5.1%
Migration & Refugee Assistance	1,694.60	1,646.10	329.00	1,975.10	1,590.14	1,114.02	2,704.16	+36.9%	+59.6%
Emergency Refugee and Migration	49.90	27.20	—	27.20	25.82	—	25.82	-5.1%	-93.3%
Inter-American Foundation	22.45	22.50	—	22.50	21.36	—	21.36	-5.1%	-4.9%
African Development Foundation	29.44	30.00	—	30.00	28.48	—	28.48	-5.1%	-3.3%
Peace Corps	374.25	375.00	—	375.00	356.00	—	356.00	-5.1%	-4.9%
Millennium Challenge	898.20	898.20	—	898.20	852.73	—	852.73	-5.1%	-5.1%

	FY2011 actual ^a	FY2012 actual (P.L. 112-74)			Post-sequestration/post rescission estimate for FY2013			% change 2013 vs. 2012	% change 2013 vs. 2011
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Core	OCO	Total		
Corporation									
Treasury Department Technical Assistance	25.45	25.45	1.55	27.00	24.16	—	24.16	-10.5%	-5.1%
Debt Restructuring	49.90	12.00		12.00	—	—	—	n.a.	n.a.
Title IV. Military/Security Assistance, Subtotal	8,414.23	7,269.82	2,479.77	9,749.59	6,900.35	2,170.60	9,070.95	-7.0%	+7.8%
International Narcotics Control & Law Enforcement	1,593.81	1,061.10	574.61	1,635.71	1,005.61	932.47	1,938.08	+18.5%	+21.6%
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining	738.79	590.11	121.16	711.27	560.27	114.59	674.86	-5.1%	-8.6%
International Military Education & Training	105.79	105.79	—	105.79	100.43	—	100.43	-5.1%	-5.1%
Foreign Military Financing	5,374.23	5,210.00	1,102.00	6,312.00	4,946.53	1,046.61	5,993.14	-5.1%	+11.5%
Peacekeeping Operations	304.39	302.82	207.00	509.82	287.51	76.93	364.44	-28.5%	+19.7%
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF)	297.22	—	452.00	452.00	0.00	—	0.00	n.a.	n.a.
Global Security Contingency Fund	—	—	23.00	23.00	0.00	—	0.00	n.a.	n.a.
Title V. Multilateral Assistance, Subtotal	2,299.47	2,958.80	—	2,958.80	2,879.84	—	2,879.84	-2.7%	+25.2%
World Bank: Global Environment Facility	89.82	89.82	—	89.82	124.84	—	124.84	+39.0%	+39.0%
International Clean Technology Fund	184.63	184.63	—	184.63	175.28	—	175.28	-5.1%	-5.1%
Strategic Climate Fund	49.90	49.90	—	49.90	47.37	—	47.37	-5.1%	-5.1%
World Bank: Int'l. Development Association	1,232.53	1,325.00	—	1,325.00	1,351.02	—	1,351.02	-2.0%	+9.6%
Int. Bank Recon & Dev		117.36	—	117.36	180.99	—	180.99	+54.2%	n.a.
Inter-Amer. Dev. Bank—capital	—	75.00	—	75.00	107.34	—	107.34	+43.1%	n.a.
IADB: Enterprise for Americas MIF	24.95	25.00	—	25.00	15.00	—	15.00	-40.0%	-39.9%
IADB: Inter-American Investment Corporation	20.96	4.67	—	4.67	—	—	—	n.a.	n.a.
Asian Development Bank/Fund	106	206.59	—	206.59	196.13	—	196.13	-5.1%	+85.0%
African Development Bank/Fund	109.78	204.92	—	204.92	194.17	—	194.17	-5.2%	+76.9%
International Fund for Agricultural Development	29.44	30.00	—	30.00	28.48	—	28.48	-5.1%	-3.3%
Global Food Security Fund	99.80	135.00	—	135.00	128.17	—	128.17	-5.1%	+28.4%
International Organizations & Programs	351.29	343.91	—	343.91	331.05	—	331.05	-3.7%	-5.8%
Multilateral Debt Relief	—	167.00	—	167.00	—	—	—	n.a.	n.a.
Title VI. Export Aid, Subtotal	(149.40)	(1,015.43)	—	(1,015.43)	(513.72)	—	(513.72)	n.a.	n.a.
Export-Import Bank (net)	2.58	(799.70)	—	(799.70)	(354.35)	—	(354.35)	n.a.	n.a.
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (net)	(201.88)	(265.73)	—	(265.73)	(206.84)	—	(206.84)	n.a.	n.a.
Trade & Development Agency	49.90	50.00	—	50.00	47.47	—	47.47	-5.0%	-4.8%
Foreign Ops TOTAL	33,297.77	28,840.43	6,575.33	35,415.76	27,695.66	7,325.66	35,021.32	-1.1%	+5.2%

	FY2011 actual ^a	FY2012 actual (P.L. 112-74)			Post-sequestration/post rescission estimate for FY2013			% change 2013 vs. 2012	% change 2013 vs. 2011
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Core	OCO	Total		
State-Broadcasting-Related, TOTAL	15,929.81	13,393.68	4,627.45	18,021.14	13,275.69	4,584.50	17,860.19	-0.9%	+12.1%
State-Foreign Operations, TOTAL	49,227.58	42,234.11	11,202.78	53,436.90	40,971.35	11,910.16	52,881.51	-1.0%	+7.4%

Source: FY2011 and FY2012 data are from the FY2013 Congressional Budget Justification; FY2013 data are from tables provided to CRS from the Department of State.

Notes: Figures in parentheses are negative numbers. n.a. = not applicable

a. FY2011 figures reflect a 0.2% across-the-board rescission included in P.L. 112-10.

Author Contact Information

Susan B. Epstein
 Specialist in Foreign Policy
 sepstein@crs.loc.gov, 7-6678