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Overview

On February 9, 2016, the Obama Administration submitted to Congress its FY2017 budget request totaling $52.78 billion in new budget authority for the State Department, Foreign Operations, and Related Appropriations (SFOPS) accounts. Of the total request, $17.05 billion was for State Operations and related agencies (a 3.6% increase over FY2016 estimates), and $35.74 billion was for Foreign Operations (-1.8% compared with FY2016 estimates that included emergency Ebola funds).

On June 29, 2016, the Senate Appropriations Committee introduced and reported the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2017 (S. 3117/S.Rept. 114-290). It would have provided a total of $52.24 billion, after rescissions and including funds designated for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO).

On July 15, 2016, the House Appropriations Committee introduced and reported its Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2017 (H.R. 5912/H.Rept. 114-693). The measure would have provided $52.24 billion, including OCO.

On September 29, 2016, President Obama signed into law (P.L. 114-223) a continuing resolution (CR, H.R. 5325) to extend funding for the federal government, including the SFOPS appropriations, until December 9, 2016. The CR continued FY2016 funding levels after a reduction of 0.496% that was applied only to enduring fund accounts within SFOPS, not OCO.

On November 10, 2016, the Obama Administration amended its FY2017 budget request, calling for an additional $11.6 billion in OCO funds for national security activities, including $5.8 billion for Department of Defense accounts and $5.8 billion in SFOPS accounts. This raised the total SFOPS request for FY2017 to $58.57 billion. According to the Administration, these funds would support activities to counter ISIS and other counterterrorism activities, stabilize regions affected by ISIS, enhance embassy security, and provide emergency and humanitarian assistance needed as a result of ISIS. The table in Appendix A has been updated to reflect the supplemental SFOPS request.

On December 10, 2016, Congress passed and President Obama signed into law a second continuing resolution, the Further Continuing and Security Assistance Appropriations Act, 2017, P.L. 114-254 (H.R. 2028), Division A, to fund the federal government through April 28, 2017. For most accounts, the CR provides funding at the FY2016 level, less an across-the-board reduction of 0.19% for non-OCO accounts. Within Division B, Security Assistance Appropriations Act, 2017, Title II, Congress provided $4.3 billion in supplemental FY2017 SFOPS funds for counterterrorism/counter-ISIS and humanitarian aid activities.

In early May 2017, Congress passed a final appropriations bill, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017 (P.L. 115-31), that provides $53.23 billion in full-year funding through September 30, 2017. Together with the supplemental funds enacted in December (P.L. 114-254), total enacted SFOPS funding for FY2017 is $57.53 billion, an 8.8% increase over the FY2016 SFOPS funding level. The increase is entirely due to a 40% total increase in OCO funding.

This report provides an overview and highlights of the request with an account-by-account comparison of the FY2017 request to the House and Senate committee-passed bills and FY2016

---

1 This figure includes $158.9 million for the Foreign Service Retirement account, which is mandatory spending and therefore is not included in any State Operations data that reflect only discretionary spending.
estimates in Appendix A. Appendix B provides the International Affairs 150 function funding levels.

Table 1. Status of State-Foreign Operations Appropriations, FY2017
(funding in billions of current U.S. dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>302(b) Allocations</th>
<th>Committee Action</th>
<th>Floor Action</th>
<th>Conference/Agreement</th>
<th>Public Laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/14/16</td>
<td>4/14/2016</td>
<td>7/15/16</td>
<td>6/29/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$52.24</td>
<td>$52.08</td>
<td>$52.24</td>
<td>$52.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 established a congressional budget process. The act, as amended, includes a requirement that the House and Senate allocate funds to the Appropriations Committee, which are then divided among the 12 subcommittees, as required by Section 302(b). The Senate 302(b) allocation report total does not appear to include $159 million in mandatory spending for the Foreign Service Retirement account, which is included in the House allocation and the House and Senate committee totals.

Floor action and conference agreement columns are blank because the House and Senate proposals never came to the floor for consideration.

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 and State-Foreign Operations Appropriations

The FY2017 appropriations process was shaped by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (BBA, H.R. 1314; P.L. 114-74) that Congress passed at the end of October 2015. The law raised the overall discretionary spending limits set by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA, P.L. 112-25) from $1.039 trillion to $1.069 trillion for FY2017. The law also increased non-security funding (that includes SFOPS funding) from $503.5 billion to $518.5 billion for FY2017 and established a $14.895 billion minimum for SFOPS OCO funding for FY2016 and FY2017. The BBA also impacted the FY2016 appropriations cycle, raising the discretionary spending cap that year from $1.016 trillion to $1.066 trillion, increasing security funding from $523.1 billion to $548.1 billion and nonsecurity funding from $493.5 billion to $518.5 billion, and setting an SFOPS OCO minimum of $14.895 billion.

For FY2016, Congress appropriated $14.895 billion for SFOPS OCO funds, including emergency funds to address the Zika virus. In December 2016, Congress passed $4.3 billion in foreign affairs OCO funds for FY2017, and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY2017 (P.L. 115-31), provides an additional $16.49 billion in foreign affairs OCO funds, resulting in an FY2017 OCO funding total of $20.785 billion. (For more details, see the following section, Table 2, and the table in Appendix A.)

FY2017 Enduring and Overseas Contingency Operations Funds

In the FY2017 request, as in every year since FY2012, the Obama Administration distinguished between enduring (ongoing, regular, or base) costs and those to support “overseas contingency operations” (OCO). OCO-designated funds, which do not count toward discretionary budget allocations established each year by appropriators, were initially described in budget documents as “extraordinary, but temporary, costs of the Department of State and USAID in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan,” but have been used for a broader range of countries and activities,

2 The BBA also impacted the FY2016 appropriations cycle, raising the discretionary spending cap that year from $1.016 trillion to $1.066 trillion, increasing security funding from $523.1 billion to $548.1 billion and nonsecurity funding from $493.5 billion to $518.5 billion, and setting an SFOPS OCO minimum of $14.895 billion.

3 Executive Budget Summary, Function 150 & Other International Programs, Fiscal Year 2013, p. 137.
including counterterrorism efforts. The OCO designation gained increased significance in August 2011 with enactment of the Budget Control Act, which specified that emergency and OCO funds do not count toward the budget caps established by the act for FY2011-FY2021 and enforced by across-the-board cuts called sequestration. Use of the OCO designation expanded further with enactment of the Bipartisan Budget Act (BBA) in 2015, which established a minimum annual OCO funding level for FY2016 and FY2017 SFOPS appropriations that was significantly higher ($14.89 billion) than SFOPS OCO spending in prior years. As a result of the BBA, the Obama Administration request and House and Senate SFOPS bills all called for the same OCO funding level for FY2017, which was level with the FY2016 OCO funding but represented an increase of 59% from the FY2015 funding.

In addition to the BBA-established minimum of $14.89 billion for FY2017, on November 10, 2016, the Obama Administration submitted to Congress a request for increased OCO appropriations, primarily to counter ISIS and fund various related expenses. The SFOPS portion of the request included additional funds for diplomatic engagement to support the strategy to counter ISIS, security assistance, and emergency humanitarian needs.

In Division B of its second continuing resolution (CR), passed and signed on December 10, 2016, Congress provided supplemental FY2017 OCO funding for many accounts. The additional amounts requested by the Obama Administration and those provided by Congress are in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. SFOPS Amended OCO Request and Appropriation for FY2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(in millions of current U.S. dollars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIG/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PKO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE/USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG/USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIF/USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEECA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 10-year foreign affairs funding trend shows a general decline in enduring funds and a general increase in OCO amounts, particularly since FY2014 (see Table 3).

Table 3. State-Foreign Operations Appropriations, FY2008-FY2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
<th>FY16 Est.</th>
<th>FY17 Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enduring $</td>
<td>34.52</td>
<td>50.30</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>42.91</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>37.97</td>
<td>36.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCO/Supp $</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>20.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.18</td>
<td>52.13</td>
<td>51.78</td>
<td>48.80</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>50.57</td>
<td>49.43</td>
<td>52.90</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>57.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Congressional Budget Justification Department of State and Foreign Operations, Fiscal Year 2017; CRS appropriations reports; Letter from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, Amendments to the FY2017 Budget, November 10, 2016, and CRS calculations.

Note: Supp=emergency supplemental funds, largely used for Iraq and Afghanistan before the OCO designation was first used in FY2012. FY2015 OCO/Supp includes $9.37 billion for OCO and $2.53 billion for emergency Ebola funds. OCO/Supp $ for FY2017 includes $4.3 billion within P.L. 114-254 and $16.485 within P.L. 115-31.

Key Issues for Congress

Within the broad range of activities supported by the SFOPS budget are several programs and focus areas that may be of particular interest to Congress as a result of their size, recent funding or policy changes, or relation to current world events. This section discusses the Obama Administration’s requests for these programs, as amended, as well as their treatment in the House and Senate proposals and the enacted legislation (P.L. 114-252, the FY2017 security assistance supplemental; and P.L. 115-31, the FY2017 omnibus appropriation)

State Department Operations

Administration of Foreign Affairs. The Administration of Foreign Affairs accounts fund salaries and expenses, including security funding, for the Diplomatic and Consular Programs (D&CP) account, embassy security and construction, and educational and cultural exchanges, among other activities. The Obama Administration’s initial request totaled $12.06 billion; this figure increased to $13.84 billion upon submission of the Administration’s supplemental request, which included an additional $1.77 billion for Administration of Foreign Affairs. P.L. 114-254 and P.L. 115-31 provided a combined $13.65 billion for the Administration of Foreign Affairs, or $190 million less than the Obama Administration’s request. However, funding for DC&P totaled $9.61 billion, or $190 million more than the request; in addition, the law’s funding for educational and cultural exchanges fell below the Administration’s request by $5.6 million.

Cuba. In order to support implementation of its new Cuba policy, $3.8 million was requested within the D&CP account for infrastructure improvements to the U.S. embassy in Havana (converted from an Interests Section last year). The State Department’s funding request would have supported up to 10 additional U.S. citizen positions (at least 8 foreign service officers and 1
civil servant), as well as refurbishing workspace, securing communications, and updating vehicles for the motor pool.

The House bill (H.R. 5912) included language prohibiting funds from being used for the establishment of a United States diplomatic presence in Cuba or to facilitate the establishment or operation of a diplomatic mission of Cuba in the United States beyond that which was in existence prior to December 17, 2014, with certain exceptions and limitations.

The Senate bill (S. 3117) had no comparable provision. P.L. 115-31 did not address this matter, in effect negating the House language.

**Contributions to International Organizations and Peacekeeping Activities.** The Contributions to International Organizations (CIO) account funds the U.S. share of the assessed budgets of 44 international organizations, including the U.N. regular budget and U.N. specialized agencies. The FY2017 CIO request was $1.39 billion, a 4% decrease from the FY2016 estimated level. The reduction was tied to a decrease in the U.N. regular budget projection, as well as the winding down of United Nations Criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. H.R. 5912 would have provided $41.14 million less than requested and S. 3117 would have provided $11.81 million less. P.L. 115-31 provided $1.36 billion, or $30 million less than the original request. However, it fully funds the OCO portion of the original request, which totals $96.24 million.

The Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) request, which funds U.N. peacekeeping missions and the two international war crimes tribunals, was $2.39 billion, a decrease of 2.7% from the FY2016 level. The request was based on the U.N. peacekeeping assessment for the United States of 28.56% (rather than the amount recognized by U.S. law of 25%, which Congress raised to 27.14% in recent years). It also reflected the possible closure of the U.N. Mission in Liberia. In addition, the Obama Administration’s FY2017 request included $150 million for a Mechanism for Peace Operations Response (MPOR), a repeat proposal from the FY2015 and FY2016 requests intended to support urgent—but as yet undefined—peacekeeping needs. The proposal was not funded by Congress in prior years.

The House would have provided $1.95 billion or $445.4 million less than requested for CIPA. The Senate measure would have funded CIPA at $2.37 billion, nearly the level of the request. P.L. 115-31 provided $1.91 billion, or $440 million less than the Obama Administration’s original request. Congress did not, as in previous years, raise the U.S. cap; consequently the U.S. assessment is capped at 25%. As in prior years, Congress did not fund the $150 million request for MPOR.

**Diplomatic Security.** The Obama Administration’s initial FY2017 request would have increased Worldwide Security Protection (WSP), which supports the Diplomatic Security Bureau’s functions around the world, by 9.4% over FY2016 estimated levels to $3.71 billion. The Obama Administration’s supplemental request brought the aggregate request for WSP to $4.27 billion. Much of the increase in requested funding was for security measures in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Physical security upgrades at diplomatic facilities, which are mostly funded through Worldwide Security Upgrades (WSU) under the Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance (ESCM) account, are managed by the Bureau of Overseas Building Operations. The WSU request for FY2017 was for $1.6 billion, an 11% increase from FY2016 estimated levels. Within the ESCM request was $1.0 billion to provide for the Department of State’s share of the Capital Security Cost Sharing (CSCS) program, which is an interagency shared-funding mechanism designed to ensure each U.S. government agency represented abroad is paying its fair share of construction costs for new and more secure facilities; it is unclear whether other agencies are fulfilling their commitments under the program.
The House and Senate bills would have provided the same total as requested. The Senate, however, would have designated more of the total as OCO funds, while the House funding was the same as the Obama Administration’s request. Through P.L. 114-254 and P.L. 115-31, Congress provided $4.64 billion for WSP and $2.21 billion for WSU, exceeding the requests by $370 million and $610 million, respectively.

**Cuts to NED, Asia Foundation, East-West Center.** The FY2017 request repeated the Obama Administration’s FY2015 and FY2016 request for deep budgetary cuts to a number of State Department-funded institutions. An overall cut of 43% to these accounts would have meant significant reductions in funding for, among other institutions, the East-West Center, the Asia Foundation, and the National Endowment for Democracy (cuts of 35%, 29%, and 39% respectively). The Senate bill would have kept funding levels the same for all three organizations, while the House bill would have cut funding only for the East-West Center. P.L. 115-31 maintained FY2016 funding levels for all three organizations for FY2017.

**Passport Surge.** The department anticipated a 37% increase over FY2015 in passport applications in FY2017, or an estimated 20 million requests. The increased load is due to the 10-year expiration of some 18 million passports issued in 2007 as the Western Hemisphere Travel Initiative (WHTI) was being implemented. That measure for the first time required passports for Americans returning by air from Bermuda, Canada, the Caribbean, and Mexico. Nearly 10 years later, those passports are beginning to expire, increasing demand for passport renewals. The Passport Services Enhancement Act of 2005 authorized the department to charge a fee to cover the costs of increased passport demand from the WHTI, and the Obama Administration request included an extension of this authority through FY2017.

P.L. 115-31 provides the Secretary of State with the authority to collect a surcharge on passport fees to cover any costs of meeting increased demand for passports.

**Foreign Operations**

Foreign Operations accounts, which fund foreign assistance activities, would have totaled about $39.87 billion under the amended FY2017 request, comprising about two-thirds of the international affairs budget. As in recent years, the FY2017 funding would have been allocated largely to major Obama Administration foreign aid initiatives and support to strategic allies. In addition, notable focus areas within the FY2017 request included countering ISIS, humanitarian assistance, responding to Russian aggression, and Central American migration.

The House committee-passed bill, H.R. 5912, included $35.95 billion for Foreign Operations accounts, and the Senate committee-passed bill, S. 3117, included $35.52 billion for these accounts. Enacted FY2017 foreign operations funding totals $39.44 billion, including $2.59 billion in P.L. 114-254 and $36.85 billion in P.L. 115-31. The enacted funding level is about 8.5% more than the FY2016 Foreign Operations funding estimate, and about 1.1% less than the amended Obama Administration request. Of the total, about $13.92 billion, or 35%, was designated as OCO funding.

**Administration Initiatives.** The Obama Administration’s four broad foreign assistance initiatives would have continued to play a major role under the FY2017 foreign operations request and the House and Senate proposals, accounting for about 30% of the original foreign operations request,

---

4 In this section, references to H.R. 5912 and S. 3117 include both the bills and their accompanying reports (H.Rept. 114-693 and S.Rept. 114-290, respectively).
but somewhat less of the amended request, as few if any of the additional counter-ISIS funds were likely to be channeled through these initiatives.

- **Global Health Initiative**, the request was $8.577 billion, about a 0.9% increase from the FY2016 estimate. The request would have continued to focus resources primarily on HIV-AIDS treatment and prevention (70%), as well as maternal and child health, and stopping infectious diseases. The Obama Administration proposed boosting malaria funding by about 11% in FY2017, compared to FY2016 estimates, in part by seeking authority to reprogram unobligated emergency funds appropriated for Ebola response in FY2015, and included $275 million for GAVI, the vaccine alliance, a 17% increase over the FY2016 estimate.

  H.R. 5912 included $8.917 billion for global health programs, including $275 million for GAVI, but would have boosted spending for maternal and child health (+22%) and malaria (+13%) relative to the request while reducing funds for family planning and reproductive health (-15%).

  S. 3117 provided $8.665 billion for global health and matched the Obama Administration’s request for GAVI and malaria programs while boosting funding for tuberculosis (+26%) and nutrition (+15%) relative to the request.

  P.L. 115-31 included $8.725 billion for global health programs, a 2.6% increase over the FY2016 funding level. Allocations for specific health sectors were similar to FY2016, exceptions being an increase for malaria programs (+12%) and pandemic influenza/emerging threats (+96%), which was boosted by establishment of a $70 million emergency reserve fund, to remain available until expended.

- **Feed the Future**, the Obama Administration’s food security initiative, would have received $1 billion under the FY2017 request, level with FY2015 funding (a FY2016 estimate is not available). Funds would have been focused on accelerating the impact of programs demonstrating progress in reducing poverty and stunting in focus countries.

  H.R. 5912 provided $1.001 billion for agricultural development and food security activities and S. 3117 provided $1.053 billion for this purpose. P.L. 115-31 provided not less than $1.006 billion for food security and agricultural development programs, including not less than $50 million for Feed the Future Development Labs.

- **Global Climate Change Initiative** funding would have totaled $1.33 billion in FY2017 under the request, level with the FY2016 request and a 62% increase from the FY2015 funding level. The increase was largely attributable to a proposed contribution ($750 million) to a multilateral Green Climate Fund (GCF), to which the Obama Administration pledged $3 billion in November 2014. This request would have been partially offset by the ending of U.S. contributions to the Strategic Climate Fund (funded at $60 million in FY2016) and the Clean Technology Fund (which received $171 million in FY2016). U.S. commitments to both funds were fulfilled with FY2016 appropriations. The Obama Administration made the same request in FY2016, but Congress appropriated no funds for the GCF. Compared with FY2015, the request would have increased funding for clean energy programs (+11%) while decreasing funds for sustainable landscapes (-14%).
H.R. 5912 did not specify a funding level for GCCI or for environmental programs generally, but included a provision prohibiting contributions to the GCF. S. 3117 recommended no less than $1.385 billion for environment programs, including no more than $500 million for the GCF.

P.L. 115-31 did not establish a funding level for climate or environmental programs as a whole, but included no less than $123.5 million for sustainable landscapes programs and $265 million for biodiversity programs. The bill also prohibited the use of funds in the Act to make payments of any kind to the Green Climate Fund.

- **Power Africa.** The Obama Administration requested $300 million ($291.3 million within State and USAID) for its initiative to expand access to electricity in sub-Saharan Africa, a 120% increase over FY2015 funding (an FY2016 funding estimate is not available).

H.R. 5912 did not specify a funding level for this initiative, while S. 3117 recommended $291 million for Power Africa. The enacted legislation, P.L. 115-31, did not specify a funding level for Power Africa.

**Top Country Recipients.** In the original FY2017 request, top foreign assistance recipients would not have differed much from FY2016.

*Israel* would have continued to be the top recipient, with a requested $3.1 billion (level with FY2016) in Foreign Military Financing (FMF) funds, followed by *Egypt*, for which $1.46 billion was requested (level with FY2015), primarily in FMF to support shared security interests. *Afghanistan* would have received $1.25 billion (+21% from FY2016), primarily to help build sustainable institutions and help the newly elected government protect development gains, and *Jordan* would have received $1.0 billion (22% below FY2016) to promote security and stability in the region as well as address economic and security strains related to the crisis in Syria. *Pakistan* would have received $742 million (a 17% increase from FY2016), to continue ongoing efforts to increase stability, counter violent extremism, and support economic growth. Other top recipients would have included *Kenya* ($626 million), *Nigeria* ($606 million), and *Tanzania* ($575 million), all of which are top recipients of global health funds. *Ethiopia* would have received $514 million, a mix of security, development, and governance assistance. *Iraq* would have rejoined the top recipient list in FY2017, after a few years absence, with a requested $510 million (a 44% increase from FY2016 funding) for security and stabilization activities, as well as support for a $1 billion sovereign loan guarantee. The Obama Administration’s supplemental request for FY2017 did not specify country allocations, but would likely have boosted funding for several of these top recipients who are partners in counterterrorism activities and/or recipients of humanitarian aid to support refugees from the Syrian conflict.

Neither the House nor Senate bill detailed comprehensive country allocation, but both bills and their accompanying reports specified aid funding levels for select countries. H.R. 5912 allocated $3.1 billion for Israel, $1.275 billion to Jordan, and explained that no funding levels were provided for Afghanistan and Pakistan because of the evolving situation in those countries. S. 3117 provided allocations for many countries, with top recipients including Israel ($3.4 billion), *Egypt* ($1.38 billion), *Jordan* ($1.0 billion), *Afghanistan* ($725 million), *Pakistan* ($642 million), and *Iraq* ($510 million).
P.L. 115-31 specified foreign assistance levels for a handful of major recipient countries, including Israel ($3.1 billion), Egypt ($1.42 billion), and Jordan ($1.28 billion). The legislation also specified that $75 million in Foreign Military Finance aid appropriated in P.L. 114-254 was to go to Israel, making total FY2017 FMF funding to Israel $3.175 billion. It is unclear how the remaining $2.515 billion enacted for foreign operations accounts in P.L. 114-254 will be allocated among countries.

Focus Areas. In addition to foreign assistance initiatives and support to strategic allies, there were a number of priority issues and objectives identified in the FY2017 Foreign Operations request. Funding for these objectives is provided across multiple appropriations accounts, and it is not yet clear how these funds will be allocated under P.L. 114-254 and P.L. 115-31.

- **Syria/Counter-ISIL.** The original FY2017 request identified $4.05 billion, a 19% increase over FY2015, for activities to counter ISIL and respond to regional instability stemming from the crisis in Syria. About half of this funding was to address humanitarian needs, with the rest to address development and security challenges in Jordan, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. In addition, much of the $4 billion in additional foreign operations OCO funding requested by the Obama Administration in November 2016 would have been allocated for such activities.

  H.R. 5912 authorized funding for both humanitarian and non-lethal economic assistance within Syria and neighboring countries to stop the advance of ISIL and address the needs of refugees, but did not specify a funding level.

  S. 3117 recommended $238 million for Syria within development assistance accounts for non-lethal assistance to promote stability and economic development, build civil society, and meet the needs of those impacted by the conflict. In addition, an unspecified amount of humanitarian assistance, as well as economic assistance to refugee host countries in the region, was made available to meet the needs of refugees and internally displaced persons in the region.

  P.L. 114-254 provided $4.3 billion in OCO funding, an unspecified amount of which was for activities to counter ISIL and provide refugee and humanitarian assistance related to the crisis in Syria. In addition, Section 8004 of P.L. 115-31 established a $169 million relief and recovery fund as part of efforts to countering ISIL and combat terrorism in the Near East and Africa.

- **Humanitarian assistance.** The Obama Administration’s original humanitarian assistance request was for $6.156 billion, including $4.805 billion within the foreign operations account, which was about 19% less than the FY2016 estimate, in part because FY2016 funding was relatively high, and because the responses to current high-level crises in Yemen and South Sudan were expected to be scaled back in FY2017. The Obama Administration requested an additional $1.214 billion in humanitarian accounts in November 2016.

  H.R. 5912 would have continued funding humanitarian assistance accounts at the FY2016 level, while S. 3117 would have provided $5.503 billion for SFOPS humanitarian assistance accounts, about 15% more than the original request and about 7% less than the FY2016 estimate.

---

5 This includes the International Disaster Assistance (IDA), Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA) and Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance (ERMA) accounts and excludes the Food for Peace account, which is humanitarian in nature but funded through the Agriculture appropriation.
Enacted humanitarian assistance for FY2017 is $9.303 billion, including $916.1 million from P.L. 114-254 and $8.387 billion in P.L. 115-31. The International Disaster Assistance funding in P.L. 115-31 includes $990 million above prior year funding specifically to address famines, specifying that no less than $300 million must be transferred to the P.L. 480 Title II food aid account. This famine funding, together with the supplemental P.L. 114-254 funding, makes total humanitarian funding enacted for FY2017 a 26% increase over the FY2016 enacted level.

- Ukraine/Countering Russian Aggression. Total funding identified by the Obama Administration for the purpose of “countering Russian aggression” would have decreased about 22% from FY2015, to $952 million, under the original FY2017 request. It is unclear whether the supplemental request would have impacted funding for this purpose. The decrease was the result of loan guarantees not being requested for Ukraine, as they were in FY2015. Aside from loan guarantees, bilateral and regional assistance to Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova would have increased by about 25%.

H.R. 5912 made available a total of $663 million for Ukraine, of which $325 million was contingent on a report from the Administration that it was necessary to continue economic and political reforms or to address vulnerabilities caused by Russian aggression. The latter could have been used to support a loan guarantee.

S. 3117 provided $295 million for Ukraine, the amount requested by the Administration, and $100 million for Georgia. It also provided $20 million in Europe and Eurasia regional funding to counter Russian aggression.

P.L. 114-254 included $157 million in the AEECA account to counter Russian aggression, and P.L. 115-31 directs not-less-than $100 million from various accounts to be used for a new Counter Russia Influence Fund. The act provides no less than $410.5 million in assistance for Ukraine, primarily from the AEECA account, a 37.6% decrease from FY2016. Total aid to Georgia and Moldova was not specified.

- Central America. As in FY2016, the Obama Administration again requested increased funding to support the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America. The $751 million requested (+34% from FY2015), would have focused on addressing the underlying causes of migration from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras.

H.R. 5912 would have provided up to $750 million to implement the U.S. Strategy for Engagement with Central America, but conditioned all aid to the governments of Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador on certification that they are taking steps to address a number of U.S policy priorities.

S. 3117 allocated $651 million for the Strategy, conditioning 25% of aid to the governments of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras on certification that they were making continued progress on a number of issues.

P.L. 115-31 included $655 million for FY2017 to implement the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America, a 12.7% reduction from FY2016. The law called for an update to the Strategy no later than 90 days after enactment and conditions the obligation of funds on recipient country actions related to border security, education of potential migrants, and cooperation with the United States.

- Democracy, Human Rights and Governance (DRG). The request included $2.72 billion for DRG assistance, a 41% increase over FY2015 and 18% over a
FY2016 congressional directive. The increase would have been spread across several regions and be used to promote government accountability, empower democratic voices, and respond to and support democratic transitions.

H.R. 5912 provided no less than $2.309 billion for democracy programs across all accounts, the same as the FY2016 funding.

S. 3117 recommended no less than $2.576 billion for democracy programs from specified economic assistance accounts, in addition to $170 million for the National Endowment for Democracy and $150.5 million for the Democracy Fund, and provided regional allocations for this assistance.

P.L. 115-31 provided not less than $2.309 billion for democracy programs across accounts, including $210.5 million (+39.9% from FY2016) for the Democracy Fund account. The legislation also requires the Trump Administration to submit a comprehensive, multiyear strategy for democracy promotion programs within 180 days of enactment.

- **Countering Violent Extremism (CVE).** The request included $187 million across several accounts for the purpose of countering violent extremism, a category that had not been highlighted in previous budget requests. The request was more than double the $92.2 million attributed to this purpose in FY2015. CVE activities include addressing conditions that drive terrorist recruitment, mitigating political and social marginalization, and countering violent extremist propaganda, among other things.

  H.R. 5912 authorized the use of funds for countering violent extremism and extremist organizations, but did not specify a funding level, while S. 3117 authorized the use of funds to support the May 2016 State and USAID Joint Strategy on Countering Violent Extremism, but did not specify a funding level.

  Countering violent extremism is among the purposes for which the supplemental funding in P.L. 114-254 was provided, but a specific amount for this objective was not specified. P.L. 115-31 also states that funds in the Act are to be made available to counter and defeat violent extremism, but does not specify a funding level. The legislation requires the Trump Administration, before obligating funds for this purpose, to submit to Congress a joint strategy to counter and defeat violent extremism and foreign fighters abroad.
Appendix A. State-Foreign Operations Appropriations, by Account

Table A-1. State Department, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2016 Actual and FY2017 Request and House and Senate Proposals

(in millions of current U.S. dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I, State, Broadcasting &amp; Related Agencies, TOTAL</td>
<td>16,470.15</td>
<td>11,800.54</td>
<td>7,032.90</td>
<td>18,833.44</td>
<td>11,250.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Foreign Affairs, Subtotal</td>
<td>11,439.23</td>
<td>8,637.70</td>
<td>5,198.66</td>
<td>13,835.87</td>
<td>8,034.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic &amp; Consular Programs</td>
<td>8,183.98</td>
<td>6,539.93</td>
<td>2,878.46</td>
<td>9,418.39</td>
<td>6,006.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of which Worldwide Security Protection)</td>
<td>[3,395.10]</td>
<td>[1,899.48]</td>
<td>[2,372.81]</td>
<td>[4,272.29]</td>
<td>[1,604.76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Investment Fund</td>
<td>66.40</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy Security, Construction &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>2,221.75</td>
<td>1,117.86</td>
<td>2,262.80</td>
<td>3,380.66</td>
<td>1,117.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(of which Worldwide Security Upgrades)</td>
<td>[688.80]</td>
<td>[358.65]</td>
<td>[1,228.00]</td>
<td>[1,586.65]</td>
<td>[358.70]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Stabilization Operations</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. &amp; Cultural Exchanges</td>
<td>590.90</td>
<td>639.77</td>
<td>639.77</td>
<td>572.67</td>
<td>572.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>139.30</td>
<td>87.07</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>144.47</td>
<td>87.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation Expenses</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>8.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Foreign Missions &amp; Officials</td>
<td>30.04</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>30.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency-Diplomatic &amp; Consular Services</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation Loans</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment American Institute Taiwan</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>31.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Chancery Center</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Service Retirement (mandatory)</td>
<td>158.90</td>
<td>158.90</td>
<td>158.90</td>
<td>158.90</td>
<td>158.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Orgs, Subtotal</td>
<td>3,906.85</td>
<td>2,097.82</td>
<td>1,834.24</td>
<td>3,932.06</td>
<td>2,061.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Int’l Orgs</td>
<td>1,446.19</td>
<td>1,290.89</td>
<td>96.24</td>
<td>1,387.13</td>
<td>1,279.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Enduring</td>
<td>OCOa</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Supp. OCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions, International Peacekeeping</td>
<td>2,460.66</td>
<td>806.93</td>
<td>1,588.00</td>
<td>2,394.93</td>
<td>563.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Response Mechananism</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Commission subtotal (Function 300)</td>
<td>122.72</td>
<td>121.29</td>
<td>121.29</td>
<td>126.29</td>
<td>123.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l Boundary/U.S.-Mexico</td>
<td>73.77</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td>76.53</td>
<td>74.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fisheries</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>32.50</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>36.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Broadcasting Subtotal</td>
<td>749.59</td>
<td>777.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>777.84</td>
<td>767.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Approps, Subtotal</td>
<td>239.51</td>
<td>153.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>155.22</td>
<td>243.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Foundation</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Institute of Peace</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>37.88</td>
<td>35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Middle East-West Dialogue-Trust &amp; Program</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Exchange Programs</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli Arab Scholarship Program</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Center</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>103.50</td>
<td>103.50</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Commissions, Subtotal</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>12.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of America’s Heritage Abroad</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Religious Freedom</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security &amp; Cooperation in Europe</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional-Exec Commission on People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-China Economic and Security Review</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN OPERATION, TOTAL</td>
<td>36,363.76</td>
<td>26,228.80</td>
<td>13,637.08</td>
<td>39,865.88</td>
<td>26,091.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II. Admin of Foreign Assistance</td>
<td>1,517.18</td>
<td>1,440.09</td>
<td>249.80</td>
<td>1,689.89</td>
<td>1,355.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRS-13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>FY2016 Actual</th>
<th>2017 Request, as amended</th>
<th>FY2017 Senate Bill (S. 3117)</th>
<th>FY2017 House Bill (H.R. 5912)</th>
<th>FY17 Enacted (P.L. 114-254+P.L. 115-31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Enduring</td>
<td>OCO</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Supp. OCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Operating Expenses</td>
<td>1,282.88</td>
<td>1,306.34</td>
<td>113.46</td>
<td>1,419.80</td>
<td>1,212.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Capital Investment Fund</td>
<td>168.30</td>
<td>66.15</td>
<td>133.84</td>
<td>199.99</td>
<td>199.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Inspector General</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>70.10</td>
<td>67.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III. Bilateral Economic Assistance</td>
<td>24,078.90</td>
<td>16,531.02</td>
<td>11,250.24</td>
<td>27,781.26</td>
<td>16,057.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Programs (GHP), State + USAID</td>
<td>8,503.45</td>
<td>8,576.50</td>
<td>8,576.50</td>
<td>8,576.50</td>
<td>8,503.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP (State Dept.)</td>
<td>[5,670.00]</td>
<td>[5,670.00]</td>
<td>[5,670.00]</td>
<td>[5,670.00]</td>
<td>[5,670.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP (USAID)</td>
<td>[2,833.45]</td>
<td>[2,906.50]</td>
<td>[2,906.50]</td>
<td>[2,906.50]</td>
<td>[2,906.50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Assistance</td>
<td>2,780.97</td>
<td>2,780.97</td>
<td>2,780.97</td>
<td>2,780.97</td>
<td>2,780.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Disaster Assistance (IDA)</td>
<td>2,794.18</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>2,785.20</td>
<td>2,785.20</td>
<td>2,794.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Initiatives</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>136.09</td>
<td>151.09</td>
<td>147.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Crises Fund</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Credit Authority—Admin</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Credit Authority Subsidy</td>
<td>[40.00]</td>
<td>[60.00]</td>
<td>[60.00]</td>
<td>[60.00]</td>
<td>[50.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund</td>
<td>4,318.99</td>
<td>2,408.45</td>
<td>6,132.55</td>
<td>8,541.00</td>
<td>8,311.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Fund</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>210.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia</td>
<td>929.69</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>929.69</td>
<td>291.42</td>
<td>453.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration &amp; Refugee Assistance</td>
<td>3,059.00</td>
<td>922.60</td>
<td>2,136.40</td>
<td>3,059.00</td>
<td>2,995.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Refugee and Migration</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Agencies subtotal</td>
<td>1,363.50</td>
<td>1,460.40</td>
<td>1,460.40</td>
<td>1,367.50</td>
<td>1,367.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Foundation</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Foundation</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
<td>901.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>905.00</td>
<td>901.00</td>
<td>905.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Treasury, subtotal</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Department Technical Assistance</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>30.20</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IV. Int’l Security Assistance</td>
<td>8,886.39</td>
<td>6,206.37</td>
<td>2,137.04</td>
<td>8,343.41</td>
<td>8,643.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRS-14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Enduring</td>
<td>OCOa</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Enduring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Narcotics Control &amp; Law Enforcement</td>
<td>1,266.47</td>
<td>813.77</td>
<td>343.54</td>
<td>1,157.31</td>
<td>780.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining</td>
<td>885.47</td>
<td>454.20</td>
<td>342.25</td>
<td>796.45</td>
<td>490.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Military Education &amp; Training</td>
<td>108.12</td>
<td>110.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>110.30</td>
<td>109.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Military Financing</td>
<td>6,025.70</td>
<td>4,701.81</td>
<td>1,012.15</td>
<td>5,713.96</td>
<td>4,988.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Operations</td>
<td>600.63</td>
<td>126.29</td>
<td>439.10</td>
<td>565.39</td>
<td>94.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V. Multilateral Assistance</td>
<td>2,619.25</td>
<td>2,617.92</td>
<td>2,617.92</td>
<td>2,342.53</td>
<td>2,342.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank: Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>168.26</td>
<td>146.56</td>
<td>146.56</td>
<td>146.56</td>
<td>146.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Clean Technology Fund</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Climate Fund</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>263.00</td>
<td>263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Development Bank</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank: Int’l. Development Association</td>
<td>1,197.13</td>
<td>1,384.07</td>
<td>1,384.07</td>
<td>1,113.13</td>
<td>1,113.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Bank Recon &amp; Dev</td>
<td>186.96</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADB: Enterprise for Americas MIF</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Development Bank—capital</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Fund</td>
<td>175.67</td>
<td>214.33</td>
<td>214.33</td>
<td>214.33</td>
<td>214.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Development Bank - capital</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>32.42</td>
<td>32.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Agriculture and Food Security Program</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations &amp; Programs</td>
<td>339.00</td>
<td>332.90</td>
<td>332.90</td>
<td>347.95</td>
<td>347.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central American and Caribbean Catastrophic Risk Insurance Facility</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Infrastructure Facility</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Enduring OCOa Total</td>
<td>Enduring OCO Total</td>
<td>Enduring OCO Total</td>
<td>Supp. OCO Enduring OCO Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI. Export Assistance</td>
<td>(737.96)</td>
<td>(566.60) (566.60)</td>
<td>(577.60) (577.60)</td>
<td>(610.96) (610.96)</td>
<td>(590.30) 0.00 (590.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export-Import Bank (net)</td>
<td>(527.75)</td>
<td>(414.30) (414.30)</td>
<td>(414.30) (414.30)</td>
<td>(417.75) (417.75)</td>
<td>(414.30) (414.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Private Investment Corporation (net)</td>
<td>(270.21)</td>
<td>(233.00) (233.00)</td>
<td>(244.00) (244.00)</td>
<td>(258.21) (258.21)</td>
<td>(251.00) (251.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Development Agency</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>80.70</td>
<td>80.70</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Foreign Ops &amp; related Programs, TOTAL</td>
<td>52,833.90</td>
<td>38,029.34 20,669.98 58,699.32</td>
<td>37,341.90 15,060.00 52,401.90</td>
<td>37,343.91 14,895.00 52,238.91</td>
<td>4,300.00a 36,744.90 16,485.00 57,529.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Ons/ Rescissions, netf</td>
<td>58.09</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>(165.00) (159.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Foreign Ops Total, Net of Rescissions</td>
<td>52,891.99</td>
<td>38,029.34 20,669.98 58,705.32</td>
<td>37,353.90 14,895.00 52,242.90</td>
<td>37,343.91 14,895.00 52,238.91</td>
<td>4,300.00 36,744.90 16,485.00 57,529.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Congressional Budget Justification, Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, Fiscal Year 2017; CBO report on P.L. 114-254; P.L.115-31; CRS calculations.

**Notes:** Shaded columns indicate fiscal year totals. Figures in brackets are subsumed in the larger account above and are not counted against the total. Figures in parentheses are negative numbers. "Enduring" funding is also sometimes referred to as "base" or "ongoing" funding in budget documents. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

- a. OCO request numbers include a supplemental request made by the Administration on November 10, 2016, which included additional OCO funding for Diplomatic & Consular Programs ($746.21 million); Office of the Inspector General—State ($2.50 million); Embassy Security, Construction and Maintenance ($1,024.00 million); Migration and Refugee Assistance ($260.40 million); International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement ($19.30 million); Economic Support Fund ($2,460.40 million); Peacekeeping Operations ($90.00 million); Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining and Related ($128.00 million); International Disaster Assistance ($953.20 million); USAID Operating Expenses ($15.00 million); Peacekeeping Operations ($90.00 million); and Office of Inspector General—USAID ($2.50 million).

- b. This account is mandatory spending, so State Operations and SFOPS totals in this table differ from budget totals that include only discretionary spending.

- c. The request includes $10.8 million for the East-West Center under the Educational and Cultural Exchanges account.

- d. Of this amount, the bill specifies that no less than $300 million must be transferred to the P.L. 280 Title II (Food for Peace) account and $1.5 million for USAID Operating Expenses.


- f. FY2016 add-ons include emergency Zika funding within P.L. 113-235, Consolidated and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015; $14.59 million for Diplomatic & Consular Programs; $4 million for Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, $1 million for the Repatriation Loans Program account, $10 million for USAID Operating Expenses, and $145.5 million for Global Health Programs. Recissions of funds from the same law include $7.522 million for USAID Operating Expenses and $109.478 million from Bilateral Economic Assistance funds that were appropriate to the President. The $6 million add-on in the FY2017 Senate bill was in Title VII, for special immigrant visas; the $165 million rescission in the FY2017 Senate bill is from the ESF-OCO account.
Appendix B. International Affairs (150) Function Account, FY2015 Actual, FY2016 Estimate, and FY2017 Request and Legislation

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

Table B-1. International Affairs Budget, FY2015, FY2016, and FY2017 Request, House and Senate Proposals, and Enacted
(in millions of current U.S. dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2016 Estimate</th>
<th>FY2017 Request, as amended</th>
<th>FY2017 Senate Bills</th>
<th>FY2017 House Bills</th>
<th>FY2017 Enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State-Foreign Operations,</strong></td>
<td>52,757.01</td>
<td>58,571.56</td>
<td>52,104.14</td>
<td>52,102.79</td>
<td>57,390.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>excluding commissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce-Justice-Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Claim Settlement</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l Trade Commission</td>
<td>88.84</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>91.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 480</td>
<td>1,466.00</td>
<td>1,350.00</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td>1,466.00</td>
<td>1,466.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern-Dole</td>
<td>201.63</td>
<td>182.05</td>
<td>201.63</td>
<td>201.63</td>
<td>201.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Procurement</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total International Affairs</strong></td>
<td>54,515.85</td>
<td>60,213.89</td>
<td>53,996.64</td>
<td>53,862.79</td>
<td>59,151.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(150)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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

b. The FY2017 Senate Agriculture appropriations bill provides $10 million for a local and regional procurement program, but does so through the McGovern-Dole account rather than a separate account as requested.
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