



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

Susan B. Epstein  
Specialist in Foreign Policy

March 13, 2013

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

[www.crs.gov](http://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), requires across-the-board reductions (sequestration) in most federal defense and nondefense discretionary programs, projects, and activities, including those in foreign affairs. These automatic cuts went into effect on March 1, 2013. Of ongoing interest will be the impact of these cuts on State Department operations, foreign aid programs, and their ability to protect Americans and promote U.S. interests overseas.

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 remains 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 that sequestration is being implemented, Congress is also working on continuing government funding through the remainder of the fiscal year. Currently, the government is operating under a continuing resolution (CR, P.L. 112-175) that provides stop-gap funding through March 27, 2013. Some believe that Congress might pass a CR that provides more flexibility for implementing the sequestration law. Whether or not a CR amends the across-the-board cuts, many expect the new CR funding levels to change the baseline of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) calculations and, thus, change the current estimates of sequestration cuts, including for foreign affairs spending accounts.

In addition, the Administration has indicated that it intends to submit its FY2014 budget request to Congress in April. It will identify President Obama's priorities and plans for meeting the BCA caps in the next fiscal year.

This report discusses current OMB estimates of foreign affairs accounts sequestration amounts. For background on the current foreign affairs budget, see CRS Report R42621, *State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2013 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 Foreign Affairs Sequestration Is to Be Implemented.....	2
Foreign Affairs Exemptions.....	4
Preliminary Calculations and Possible Impact .....	4

## **Tables**

Table 1. State Department, Foreign Operations and Related Agencies Appropriations, FY2011-FY2013 Post-Sequestration Estimate .....	6
---	---

## **Contacts**

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

## Background

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

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 savings.

Section 302 of the BCA amends 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 are established for FY2013 through FY2021. The spending reductions are 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 are achieved through sequestration in FY2013 and through downward adjustment of statutory limits to be met in the appropriation process for FY2014 to FY2021.

To meet the spending limits, 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.

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 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

---

<sup>1</sup> For more detail, see CRS Report R41965, *The Budget Control Act of 2011*, by Bill Heniff Jr., Elizabeth Rybicki, and Shannon M. Mahan.

14, 2012, presents the methodology, identifies sequestrable and exempt funds, and estimates sequestration at the account-level.<sup>2</sup>

## **Sequestration of the Department of State and Foreign Operations Appropriations**

The State-Foreign Operations (SFOP) appropriations, typically representing about 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 Foreign Affairs Sequestration Is to Be 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), requires \$85.3 billion in automatic cuts to be applied equally (\$42.65 billion for each) between defense and nondefense accounts.<sup>3</sup> Defense is defined as spending under the 050 budget function, and nondefense is defined as spending under most other budget functions. Foreign affairs appropriations are categorized as nondefense. OMB calculates that, in order to meet the FY2013 budget cap and based on the current CR funding levels, a 5% reduction for nondefense discretionary funding and a 5.1% reduction for nondefense mandatory programs is necessary between March and September 30, 2013.<sup>4</sup>

The approximately 5% reduction is 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) provides appropriations for foreign affairs spending at the FY2012 appropriation act levels plus an increase of .0612% for most accounts through March 27, 2013.<sup>5</sup> According to State Department officials, for State Department operations, many reductions will be calculated at the account level, but some will be at PPA levels as defined in the most recent appropriations and authorization acts or related report language.<sup>6</sup> For foreign operations, the FY2012 appropriation

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/fy13ombjsequestrationreport.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> Appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations was not increased by 0.612% for FY2013.

<sup>6</sup> 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 (continued...)

act defined some PPAs, particularly foreign aid programs. 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 is to be 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 is to be applied at *the account level and to earmarks* 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).

The sequester is to be applied at the *country allocation level and to earmarks* 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 have the authority to reprogram certain funds to protect a particular country or activity, subject to regular notification procedures. That would mean, however, that other PPAs within those accounts would be further reduced. It is possible that transfer authority may be available as defined by Section 7009, Title VII, Division I of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, P.L. 112-74.<sup>7</sup> Because of these uncertainties, precise country allocations after sequestration cannot be calculated.

---

(...continued)

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.

<sup>7</sup> Telephone conversation with the Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance (F Bureau), Department of State, February 20, 2013.

## 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 include<sup>8</sup>

- **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.

## Preliminary Calculations and Possible Impact

OMB's calculations based on the current six-month CR, as seen in the **Table 1** below, show that the sequestration would reduce State-Foreign Operations appropriations by more than \$2.7 billion in FY2013. The total estimate of \$52.3 billion for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs in FY2013 is 3% below the FY2012 appropriation estimate, but still 6% above the FY2011 actual funding level.

Within the total reduction, according to OMB, the Department of State's Administration of Foreign Affairs will be reduced by \$670 million. Of specific interest to some in Congress is the anticipated \$550 million reduction in the Diplomatic and Consular Programs (D&CP) account, which includes Worldwide Security Programs (WSP) funds for embassy security, and the \$79 million reduction in Embassy Security, Construction, and Maintenance (ESCM), which includes Worldwide Security Upgrades (WSU) for facility security around the world.<sup>9</sup> While WSP and WSU estimated reductions are not available, the House Appropriations Committee Democrats estimate that sequestration could cut about \$168 million from embassy security activities at a time when many, including the Accountability Review Board (ARB) for the Benghazi Consulate attack, are saying embassy security is already underfunded.<sup>10</sup>

OMB estimates show Global Health Programs (GHP) would lose \$411 million, including an estimated \$280 million from the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR); the Economic Support Fund (ESF) would lose \$284 million; and Foreign Military Financing (FMF) would lose \$317 million.

OMB also calculates that U.S. Contributions to International Peacekeeping and Peacekeeping Operations are scheduled to lose \$92 million and \$19 million, respectively, which could cause disruption in activities such as the ongoing U.S. efforts to stabilize Mali. More than \$100 million

---

<sup>8</sup> Telephone conversation with the State Department's Bureau of Budget and Planning, February 13, 2013.

<sup>9</sup> In addition to appropriations, D&CP has an estimated \$2,290 million in fees that would also be sequestered, reducing it by \$115 million.

<sup>10</sup> The House Committee on Appropriations, *Report on Sequestration*, by House Committee Democrats, February 13, 2013, pp. 27-31.

would be reduced from international counter-narcotics programs, which could hinder the work to dismantle drug-trafficking in Mexico and elsewhere. And sequestration is expected to reduce International Broadcasting funds by about \$39 million, perhaps limiting the ability to influence audiences abroad.

According to Secretary of State John Kerry, other possible impacts from these cuts could include the following:<sup>11</sup>

- Reductions in humanitarian aid may reduce the U.S. ability to address growing needs in Syria, the Horn of Africa, and the Sahel.
- Reductions in security assistance could hinder U.S. support for Israel. Sequestration of national security assistance would include an estimated reduction of \$317 million in Foreign Military Financing, more than half of which typically is appropriated for Israel. Another 42% of FMF funds in recent years have gone to Egypt, Jordan, and Iraq.
- The Diplomatic and Consular Programs account could restrict the ability to help Americans abroad and could limit the processing of visa applications. The Department of Commerce estimates that issuing visas promotes American job creation in the travel and tourism industry.
- An estimated reduction in U.S. economic and development assistance overseas by more than \$400 million may hinder lifesaving global health programs and curtail opening up overseas markets for U.S. exports and the resulting job creation that supports those exports.

In sharp contrast, however, some Members of Congress believe reducing foreign aid would not cause a significant problem. They argue that the United States should spend that money domestically.<sup>12</sup> Some also suggest that foreign aid funding has increased in recent years and the sequester would bring it in line with funding levels during the George W. Bush Administration. A recent survey illustrated this sentiment when, among 19 categories included in the survey, foreign aid received the highest percentage in favor of decreasing its funding. Public opinion, however, registers a split on this issue. When Americans were asked what should happen to foreign aid funding, 48% said it should be decreased, although 49% said it should be increased or remain the same. The Department of State received a more favorable response, with 34% believing its funding should be decreased, while 60% said it should be increased or remain the same.<sup>13</sup>

Foreign aid proponents 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 less than 1% of the total U.S. government budget.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, for the U.S. government to not

---

<sup>11</sup> Letter from Secretary of State John F. Kerry to Senator Barbara A. Mikulski, Chairwoman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, February 11, 2013.

<sup>12</sup> Sen. Rand Paul's Sequester Solution: *Stop Replacing Retired Federal Workers, Cut Foreign Aid & Travel*, Real Clear Politics, February 26, 2013, [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2013/02/26.Looming\\_US\\_cuts\\_raise\\_fears\\_for\\_world's\\_poor](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2013/02/26.Looming_US_cuts_raise_fears_for_world's_poor), Agence France-Presse, <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/130226/looming-us-cuts-raise-fears-world's-poor>, February 26, 2013.

<sup>13</sup> Pew Research Center, *As Sequester Deadline Looms, Little Support for Cutting Most Programs*, February 22, 2013, p. 1.

<sup>14</sup> While State-Foreign Operations appropriations typically represents about 1.5% of the total federal budget, the (continued...)



be engaged with many countries trying to transition toward democracy would likely leave a void that could be filled by unfriendly countries.

Despite differing views of reducing foreign affairs spending, how current and future Administrations do more overseas with less will be key as reductions continue to FY2021 and perhaps beyond. **Table 1** below outlines budget levels by account for FY2011, estimated FY2012 levels, and OMB estimates of the FY2013 baseline and sequestration levels.

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

(millions of current U.S. \$)

	FY2011 actual <sup>a</sup>	FY2012 estimate (P.L. 112-74)			Sequestration of Appropriations for FY2013 <sup>b</sup>		
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Sequestered approps [funds not sequestered in brackets]	Sequester amount	FY2013 appropriation estimate post sequestration
<b>Title I. State Department Administration of Foreign Affairs, Subtotal</b>	<b>11,384.83</b>	<b>9,018.01</b>	<b>4,513.34</b>	<b>13,531.35</b>	<b>13,604</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>12,934</b>
Diplomatic & Consular Program	8,717.07	6,529.13	4,389.06	10,918.19	11,001 <sup>c</sup>	550 <sup>c</sup>	10,451
Capital Investment Fund	59.38	59.38		59.38	60	3	57
Embassy Security, Construction & Maintenance	1,630.95	1,537.00	33.00	1,570.00	1,579	79	1,500
Conflict Stabilization Operations	35.20	21.82	8.50	30.32	8	*	8
Ed. & Cultural Exchanges	599.55	583.20	15.60	598.80	602	30	572
Office of Inspector General	104.79	61.90	67.18	129.08	129	6	123
Representation Allowances	7.84	7.30		7.30	7	*	7
Protection of Foreign Missions & Officials	27.94	27.00		27.00	27	1	26
Emergency-Diplomatic & Consular Services	19.35	9.30		9.30	9	*	9
Repatriation Loans	1.57	1.45		1.45	1	*	1
International Center	0.51	0.52		0.52	1	*	1
Payment American Institute Taiwan	21.78	21.11		21.11	21	1	20
Foreign Service Retirement (mandatory)	158.90	158.90		158.90	[159]	—	159
<b>International Organizations, Subtotal</b>	<b>3,462.58</b>	<b>3,277.88</b>	<b>101.30</b>	<b>3,379.18</b>	<b>3,399</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>3,229</b>
Contributions to Int'l Orgs	1,578.65	1,449.70	101.30	1,551.00	1,560	78	1,482
Contributions to International Peacekeeping	1,883.93	1,828.18		1,828.18	1,839	92	1,747
<b>International Commissions</b>	<b>132.64</b>	<b>124.16</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>124.16</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>119</b>

(...continued)

foreign aid portion typically represents less 1% of the federal budget.

	FY2011 actual <sup>a</sup>	FY2012 estimate (P.L. 112-74)			Sequestration of Appropriations for FY2013 <sup>b</sup>		
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Sequestered approps [funds not sequestered in brackets]	Sequester amount	FY2013 appropriation estimate post sequestration
Int'l Boundary/ U.S.-Mexico	69.66	76.17		76.17	77	4	73
American Sections	12.58	11.69		11.69	12	1	11
International Fisheries	50.40	36.30		36.30	37	2	35
<b>International Broadcasting, Subtotal</b>	<b>738.76</b>	<b>747.13</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>751.53</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>717</b>
Broadcasting Operations	732.31	740.10	4.40	744.50	749	39	710
Capital Improvements	6.45	7.03		7.03	7	*	7
<b>Related Appropriations, Subtotal</b>	<b>198.00</b>	<b>183.77</b>	<b>8.40</b>	<b>192.17</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>184</b>
Asia Foundation	17.86	17.00		17.00	17	1	16
U.S. Institute of Peace	39.40	30.59	8.40	38.99	39	2	37
Center for Middle East-West Dialogue-Trust & Program	1.30	0.84		0.84	[1]	—	1
Eisenhower Exchange Programs	0.30	0.50		0.50	[1]	—	1
Israeli Arab Scholarship Program	0.42	0.38		0.38	1	*	1
East-West Center	20.96	16.70		16.70	17	1	16
National Endowment for Democracy	117.76	117.76		117.76	118	6	112
<b>Other Commissions</b>	<b>13.00</b>	<b>11.84</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>11.84</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>*</b>	<b>12</b>
Preservation of America's Heritage	0.60	0.63		0.63	[1]	—	1
Int'l Religious Freedom	4.30	3.00		3.00	[3]	—	3
Security & Cooperation Europe	2.60	2.72		2.72	[3]	—	3
Cong.-Exec. on People's Republic of China	2.00	2.00		2.00	[2]	—	2
U.S.-China Economic and Security Review	3.50	3.49		3.49	3	*	3
<b>State/Broadcasting/Related Agencies, TOTAL</b>	<b>15,929.81</b>	<b>13,362.79</b>	<b>4,627.44</b>	<b>17,990.23</b>	<b>18,091</b>	<b>896</b>	<b>17,195</b>
<b>Title II. U.S. Agency for International Development</b>	<b>1,528.44</b>	<b>1,268.50</b>	<b>259.50</b>	<b>1,528.00</b>	<b>1,535</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1,457</b>
USAID Operating Expenses	1,347.30	1,092.30	255.00	1,347.30	1,354	68	1,286
Conflict Stabilization Operations	4.99			—	—	—	—
USAID Capital Investment Fund	129.74	129.70		129.70	130	7	123
USAID Inspector General	46.41	46.50	4.50	51.00	51	3	48
<b>Title III. Bilateral Economic Assistance, Subtotal</b>	<b>21,205.03</b>	<b>18,353.94</b>	<b>3,218.56</b>	<b>21,572.50</b>	<b>21,544</b>	<b>1,077</b>	<b>20,467</b>
Global Health Programs (GHP), State + USAID	7,832.31	8,167.86		8,167.86	8,218	411	7,807
Development Assistance	2,519.95	2,519.95		2,519.95	2,535	127	2,408

	FY2011 actual <sup>a</sup>	FY2012 estimate (P.L. 112-74)			Sequestration of Appropriations for FY2013 <sup>b</sup>		
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Sequestered approps [funds not sequestered in brackets]	Sequester amount	FY2013 appropriation estimate post sequestration
International Disaster & Famine Assistance	863.27	825.00	150.00	975.00	980	49	931
Transition Initiatives	54.89	50.14	6.55	56.69	57	3	54
Complex Crises Fund	39.92	10.00	30.00	40.00	40	2	38
Development Credit Authority –Admin	8.28	8.30		8.30	8	*	8
Economic Support Fund	5,931.71	2,994.75	2,801.46	5,796.21	5,675	284	5,391
Assistance for Europe; Eurasia & Central Asia (AEECA)	695.74	626.72		626.72	631	32	599
Democracy Fund	114.77	114.77		114.77	115	6	109
Migration & Refugee Assistance	1,694.60	1,646.10	229.00	1,875.10	1,885	94	1,791
Emergency Refugee and Migration	49.90	27.20		27.20	27	1	26
Inter-American Foundation	22.45	22.50		22.50	23 <sup>c</sup>	1 <sup>c</sup>	22
African Development Foundation	29.44	30.00		30.00	30	2	28
Peace Corps	374.25	375.00		375.00	377	19	358
Millennium Challenge Corporation	898.20	898.20		898.20	904	45	859
Treasury Department Technical Assistance	25.45	25.45	1.55	27.00	[27]	—	27
Debt Restructuring	49.90	12.00		12.00	12	1	11
<b>Title IV. Military/Security Assistance, Subtotal</b>	<b>8,413.96</b>	<b>7,269.82</b>	<b>3,097.27</b>	<b>10,367.09</b>	<b>10,501</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>9,978</b>
International Narcotics Control & Law Enforcement	1,593.81	1,061.10	943.61	2,004.71	2,051	103	1,948
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining	738.52	590.11	120.66	710.77	714	36	678
International Military Education & Training	105.79	105.79		105.79	106	5	101
Foreign Military Financing	5,374.23	5,210.00	1,102.00	6,312.00	6,344	317	6,027
Peacekeeping Operations	304.39	302.82	81.00	383.82	386	19	367
Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund (PCCF)	297.22		800.00	800.00	850	43	807
Global Security Fund		—	50.00	50.00	[50]	—	50
<b>Title V. Multilateral Assistance, Subtotal</b>	<b>2,299.47</b>	<b>2,971.10</b>		<b>2,971.10</b>	<b>3,259</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>3,109</b>
World Bank: Global Environment Facility	89.82	89.82		89.82	[90]	—	90
International Clean Technology Fund	184.63	184.63		184.63	186	9	177
Strategic Climate Fund	49.90	49.90		49.90	50	3	47
World Bank: Int'l. Development Association	1,232.53	1,325.00		1,325.00	1,501	75	1,426
Int. Bank Recon & Dev		117.36		117.36	208	10	198
Inter-Amer. Dev. Bank - capital		75.00		75.00	80	4	76

	FY2011 actual <sup>a</sup>	FY2012 estimate (P.L. 112-74)			Sequestration of Appropriations for FY2013 <sup>b</sup>		
	Total	Core	OCO	Total	Sequestered approps [funds not sequestered in brackets]	Sequester amount	FY2013 appropriation estimate post sequestration
IADB: Enterprise for Americas MIF	24.95	25.00		25.00	25	1	24
IADB: Inter-American Investment Corporation	20.96	4.67		4.67	[5]	—	5
Asian Development Bank/Fund	106	206.59		206.59	208	10	198
African Development Bank/Fund	109.78	204.92		204.92	214	11	203
International Fund for Agricultural Development	29.44	30.00		30.00	30	2	28
Global Food Security Fund	99.80	135.00		135.00	136	7	129
International Organizations & Programs	351.29	348.71		348.71	351	18	333
Multilateral Debt Relief		174.50		174.50	[175]	—	175
<b>Title VI. Export Aid, Subtotal</b>	<b>(149.40)</b>	<b>(413.01)</b>		<b>(413.01)</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>102</b>
Export-Import Bank (net)	2.58	(266.00)		(266.00)	—	—	—
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (net)	(201.88)	(197.01)		(197.01)	58	3	55
Trade & Development Agency	49.90	50.00		50.00	50	3	47
<b>Foreign Ops TOTAL</b>	<b>33,297.50</b>	<b>29,450.35</b>	<b>6,575.33</b>	<b>36,025.68</b>	<b>36,947</b>	<b>1,834</b>	<b>35,113</b>
<b>State-Broadcasting-Related, TOTAL</b>	<b>15,929.81</b>	<b>13,362.79</b>	<b>4,627.44</b>	<b>17,990.23</b>	<b>18,091</b>	<b>896</b>	<b>17,195</b>
<b>State-Foreign Operations, TOTAL</b>	<b>49,227.31</b>	<b>42,813.14</b>	<b>11,202.77</b>	<b>54,015.91</b>	<b>55,038</b>	<b>2,730</b>	<b>52,308</b>

**Source:** FY2011 and FY2012 data are from the FY2013 Congressional Budget Justification; FY2013 data are from the OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Sequestration for Fiscal Year 2013, March 1, 2013.

**Notes:** Figures in brackets are funds that are appropriated, but not sequestered. Figures in parentheses are negative numbers.

\* denotes \$500,000 or less.

- FY2011 figures reflect a 0.2% across-the-board rescission included in P.L. 112-10.
- Calculations provided by the Office of Management and Budget, OMB Report to the Congress on the Joint Committee Sequestration for Fiscal Year 2013, March 1, 2013.
- In addition to appropriations, D&CP funds include an additional \$2,290 million in direct spending authority that a sequester would reduce by \$115 million. The Inter-American Foundation, in addition to appropriations, gets \$6 million in direct spending authority that would be reduced by less than \$500,000.
- Figures are net of offsetting receipts.

## **Author Contact Information**

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