

State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs

DISCRETIONARY

\$10
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹

End Funding for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change

The IPCC was established in 1988 “to provide policymakers with regular scientific assessments concerning climate change, its implications and potential future risks, as well as to put forward adaptation and mitigation strategies. It has 195 member states.”² The organization’s studies³ have been subject to bias, politicization, and selective data. The IPCC has also been instrumental in confining global-warming research and debate to a narrow, politically correct perspective, claiming that man-made greenhouse gas emissions are the primary drivers of catastrophic, accelerating global warming. IPCC data and analysis should not be relied upon or disseminated unless they first meet the standards that Congress has set in the Information Quality Act.

Current law prohibits the transfer of U.S. funds to international organizations that grant full membership to the Palestinian territories.⁴ On December 18,

2015, the Palestinian Authority deposited its instrument of accession to the UNFCCC. In accordance with Article 23(2) of the treaty, the PA officially became the 197th party to the UNFCCC on March 17, 2016.⁵ As was the case when the Palestinians joined the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO),⁶ this should have triggered a U.S. law prohibiting any future U.S. funding for the UNFCCC. The Obama Administration, however, continued funding based on the argument that the UNFCCC is a treaty, not an international organization.

In fact, the UNFCCC is a treaty-based international organization, and the Framework Convention is the founding legal document upon which the organization and its structure are based. As with UNESCO, the U.S. should enforce this law for the UNFCCC and any other organization that grants full membership to the Palestinian territories.

ADDITIONAL READING

- David W. Kreutzer, “A Cure Worse than the Disease: Global Economic Impact of Global Warming Policy,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2802, May 28, 2013.
- David Kreutzer, “If IPCC Sea Level Numbers Aren’t Bad Enough, Try Tripling Them,” *The Daily Signal*, July 22, 2011.
- Brett D. Schaefer and Nicolas D. Loris, “U.S. Should Put U.N. Climate Conferences on Ice,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 3794, December 6, 2012.
- Nicolas D. Loris, Brett D. Schaefer, and Steven Groves, “The U.S. Should Withdraw from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3130, June 9, 2016.
- Brett D. Schaefer and James Phillips, “Provocative Palestinian U.N. Actions Require Strong U.S. Response,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4329, January 12, 2015.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$80
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁷

End Funding for the United Nations Development Program

The UNDP conducts projects in more than 170 countries around the world. It aspires to be the U.N. system’s premier anti-poverty agency, but the impact of the billions of dollars it spends every year on antipoverty programs is unclear. For example, a January 2013 UNDP Evaluation Office report found that the organization spent over \$8 billion on anti-poverty activities between 2004 and 2011 but that this focus was lost at the country level:

At the strategic planning level and at the Executive Board, poverty reduction is accorded top priority. However, by the time it reaches the country level, the focus on poverty reduction often becomes diluted.... Many of [the UNDP’s] activities have only remote connections with poverty, if at all.⁸

Moreover, UNDP aid meant to assist suffering populations in many authoritarian countries can inadvertently help perpetuate their suffering. In the past, the UNDP has funded inappropriate activities in Iran, North Korea, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.⁹ The U.S. has ample options for financing antipoverty programs, either bilaterally through U.S. assistance programs or multilaterally through the World Bank or regional development banks, and need not pursue these efforts through a flawed organization like the UNDP.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- Ambassador Terry Miller, “The United Nations and Development: Grand Aims, Modest Results,” Heritage Foundation *Special Report* No. SR-86, September 22, 2010.
- Brett Schaefer, “Why Does UNDP Continue to Aid Repressive Regimes?” The Daily Signal, August 27, 2010.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$32.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁰

Eliminate Funding for the United Nations Population Fund

For years, the U.S. withheld funding for the UNFPA under the Kemp–Kasten Amendment, which prohibits U.S. international aid from supporting coercive abortion procedures or involuntary sterilization.¹¹ In 2009, President Barack Obama announced that he would restore funding, and the U.S. has since sent tens of millions of taxpayer dollars to the UNFPA. In FY 2017, the U.S.-provided allocation was \$5.8 million.¹²

In a January 23, 2017, memorandum, President Donald Trump directed the “Secretary of State to take all necessary actions, to the extent permitted by law, to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars do not fund organizations or programs that support or participate in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.”¹³ In April 2017, the Trump Administration announced that it would withhold \$32.5 million in funding from the UNFPA.¹⁴

ADDITIONAL READING

- Brett D. Schaefer, “Congress Should Renew the Report Requirement on U.S. Contributions to the U.N. and Reverse Record Setting Contributions to the U.N.,” Heritage Foundation *WebMemo* No. 3324, July 22, 2011.
- Olivia Enos, Sarah Torre, and William T. Wilson, “An Economic and Humanitarian Case for Pressing China to Rescind the Two-Child Policy,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3146, November 18, 2016.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	Shifts spending to Family Planning and Reproductive Health.

DISCRETIONARY

\$193
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁵

Enforce the Cap on United Nations Peacekeeping Assessments

Current U.S. law caps U.S. payments for U.N. peacekeeping at 25 percent of the budget, but the U.N. will assess the U.S. at 27.8912 percent in 2019.¹⁶ In the past, appropriations bills allowed payments above the 25 percent cap to avoid arrears. Congress ended this practice for FY 2018 and should continue to enforce the cap and not pay any resulting arrears until the U.N. adopts a scale of assessments that specifies a 25 percent maximum share for any member state.

The Trump Administration has repeatedly stated its desire to reduce the U.S. share of the U.N. peacekeeping budget to 25 percent. President Trump reiterated this objective in his September 2017 speech to the U.N., stating that “[t]he United States bears an unfair cost burden” and “that no nation should have to bear a disproportionate share of the burden, militarily or financially.”¹⁷ As noted, Congress should continue to enforce the cap until the U.N. adopts a maximum peacekeeping assessment of 25 percent.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- Brett D. Schaefer, “Diplomatic Effort to Reduce America’s Peacekeeping Dues Must Start Now,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4781, November 1, 2017.
- Brett D. Schaefer, “The U.S. Should Push for Fundamental Changes to the United Nations Scale of Assessments,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3023, June 11, 2015.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

SFOPS

DISCRETIONARY

\$359
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁸

End U.S. Funding for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees

The UNRWA was established more than 60 years ago as a temporary initiative to address the needs of Palestinian refugees and facilitate their resettlement or repatriation, but by applying refugee status to the descendants of the original refugees, it has caused the problem to grow larger. This is unique to the UNRWA: The definition of “refugee” employed by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which addresses every other refugee population for the U.N., is consistent with the 1951 Refugee Convention. While UNHCR may classify multiple generations as refugees, they qualify based on the criteria outlined in the 1951 Convention as it currently exists, not on their relationship to the original refugees.

To advance the long-term prospects for peace, the U.S. should encourage winding down the UNRWA

to end the refugee status of Palestinians and facilitate their integration as citizens of their host states or resettlement in the West Bank and Gaza, where the Palestinian government should be responsible for their needs. The few remaining first-generation Palestinian refugees and those more recently displaced should be placed under the responsibility of the UNHCR.

In August 2018, the Trump Administration announced that “the United States will not make additional contributions to UNRWA.”¹⁹ Congress should work with the Administration to shift responsibility for recent Palestinian refugees to the UNHCR, provide funding to governments that are hosting Palestinians to facilitate integration, and demand that the Palestinians assume responsibility for the services provided by the UNRWA.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Brett D. Schaefer and James Phillips, “Time to Reconsider U.S. Support of UNRWA,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2997, March 5, 2015.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	Not addressed, although the Administration has halted U.S. payments to UNRWA, and the budget does not contain a funding request for UNRWA.

DISCRETIONARY

\$140
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²⁰

Eliminate Funding for the Global Environment Facility

The GEF manages the Special Climate Change Fund and the Least Developed Countries Fund, with a heavy emphasis on grants and financing for global-warming-adaptation projects. Since its creation by the World Bank and U.N. in 1991, the GEF has been the designated financial mechanism for a number of problematic international agreements, including the U.N. Convention on Biological Diversity, U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification, Minamata Convention on Mercury, and Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, as well as a number of international waters agreements such as the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea.²¹

According to a 2014 Transparency International report, the GEF lacks transparency in public access to information, anticorruption measures at the fund-recipient level, accountability at the executive level, and participation of project stakeholders.²² The GEF has allocated funds to help countries meet their respective Paris Protocol climate targets, including paying for green energy projects and “climate friendly” livestock initiatives.²³ Instead of using taxpayer dollars to fund energy and international climate-change projects, the U.S. should commit to free-market principles that will provide affordable, reliable energy, not government-selected technologies and energy sources.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- David W. Kreutzer, “A Cure Worse Than the Disease: Global Economic Impact of Global Warming Policy,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2802, May 28, 2013.
- Nicolas D. Loris, “Economic Freedom, Energy, and Development,” Chapter 5 in Terry Miller and Anthony B. Kim, *2015 Index of Economic Freedom* (Washington: The Heritage Foundation and Dow Jones & Company, Inc., 2015), pp. 57–67.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

SFOPS

DISCRETIONARY

\$1.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²⁴

Partially Withhold Assessed U.S. Payments to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

The OECD’s mission “is to promote policies that will improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world.”²⁵ In one area, however, the OECD has reliably promoted policies antithetical to that goal: higher taxes. Tax-related work by the OECD’s Centre for Tax Policy and Administration and other OECD directorates (for example, on carbon taxes) has focused almost entirely on studies that buttress political arguments for higher taxes and implementation of more intrusive ways to collect them. This focus is driven by high-tax European members of the OECD intent on promoting policies condemning international tax avoidance and evasion in order to prevent the flight of taxes needed to support their generous welfare programs. The ultimate goal of its “Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS)” Project and a proposed Protocol amending the Multilateral Convention on Mutual Assistance in Tax Matters is to centralize and harmonize global tax rules and increase effective tax rates on international firms.

Numerous economic studies show that tax competition benefits developed and developing economies alike, creating what Nobel-laureate economist Gary Becker calls “a race to the top rather than the bottom by limiting the ability of powerful and voracious groups and politicians in each nation to impose their will at the expense of the vast majority.”²⁶ As Milton Friedman noted, tax competition is a “liberalizing force in the world economy” that “forces governments to be more fiscally responsible.”²⁷

The United States should continue to withhold \$1.5 million of its assessed annual payment to the OECD as long as the OECD continues to support only tax studies that urge OECD members to increase taxes and implement more intrusive tax collection methods. This partial hold could be lifted if and when the OECD undertakes to conduct an equal amount of research on ways to cut government spending, reduce taxation, and make bureaucracies smaller and more efficient.

ADDITIONAL READING

- James M. Roberts and Adam N. Michel, “Trump Cut America’s Taxes: Now He Should Defund OECD Efforts to Raise Them,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4861, May 29, 2018.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$79.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²⁸

Eliminate the U.S. Trade and Development Agency

Created in 1961, the USTDA asserts that it “helps companies create U.S. jobs through the export of U.S. goods and services for priority development projects in emerging economies.” Through pilot projects, technical assistance, and other programs, it “links U.S. businesses to export opportunities by funding project preparation and partnership building activities that develop sustainable infrastructure and foster economic growth in partner countries.”²⁹ In practice, however, the USTDA has become little more than another source of taxpayer-subsidized crony corporatism.

The USTDA’s activities belong more properly to the private sector. To the extent that the agency continues to have a viable mission, that mission can be achieved by State Department Economic and Commercial Officers using existing budgetary resources.

The best way to promote trade and development is to reduce trade barriers. Another way is to reduce the federal budget deficit and thereby reduce federal borrowing from abroad so that more foreign dollars can be spent on U.S. exports instead of federal Treasury bonds. A dollar borrowed from abroad by a government is a dollar not available to buy U.S. exports or invest in the private sector of the U.S. economy.³⁰

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- James M. Roberts and Brett D. Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3247, September 19, 2017.
- “Eliminate the U.S. Trade and Development Agency,” in Republican Study Committee, *Securing America’s Future Economy: Fiscal Year 2018 Budget*, pp. 150–151.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

SFOPS

DISCRETIONARY

\$1.0
SAVINGS IN BILLIONS³¹

Overhaul U.S. Development Assistance Programs

The broad goals of U.S. assistance programs have long been to assist people in crises, enhance market opportunities for American products and investments by catalyzing economic growth in developing countries, and promote U.S. national security and foreign policy by supporting allies and countering adversaries. These are worthy goals, but U.S. foreign assistance needs to update concepts and priorities, eliminate duplication and waste, and address changing circumstances. Fundamental reform has languished far too long. As a result, many U.S. foreign aid programs can no longer help countries in need or serve U.S. interests effectively.

America’s fragmented and micromanaged foreign aid programs, split among more than 25 federal agencies, must be refitted to meet 21st century challenges.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) needs to be completely restructured, with its core health and humanitarian missions incorporated into the State Department.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation should take charge of all U.S. development assistance with the goal of graduating all countries from the need for foreign aid.

Properly designed and directed, U.S. foreign aid can support America’s national interests by addressing humanitarian crises; promoting policy changes necessary for economic growth led by the private sector, which is the most reliable and sustainable path to development; and advancing U.S. diplomatic and security priorities.

ADDITIONAL READING

- James M. Roberts and Brett D. Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3247, September 19, 2017.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	Consolidates economic assistance programs into the Economic Support and Development Fund (ESDF) and various humanitarian assistance accounts into the new International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) account.

DISCRETIONARY

\$750
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS³²

Eliminate the State Department’s Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia (AEECA) Account

The State Department’s AEECA account was established after the Cold War in the early 1990s to assist former Warsaw Pact countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union in their transition from Communism to market-based democracy.

Thirty years of funding the attainment of that goal is enough.

Most of the AEECA countries have successfully made the transition and are able to afford to hire their own technical advisors for any additional help they need, and the relatively few that remain trapped in authoritarian socialist systems will not benefit from additional funding by American taxpayers at this point. Any additional U.S. assistance to the AEECA countries should be funded through Economic Support Funds.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- James M. Roberts and Brett D. Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3247, September 19, 2017.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

SFOPS

DISCRETIONARY

\$52.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS³³

Eliminate the African Development Foundation and the Inter-American Foundation

The African Development Foundation has been providing relatively small grants to promote economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa since 1984. The Inter-American Foundation has been doing similar work in Latin America since 1969.

These small U.S. agencies are wasteful in the sense that there is no need for them to be stand-alone operations with their own administrative staffs and overhead.

Their objectives can and should be achieved by the Millennium Challenge Corporation or by the U.S.-funded multilateral development banks that these agencies were established to complement (the African Development Bank and Inter-American Development Bank).

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- James M. Roberts and Brett D. Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3247, September 19, 2017.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	Provides a small appropriation to facilitate closeout and merger with USAID.

DISCRETIONARY

\$160
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS³⁴

Close the 15 Smallest USAID Overseas Missions

Facing ongoing federal budget deficits, the United States can no longer afford the luxury of maintaining the extensive foreign aid presence that is reflected by the existence of approximately 100 overseas USAID missions. In some cases, these missions are located in countries that are not critical to the achievement of short-term to medium-term U.S. foreign policy objectives. In other cases, other Western donor nations have more extensive programs in those countries, and there is no need for USAID to duplicate their efforts.

This cut should be seen as a first step toward a comprehensive overhaul of all U.S. assistance programs, which need updated concepts and priorities, elimination of duplication and waste, and transformation to address changing global circumstances. Because fundamental reform has languished far too long, many U.S. foreign aid programs can no longer help countries in need or serve U.S. interests effectively.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- James M. Roberts and Brett D. Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3247, September 19, 2017.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

POLICY RIDERS

Increase oversight of international organizations. U.N. system revenues from assessed and voluntary contributions increased from \$14.96 billion in 2002 to \$45.72 billion in 2016. The U.S. remains the largest contributor, providing one-fifth of total contributions annually over that period. In 2016, the U.S. provided \$9.72 billion to the U.N. system according to the U.N. Chief Executives Board. The Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017,³⁵ enacted in 2016, requires the Office of Management and Budget to submit an annual report to Congress on U.S. contributions to the U.N. system. In FY 2017, the U.S. Department of State reported that total contributions to the International Organizations totaled \$12.124 billion.³⁶ However, that report does not address the question of whether the U.S. is receiving good value for those contributions. The U.S. should conduct a cost-benefit analysis of U.S. participation in all international organizations and establish a dedicated unit for international-organization issues in the Office of Inspector General for the Department of State.³⁷ In the FY 2019 budget, the Trump Administration announced that “the Department of State and USAID will review multilateral aid and contributions to evaluate how each multilateral organization to which the United States belongs advances American interests.”³⁸

Do not fund activities related to unratified treaties. If a treaty has not received the advice and consent of the Senate and has not been properly implemented in U.S. law, the U.S. should not fund any of its activities, either in the U.S. or elsewhere. Treaties are compacts between the nations that are party to them and should therefore be funded by the nations that have legally accepted their obligations. The only exception to this principle is that the U.S. should be able to pay the costs of its own diplomatic delegations that attend meetings related to treaties the U.S. is negotiating or related to treaties to which the U.S. is not a party. This exception, however, does not allow for the funding of treaty bodies or any delegation other than that of the United States.

ENDNOTES

1. Savings of \$10 million in FY 2020 are based on recommended contributions in Report No. 115-282, *Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2019*, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, 115th Cong., 2nd Sess., June 21, 2018, p. 70, <https://www.congress.gov/115/crpt/srpt282/CRPT-115srpt282.pdf> (accessed March 28, 2019). Heritage experts assume that spending holds steady through FY 2020.
2. Press release, “Summary for Policymakers of IPCC Special Report on Global Warming of 1.50 C. Approved by Governments,” Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, October 8, 2018, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/11/pr_181008_P48_spm_en.pdf (accessed March 28, 2019).
3. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change: Reports,” <https://www.ipcc.ch/> (accessed March 28, 2019).
4. “The United States shall not make any voluntary or assessed contribution: (1) to any affiliated organization of the United Nations which grants full membership as a state to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, or (2) to the United Nations, if the United Nations grants full membership as a state in the United Nations to any organization or group that does not have the internationally recognized attributes of statehood, during any period in which such membership is effective.” 22 U.S. Code § 287e, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/22/287e> (accessed March 28, 2019).
5. Announcement, “State of Palestine Joins Convention,” United Nations Climate Change, March 15, 2016, <https://unfccc.int/news/state-of-palestine-joins-convention> (accessed March 28, 2019).
6. This prohibition led the U.S. to withhold funding from UNESCO from 2011 when UNESCO granted the Palestinians full membership through 2018. The U.S. withdrew from UNESCO at the end of 2018.
7. Savings of \$80 million in FY 2020 are based on recommended contributions in Senate Report No. 115-281, *Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2019*, p. 70. Heritage experts assume that spending holds steady through FY 2020.
8. United Nations Development Programme, Evaluation Office, *Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Poverty Reduction*, January 2013, pp. vii and xiv, https://papersmart.unmeetings.org/media2/2357248/evaluation_of_undp_contribution_to_poverty_reduction.pdf (accessed March 28, 2019).
9. Brett Schaefer, “Why Does UNDP Continue to Aid Repressive Regimes?” *The Daily Signal*, August 27, 2010, <http://dailysignal.com/2010/08/27/why-does-undp-continue-to-aid-repressive-regimes/>.
10. Estimated savings of \$32.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019, Public Law 116-9, 116th Cong., February 15, 2019, <https://www.congress.gov/bills/116th-congress/house-joint-resolution/31> (accessed March 28, 2019). Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
11. Daniel Briggs, “The Kemp-Kasten Provision and UNFPA Funding,” *Americans United for Life*, April 23, 2010, <http://www.aul.org/2010/04/the-kemp-kasten-provision-and-unfpa-funding/> (accessed March 28, 2019). “The United Nations Fund for Population Activities was established as a trust fund in 1967 and began operations in 1969. In 1987, it was officially renamed the United Nations Population Fund, reflecting its lead role in the United Nations system in the area of population. The original abbreviation, UNFPA, was retained.” United Nations Population Fund, “Frequently Asked Questions: What Does UNFPA Stand For?” last updated January 2018, <https://www.unfpa.org/frequently-asked-questions#acronym> (accessed March 28, 2019).
12. U.S. Department of State, *United States Contributions to International Organizations: Sixty-Sixth Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 2017*, p. 13, <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/287307.pdf> (accessed March 28, 2019).
13. Donald J. Trump, “Presidential Memorandum Regarding the Mexico City Policy,” *The White House*, January 23, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/presidential-memorandum-regarding-mexico-city-policy/> (accessed March 28, 2019).
14. Nurith Aizenman, “Citing Abortions in China, Trump Cuts Funds for U.N. Family Planning Agency,” *NPR*, April 4, 2017, <https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2017/04/04/522040557/citing-abortion-in-china-trump-cuts-funds-for-u-n-family-planning-agency> (accessed March 28, 2019).
15. Estimated savings of \$193 million for FY 2020 are based on reducing the U.S. share of funding from 27.8912 percent to 25 percent. The approved U.N. Peacekeeping budget was \$6.691 billion for July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019, as found in United Nations General Assembly, “Approved Resources for Peacekeeping Operations for the Period from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019,” A/C.5/72/25, 72nd Sess., Fifth Committee Agenda, Item 149, July 5, 2018, <http://undocs.org/A/C.5/72/25> (accessed March 28, 2019). Heritage experts assume that this spending level holds steady through FY 2020. The projected shares come from Addendum to Report of the Secretary-General, “Implementation of General Assembly Resolutions 55/235 and 55/236,” A/73/350/Add.1, 73rd Sess., Agenda Item 149, December 24, 2018, <http://undocs.org/en/A/73/350/Add.1> (accessed March 28, 2019).
16. The U.S. peacekeeping assessment is established in three-year sets, the most recent being for 2019–2021. The specific assessment can fluctuate within each three-year scale and also when new scales are adopted using updated economic data. For instance, the U.S. peacekeeping assessment is 27.8912 percent for 2019 and 27.8908 percent for 2020 and 2021. In addition, the U.N. peacekeeping budget can change significantly as new missions are established or existing missions are expanded, contracted, or closed.
17. Donald J. Trump, “Remarks by President Trump to the 72nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly,” *The White House*, September 19, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-72nd-session-united-nations-general-assembly/> (accessed March 28, 2019).
18. Estimated savings of \$359 million for FY 2020 are based on contributions by the United States in FY 2017 as reported in U.S. Department of State, *United States Contributions to International Organizations: Sixty-Sixth Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 2017*, p. 12.

19. Heather Nauert, Press Statement, “On U.S. Assistance to UNRWA,” U.S. Department of State, August 31, 2018, <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2018/08/285648.htm> (accessed March 28, 2019).
20. Estimated savings of \$140 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
21. See, for example, Global Environment Facility, “About Us,” <https://www.thegef.org/about-us> (accessed March 28, 2019), and Global Environment Facility, “Conventions,” <https://www.thegef.org/partners/conventions> (accessed March 28, 2019).
22. Lisa Elges and Claire Martin, *Protecting Climate Finance: An Anti-Corruption Assessment of the Adaptation Fund*, Transparency International, 2014, https://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/publication/protecting_climate_finance_adaptation_fund (accessed March 28, 2019).
23. Global Environment Facility, “Projects,” <https://www.thegef.org/projects> (accessed March 28, 2019).
24. Calculation based on the following information provided to Heritage analysts by the OECD on February 4, 2019: “In 2016, the assessed contributions from the United States were 20.5 percent of the OECD’s core (i.e. assessed) budget. Of the total core contributions budget that year, a total of 3.2 percent—EUR 6.3M from all countries combined—was dedicated to the organization’s work on taxation.” USD \$1.5 million is approximately equal to €6.3 million.
25. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, “About the OECD: Our Mission,” <https://www.oecd.org/about/> (accessed March 28, 2019).
26. Chris Edwards and Daniel J. Mitchell, *Global Tax Revolution: The Rise of Tax Competition and the Battle to Defend It* (Washington: Cato Institute, 2008), p. 148.
27. Ibid.
28. Estimated savings of \$79.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
29. U.S. Trade and Development Agency, “Our Mission,” <http://www.ustda.gov/about/mission> (accessed March 28, 2016).
30. Bryan Riley and Anthony B. Kim, “Freedom to Trade: A Guide for Policymakers,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3064, October 20, 2015, <http://thf-reports.s3.amazonaws.com/2015/BG3064.pdf>.
31. Estimated savings of \$1 billion for FY 2020 are based on proposed reforms reported in James M. Roberts and Brett D. Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3247, September 19, 2017, <https://www.heritage.org/sites/default/files/2017-09/BG3247.pdf>. Although a comprehensive overhaul would generate substantial savings, we include only a portion of those savings that can easily be estimated. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
32. Estimated savings of \$750 million for FY 2020 are based on proposed reforms reported in Roberts and Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue.” Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
33. Estimated savings of \$52.5 million for FY 2020 are based on proposed reforms reported in Roberts and Schaefer, “An Overhaul of America’s Foreign Assistance Programs Is Long Overdue.” Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
34. Estimated savings of \$160 million for FY 2020 represents a calculation of the cost of operating the 15 smallest USAID mission around the world, which is 15 percent of the approximately \$1.070 billion FY 2018 budget for Program Development and Oversight as reported in U.S. Agency for International Development, *Agency Financial Report: Fiscal Year 2018*, p. 33, https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/USAIDFY2018AFR_508R.pdf (accessed March 28, 2019).
35. S. 1635, Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017, Public Law 114-323, 114th Cong., December 16, 2016, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/senate-bill/1635/text> (accessed March 28, 2019).
36. U.S. Department of State, *United States Contributions to International Organizations: Sixty-Sixth Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 2017*, p. 5.
37. Brett D. Schaefer, “U.S. Should Demand Increased Transparency and Accountability as U.N. Revenues Rise,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4154, February 26, 2014, <https://www.heritage.org/report/us-should-demand-increased-transparency-and-accountability-un-revenues-rise>.
38. Office of Management and Budget, Fiscal Year 2019 Budget of the U.S. Government, p. 84, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/budget-fy2019.pdf> (accessed March 28, 2019).