

# \$521 Million Shortfall for UN Peacekeeping Urgent Supplemental Funding Needed

OMB, GAO, and Secretaries Rice and Rumsfeld assert that UN Peacekeeping promotes U.S. national security interests and is highly cost effective

## FY06 Supplemental Is Inadequate

---

The U.S. began the 2006 fiscal year with a shortfall of \$521 million in the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account, which pays the U.S. share of UN peacekeeping missions. The President, though, has requested only \$69.8 million for additional money for CIPA in the “emergency supplemental bill”. Assuming the supplemental is funded at this level, **the U.S. will continue to have a \$452 million shortfall from FY06 and earlier.**

If this shortfall is left unaddressed, by July, the U.S. will be unable to pay for peacekeeping missions that it is specifically endorsing and voting for in the UN’s Security Council.

## What Happens When The U.S. Falls Behind In Its Payments?

---

- **Bush Administration Supports Increase in UN Peacekeeping:** Since 2003, the Bush Administration has supported a major increase in UN peacekeeping missions to help end brutal conflicts, support stability and transition to democratic change, and bring relief for hundreds of millions of people, including new operations in Sudan, Haiti, Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia, Burundi and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This has increased peacekeeping forces to over 70,000 worldwide.
- **UN Peacekeeping has helped maintain stability abroad:** Late last year, *The Human Security Report*, a major international study on peace and war, judged that, contrary to popular belief, the global security climate improved dramatically between 1988 and 2001, with genocides and politicides plummeting by 80 percent. The study attributed that decline to the explosion in conflict prevention, peacemaking, and post-conflict activities, including increases in the number and complexity of UN peacekeeping missions. View report: <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=28&Itemid=63>
- **Efforts to Halt the Genocide in Darfur are Impeded:** A UN mission to Darfur is expected to come into force within a matter of months and, according to Jane Holl Lute, the UN’s Assistant Secretary General for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, it will be the largest and most complex peacekeeping mission ever undertaken by the United Nations. Secretary General Annan has said that at least double the current 7,700-person AU force is needed to stop the violence. Given the politics on the ground in Sudan and our existing commitments elsewhere in the world, the U.S. government is eager to have the UN to take this mission on as soon as possible. Without U.S. funds NOW, the UN may not be able to convince nations – already owed for their previous commitments – to contribute additional troops for a Darfur mission when that mission comes into force. Millions of Sudanese have already suffered while waiting for the international community to respond. Congress can help ensure more do not suffer needlessly by providing the UN with the financial resources NOW so that they will be ready to step in when called.
- **Troop Contributing Nations Bear the Burden:** When the U.S. or other countries fail to pay or defer their peacekeeping bills; the UN is forced to adjust its bill-paying strategies. The UN will pay deadline sensitive bills, like paying for equipment, travel, and short-term logistical expenses, but defer payments to troop contributing nations. After the U.S. repaid its arrears to the UN under the Helms-Biden deal in 1998, for

# FACT SHEET

example, the UN finally reimbursed 14 to 15 countries for up to 3 years worth of deferred troop contributing costs.

- **The UN's Ability to Effectively Operate is Handicapped:** Major troop contributing nations to the UN are Pakistan, Bangladesh, India, Nigeria, Ghana, Kenya, Uruguay, Jordan, Ethiopia, Nepal, South Africa, Morocco, Ukraine, Argentina, and Poland. The chief problem in a failure to keep up with UN peacekeeping assessments is that it makes it harder and harder to get these nations to continue to serve as peacekeepers, especially in big missions with complex logistics and high costs.
- **Secretary Rice notes that the UN does the work, so the U.S. doesn't have to:** "[UN Peacekeeping] is much more cost effective than using American forces. And of course, America doesn't have the forces to do all of these peacekeeping missions, but somebody has to do them. And the United States has to pay its share of people doing them." - *Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, before the House SSJC Appropriations Subcommittee on March 9, 2005.*
- **2006 GAO report finds that UN Peacekeeping is highly cost effective:** A recent General Accounting office (GAO) study concluded that *UN peacekeeping is eight times less expensive than funding a U.S. force* (because the UN is half as expensive and the U.S. only pays a quarter of the costs).
- **Secretary Rumsfeld endorses UN Peacekeeping:** Speaking before the Senate Appropriators last month, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld cited the UN operation in Haiti as "one example of the benefit of empowering partner nations," noting that "[W]ithout the major help of other nations, it would have cost the U.S. taxpayers almost eight times as much in dollars, to say nothing of the added stress on our forces."
- **OMB rates UN Peacekeeping (CIPA) spending "Very Effective":** OMB just gave CIPA its highest (three-star) rating under its Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), judging CIPA funds to be effective, achieving their stated goals, and linked to the State Department's objectives. The full assessment is at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary.10002212.2005.html>.
- **UN Peacekeeping has a record of success:** A 2005 RAND report suggests the UN is better suited for peacekeeping missions than unilateral U.S. action. The study compared 16 U.S. and UN nation-building missions and found that of the "eight UN-led cases, seven are at peace. Of the eight U.S.-led cases, four are at peace; four are not—or not yet—at peace."

## U.S. Votes for UN Peacekeeping and Benefits Tremendously – Lets Fund It

---

Over the course of the last several years, the United States has displayed an increasing need and desire for UN peacekeeping. As a permanent member of the Security Council – which authorizes UN peacekeeping missions – the U.S. has the right to block the creation of any new mission and to cut off any existing mission, every six months, as each mission comes up before the Security Council for review. Rather than exercise this right, however, the U.S., through its permanent representative John Bolton, has continued to support new and existing peacekeeping missions.

This is hardly surprising given the cost-effective, successful track record of UN peacekeeping and support for it among top U.S. officials. If we would like to continue to use and increase this burden sharing arrangement, it would behoove us to pay troop contributing nations for services rendered. After all, they are putting their troops into harm's way so that the United States armed forces don't have to.

For more information on this paper contact Citizens for Global Solutions' Legislative Coordinator, Simon Weber at [sweber@globalsolutions.org](mailto:sweber@globalsolutions.org) or 202-546-3950 ext. 104.