

**Statement by Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs  
Kristen L. Silverberg  
U.S. Department of State  
House Committee on Foreign Affairs  
Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and  
Oversight  
April 2, 2008**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me to address this Subcommittee today on the critically important subject of United States payments for United Nations peacekeeping. My remarks will focus on the level and timeliness of funding provided by the United States for its assessed contributions to United Nations peacekeeping and the amounts owed for UN peacekeeping. I would like to stress at the outset that the Administration seeks to work in close partnership with Congress in addressing the specific challenges that the unique and inherently unpredictable nature of UN peacekeeping operations – and the sharply increasing demand for them – present for our budget preparation, financial management, oversight, appropriations and expenditures processes.

Before discussing the details of U.S. payments, I would also like to emphasize that the Administration considers United Nations peacekeeping to be in the direct national security interest of the United States. It deserves and it receives both our political and financial support. UN peacekeeping operations are generally authorized and reviewed by the UN Security Council at regular intervals, where U.S. permanent membership and our right of veto ensure that our support is necessary for peacekeeping operations to receive Security Council mandates or to be re-authorized at the end of each mandate period – typically every six to twelve months. We keep Congress informed about these developments through monthly briefings to the relevant committees and written notifications of all new missions or significant changes to the mandates of existing missions.

UN peacekeeping operations serve as important tools to address a wide range of threats to international peace and security – especially those where direct military involvement by the United States is not necessary or appropriate. The tasks of UN peacekeepers are varied, ranging from the separation of opposing forces on Cyprus or the Golan Heights to complex civilian protection and stabilization missions in countries such as Sudan,

Cote d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti and Liberia. And UN peacekeeping is in most cases a comparatively effective, efficient, and successful means of addressing security and stabilization challenges. While UN peacekeeping operations face great difficulties in such hostile environments as Darfur, Chad and Eritrea, and are unable to by themselves resolve difficult underlying political conflicts, as in Cyprus or in Lebanon, UN peacekeeping operations contribute to the prevention or mitigation of conflict and the resulting protection of civilians. The UN's blue helmets are playing a positive role in the transitions to stability and democratic governance underway in Timor-Leste, Liberia, the Congo and Haiti. Successful peacekeeping operations in Burundi and Sierra Leone have completed their work in recent years, with follow-up efforts now proceeding with the advice and assistance of the UN's Peacebuilding Commission.

UN peacekeeping has been deemed by a number of detailed studies, including those by the Government Accountability Office and the Rand Corporation, to be a cost-effective means of addressing conflicts and post-conflict stabilization. The international community increasingly relies on UN peacekeeping to maintain security and promote stability in troubled regions. Since 2001, the number of authorized peacekeepers has nearly tripled, from under 40,000 to almost 120,000, as the Security Council has created large missions in Liberia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Haiti, Cote d'Ivoire, Lebanon, Southern Sudan and Darfur. This dramatic increase in the scope and size of peacekeeping operations has placed a considerable strain on the capacity of the United Nations and troop contributing nations to meet growing demands for troops and equipment as well as the financial resources that are the main subject of today's hearing.

UN peacekeeping is certainly not cost-free, and it is important to note that the costs involved include human lives as well as financial resources. Ukrainian police officer Ihor Kynal, who died as a result of injuries sustained in a March 18 incident in the city of Mitrovica, Kosovo, was the latest of over 2,440 UN peacekeepers to give their lives in service to international peace.

I now turn to the main subject of this hearing, the financial contributions of the United States to UN peacekeeping. In so doing I would like to highlight the dramatic growth in U.S. payments for this purpose, both from regularly appropriated and supplemental or emergency funds over the

past three years – a trend that has largely been driven by the dramatic increase in peacekeepers authorized and deployed around the world.

In fiscal year 2006, the U.S. paid just over \$1.022 billion in assessments for UN peacekeeping.

In fiscal year 2007, we made assessed payments of \$1.465 billion from the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account. This total was composed of \$1.135 billion under the full-year Continuing Resolution, plus \$16 million in FY 2007 supplemental funds for new operations in Timor, \$184 million in FY 2007 supplemental funds for expanded operations in Lebanon, and \$129.8 million in supplemental funds carried over from FY 2006 for operations in Sudan.

In fiscal year 2008, Congress has thus far appropriated \$1.691 billion for the CIPA account in the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, including \$550.4 million in regular and emergency funds intended for use to support the UN-AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID). Just over \$1 billion of this amount has already been transferred to the UN to meet outstanding obligations for 15 peacekeeping operations, and we will soon be processing payments for assessments received recently from the remaining two operations. Additionally, \$83 million in FY 2007 supplemental funds remained available for use in FY 2008 to support the UN's newest mission in Chad and the Central African Republic. The Administration continues to seek \$333.6 million in supplemental funds in FY 2008 for UNAMID in order to cover the full U.S. share of the UNAMID budget – \$884 million – which we expect to be billed during this fiscal year. Thus, should Congress meet the Administration's request for supplemental funding for FY 2008, total payments for UN peacekeeping during this fiscal year would reach approximately \$2.108 billion.

In addressing the Subcommittee's interest in the amount of U.S. arrears owed to UN peacekeeping operations, it is important to distinguish among different categories of arrears:

- First, UN records continue to include “arrears” dating back to the 1990s of about over \$450 million. Most of this amount relates to legislative or policy restrictions, in addition to funding shortfalls, which prevented the U.S. from paying these assessments. By far the

largest single element of this amount, sometimes referred to as contested peacekeeping arrears, is the difference between the rate that was assessed during that period (well over 30 percent) and the 25 percent legislative “cap,” originally imposed in 1994, that restricted U.S. payment for a UN peacekeeping operation to no more than 25 percent of the total assessed contributions for that operation.

- Second, the UN also cites arrears of nearly \$160 million between the end of FY 2005 and the first quarter of FY 2008 because of the legislative “cap” that I have already mentioned. This cap was lifted between 2001 and 2005, but was re-imposed for calendar years 2005 through 2007, during which period we were assessed between over 27 percent to just under 26 percent. We are very appreciative of the fact that Congress raised the cap for calendar year 2008 to 27%, which will allow us to pay UN peacekeeping assessments at the full rate assessed by the UN – currently 25.9624 percent. The President’s budget request for FY 2009 also asks Congress to lift the cap to 27.1 percent for calendar year 2009, as well as for calendar years 2005 through 2007, so that the Administration may clear these cap-related arrears and avoid accumulating similar arrears in the next fiscal year.
- Third, the U.S. has deferred some payments at the end of each recent fiscal year because of shortfalls in funding. The amount that might need to be deferred at the end of FY 2008, if any, can be determined only after:
  - A) It becomes clear whether Congress will appropriate the remaining \$333.6 million of the Administration’s supplemental request for UNAMID (for which \$390 million in “bridge” funding was already provided in the FY 2008 CIPA appropriation);
  - B) the UN’s peacekeeping budget for the year that begins on July 1, 2008, has been adopted; and
  - C) the UN issues assessments for the first part of the upcoming budget year, also taking into account any adjustments or credits that reflect actual spending for existing missions.

We currently estimate that as much as \$250 million in CIPA payments may need to be deferred at the end of FY 2008.

With regard to the FY 2009 budget, the President has requested \$1.497 billion for the CIPA account. I would like to emphasize the inherently unpredictable nature of UN peacekeeping, which has been characterized by great fluctuations in size and cost over the past two decades. As a result, specific figures for each peacekeeping operation are notional estimates that are likely to be adjusted throughout the budget process, and throughout the year, to account for changing circumstances in each mission. And I would like to assure you that the Administration continually works with our partners in the UN Secretariat and the Security Council to assess the possibility of downsizing or achieving savings in peacekeeping operations. Our request for FY 2009, within the constraints of the overall budget, is intended to ensure that the United States continues to play the leading role in financing UN peacekeeping operations and to ensure that the UN has the financial resources necessary to avoid any disruption or delays.

Finally, while I have focused my remarks on direct payments of UN peacekeeping assessments through funds appropriated under the CIPA account, I also wish to note that the United States has also spent over \$800 million over the past five fiscal years through other appropriations that contribute directly or indirectly to multilateral peacekeeping. In particular, I would draw attention to our work under the Global Peacekeeping Operations Initiative (GPOI) and the related ACOTA program to train and equip peacekeeping forces from other countries to participate in UN and other international peacekeeping operations. I would also highlight our substantial support until the end of 2007 for infrastructure development and maintenance for the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS), which operated in Darfur before the transition to UNAMID, and for such purposes as transportation of non-U.S. peacekeeping personnel and equipment to a UN peacekeeping operation.

Thank you.