South Africa is the largest recipient of the US’ health ODA. USAID programs in South Africa focus on employment and job skills, promoting basic education, combatting gender-based violence, and HIV/AIDS care, prevention, and treatment.
ODA funding trends

- The United States (US) is the largest donor country, with official development assistance (ODA) at US$34.3 billion in 2018. Relative to economic size, however, ODA is low, at 0.17% of gross national income (GNI). This ranks the US 22nd out of the 29 donor country members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

- Congress passed the fiscal year (FY) 2019 budget bill in February 2019, which largely rejects the significant foreign assistance budget cuts proposed by President Donald Trump. The International Affairs Budget for FY2019 remains stable compared to FY2018 funding levels.

- The president’s FY2020 budget once again proposes steep cuts to foreign assistance but given that Congressional support for development assistance remains strong, it is unlikely that big cuts will be enacted.

![The US' Gross/Net ODA Disbursements](chart.png)

*Graph showing US' gross/Net ODA disbursements from 2014 to 2019 (estimate).*
Strategic priorities

- The Trump administration strongly links development assistance to US national security concerns and economic growth. Economic development is a top priority, while funding for global health and flagship programs is strong.
- United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Administrator Mark Green has presented additional priorities: supporting countries to transition from development assistance to self-reliance and humanitarian assistance.

Outlook

- USAID is reorienting the way it works with partner countries under the ‘Journey to Self-Reliance’, a new strategy to "end the need for" foreign assistance in partner countries. It is also transforming its organizational structure to promote more effective development assistance by merging several key offices and functions, including budget and policy.
- In late 2018, Congress approved legislation to create a new development finance institution (DFI), the United States International Development Finance Corporation (DFC). The legislation doubles the size of the US’ current DFI and authorizes a wider set of development finance tools.
How much ODA does the United States provide?

The US is by far the largest donor, providing almost one-fourth of global ODA

The US is the largest donor country among members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Its net ODA was US$34.3 billion in 2018 (current prices). This represents around one-fourth (22%) of the ODA provided by all DAC countries.

These numbers are based on the new methodology for measuring ODA loans which the OECD DAC will apply to ODA reporting for 2018 onward. Preliminary ODA figures for 2018 using this new methodology were first released in April 2019. This methodology, called ‘grant-equivalent’ methodology, provides a more accurate way to count donor efforts in concessional ODA loans because only the ‘grant’ portion of loans, expressed as a monetary value, is counted as ODA. Given that the US provides the totality of its ODA in the form of grants, this reform has a marginal impact on its ODA levels. According to the previous methodology, known as the ‘cash basis’ methodology, net ODA was 1.5% below ODA figures using the new methodology.

To allow for comparison overtime, the OECD still publishes net ODA disbursements according to the cash basis methodology. Following a 10%-increase in ODA between 2015 and 2016, ODA levels were largely stable in 2017. In 2018, however, ODA decreased by 5%. Relative to the size of its economy, US ODA is low: In 2018, the US spent 0.17% of its GNI on ODA, ranking 22nd among DAC donors, far below the ODA/GNI target of 0.7%.

Foreign assistance spending under the Trump administration (which includes funds for diplomacy and development) has remained largely unchanged due to Congressional support for such spending. The FY2019 approved funding levels largely reject the deep cuts to US foreign assistance included in the president’s FY2019 budget request, setting US funding for development and diplomacy (International Affairs Budget, see question four: ‘How is the US’ ODA budget structured?’) at US$56.1 billion, including base and Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding. This represents a small increase of US$193 million compared to FY18 levels. Congress also approved the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill, which funds the State Department (State), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and other US agencies responsible for US foreign assistance, at US$54.2 billion — US$11.9 billion more than the 30% cut requested by Trump for FY2019.

The final spending levels for FY2018 and FY2019 are relatively stable. Some of the increases for FY2019 include more funds for USAID’s Capital Investment Fund (+14%), the National Endowment for Democracy (+6%), and the Democracy Fund (+5%). There are also modest increases in overall humanitarian and global health funding. Decreases in funding include a cut to the State Department’s Capital Investment Fund (-10%) and a decrease in Economic Support Funds (-6%).

The president’s FY2020 budget request, released in March 2019, once again proposed steep cuts to foreign assistance spending. The budget requests a 23% cut to the State, USAID, and other international programs compared to FY2019 enacted levels. It also eliminates Overseas Contingencies Operations (OCO) funding, discretionary spending that supports international affairs activities, for State and USAID (see ‘Key Question 5: How is the US’ ODA budget structured?’). Given that Congressional support for international assistance remains strong, it is unlikely that big cuts to the budget will be enacted.
In June 2018, the US Senate narrowly rejected the Trump administration’s proposal to cut US$15 billion in unused funds from the prior year. That proposal included cuts of US$334 million from the International Affairs Budget, including US$252 million in funding for Ebola response, US$30 million from the Complex Crises Fund, and US$52 million from the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Later, in August 2018, the White House Office of Management and Budget was forced to abandon a separate plan to rescind US$3 billion in already-approved, unobligated foreign assistance funding due to broad pushback. The plan, despite not being enacted, forced agencies involved in US foreign assistance to rapidly commit unused funding to avoid losing it.
TOP 10 DAC DONOR COUNTRIES, 2018
Total ODA disbursements; US$ billions; in current prices

United States: 34.3
Germany: 25
United Kingdom: 18.4
Japan: 14.2
France: 12.2
Sweden: 5.6
Netherlands: 5.6
Italy: 5
Canada: 4.7
Norway: 4.3

OECD DAC preliminary data (April 2019).
DAC DONOR COUNTRIES, 2018
Net ODA as % of GNI

OECD DAC preliminary data (April 2019).
What are the United States’ priorities for global development?

Trump administration links development assistance to US national security and economic interests; development finance and economic development are key focus areas in FY2019

Overarching priorities for US development policy are set by the White House. Under former President Barack Obama, global development was elevated to a core component of US international engagement in the 2010 Presidential Policy Directive on Global Development (PPD-6), along with diplomacy and defense. Under President Donald Trump, priorities are shifting to be more strongly linked to national interests. The US National Security Strategy, published in December 2017, and the president’s FY2019 budget request both reinforce the topline shift that was first presented in the president’s FY2018 budget request: advancing national security and economic competitiveness and promoting economic growth. Additionally, the US National Security Council, the principal forum used by the president for consideration of foreign policy matters, is currently conducting a foreign assistance review which could further alter priorities and means of implementation.

Further development priorities are outlined by the US Department of State (State Department), responsible for foreign policy, and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the development assistance agency, in the Joint Strategic Plan for FY2018-2022:

1. Protect America’s security at home and abroad,
2. renew America’s competitive advantage for sustained economic growth and job creation,
3. promote American leadership through balanced engagement, and
4. ensure effectiveness and accountability to the American taxpayer.

Within these goals, other dimensions of US foreign assistance are emphasized: counter-terrorism, health, economic growth, US economic security, private-sector partnership, and humanitarian relief.

In February 2018, in a briefing about the President’s FY2019 budget request, Deputy-Secretary of State John Sullivan cited the following related priorities for his department: US prosperity; economic and development assistance, including for refugees and humanitarian crises; water; sanitation; health; and food security.

In FY2019 and FY2020, focus will be on the launch of the new development finance corporation (DFC), a development finance institution which combines the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and some development finance work at USAID, with a higher spending limit and new equity functions to allow the US to more effectively tap into private resources and further US development goals. Legislation to create the DFC, which enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress as well as support from the Trump administration and the development community, passed in September 2018. The law provided for the creation of a ‘Chief Development Officer’, underscoring the strong development function of the DFC. The new law also required the Administration to submit an implementation plan to Congress — a process which OPIC is leading — on March 8, 2019. The DFC is expected to open its doors on October 1, 2019.
Other priorities include USAID’s policy shift towards the ‘Journey to Self-Reliance’, a new strategy released in 2019 which aims to “end the need for” foreign assistance in partner countries. Going forward, USAID will be transforming its programs to focus on building self-reliance – or, “the ability to solve their own development challenges” – in partner countries. To facilitate this shift, USAID is re-orienting its cooperation according to how self-reliant each of its partner countries is. Partners are scored using ‘Country Roadmaps’, which rank countries on 17 publicly-available, third-party metrics. The metrics examine areas such as open and accountable governance, inclusive development, economic policy, and the relative capacities of the government, civil society, citizens, and the economy. The strategy also pledges to engage more deeply with the private sector to catalyze enterprise-driven development.

A final priority for USAID is its internal reorganization process, which has tentative bipartisan support. According to administrator Mark Green, the proposed changes will “position its structure, workforce, programs, and processes” for more effective development assistance by consolidating several offices, including merging budget, management, and policy functions. It will also realign USAID’s humanitarian, crisis, and conflict work under one new associate administrator, and will merge development, democracy, and innovation into one bureau, with the aim of: streamlining technical expertise; elevating democracy, governance, and human rights; and ensuring that private-sector, gender, and faith-based and community approaches are integrated across programs. As of March 2019, only one of nine of these reorganizational elements (humanitarian assistance) had received approval from Congress for implementation to move forward.

In February 2019, the Administration launched the new ‘Women’s Global Development and Prosperity Initiative’ (W-GDP) with a focus on women’s economic empowerment. The fund is an effort to assist 50 million women in the developing world by 2025. The President’s FY2020 budget provided US$100 million for the fund (on top of the US$50 million announced in February 2019), which is intended to mobilize private capital. The announcement was met with mixed reviews, including questions about the size of the initial investment and the fact that the Trump administration has tried to cut USAID’s budget over the last two fiscal years.
Table 1. United States Department of State and USAID, Strategic Plan 2018-2022 – Strategic goals and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goals</th>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Protect America’s Security at Home and Abroad</td>
<td>Counter the proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and their delivery systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defeat ISIS, al-Qa’ida and other transnational terrorist organizations, and counter state- sponsored, regional, and local terrorist groups that threaten U.S. national security interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter instability, transnational crime, and violence that threaten US interests by strengthening citizen-responsive governance, security, democracy, human rights, and rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase capacity and strengthen resilience of our partners and allies to deter aggression, coercion, and align influence by state and non-state actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen US border security and protect U.S. citizens abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Renew America’s Competitive Advantage for Sustained Economic Growth and Job Creation</td>
<td>Promote American prosperity by advancing bilateral relationships and leveraging international institutions and agreements to open markets, secure commercial opportunities, and foster investment and innovation to contribute to U.S. job creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote healthy, educated and productive populations in partner countries to drive inclusive and sustainable development, open new markets and support US prosperity and security objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advance US economic security by ensuring energy security, combating corruption, and promoting market-oriented economic and governance reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promote the transition to a low-emission, climate resilient world while expanding global access to sustainable energy</td>
<td>Transition nations from assistance recipients to enduring diplomatic, economic, and security partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage international fora to further American values and foreign policy goals while seeking more equitable burden sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase partnerships with private sector and civil society organizations to mobilize support and resources and shape foreign public opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project American values and leadership by preventing the spread of disease and providing humanitarian relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protect core US interests by advancing democracy and human rights and strengthening civil society</td>
<td>Strengthen the effectiveness and sustainability of our diplomacy and development investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide modern and secure infrastructure and operational capabilities to support effective diplomacy and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhance workforce performance, leadership, engagement, and accountability to execute our mission efficiently and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthen security and safety of workforce and physical assets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Department of State and USAID Joint Strategic Plan 2018-2022
How does the United States spend its ODA?

Bilateral programs receive vast majority of US ODA; US among largest contributors to multilateral organizations in total volume

The US provides development assistance mainly in the form of bilateral support to partner countries. According to OECD data, the US channels US$30.7 billion of its ODA bilaterally, accounting for 87% of its total ODA in 2017. This is far above the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) average of 60%, reflective of the US’ long-standing emphasis on bilateral cooperation.

Bilateral spending focuses on health and is channeled entirely as grants

According to OECD data, the largest share of US bilateral ODA went to global health (US$9.0 billion, or 29% of bilateral ODA in 2017). This aligns with the US’ long-standing prioritization of global health, given that the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), one of the US’ largest development programs, provides significant funds bilaterally. For FY2018, PEPFAR had a total HIV/AIDS budget of US$5.2 billion. Of this, US$4.3 billion was bilaterally programmed for HIV/AIDS, US$330 million for USAID HIV/AIDS programs, and $261 million for tuberculosis (TB) programs. According to the US Global Leadership Coalition’s budget analysis, FY2019 saw a US$500-million increase in PEPFAR’s bilateral funding over FY2018.

Other funding priorities included humanitarian assistance (US$7 billion, 23%), government and civil society (US$2.9 billion, 9%), and education (US$1.6 billion, 5%) (see figure). This is broadly in line with the US’ policy priorities. However, spending for agriculture—the fifth-largest sector for bilateral spending in 2016—dropped by 13% in 2017 to become the ninth-largest. Bilateral ODA levels have remained stable in the current fiscal year: In the final FY2019 budget passed by Congress in February 2019, funding for bilateral economic assistance remains stable compared to FY2018 at US$24.5 billion, in line with the stability of the International Affairs Budget overall.

US bilateral ODA is provided entirely (100%) in the form of grants. The US relies on the public sector (35% of total ODA, far below the DAC average 50%) and on NGOs and civil society (24%, above the DAC average of 17%) to channel bilateral ODA. Both the Obama and Trump administrations have pledged to work with more local development partners. PEPFAR in particular has set ambitious goals: 40% of funding will go to local implementers by the end of 2019, rising to 70% by the end of 2020. Local partners currently receive 34% of total PEPFAR funding.

Who are the US’ ODA recipients?

ODA focuses on world’s poorest countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa

The US focuses its ODA on the world’s poorest countries: 36% of bilateral ODA went to low-income countries in 2017, significantly higher than the DAC average of 24%. Regionally, the US concentrates its bilateral ODA on sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). Between 2015 and 2017, the US provided an average of US$10.4 billion (35% of its bilateral ODA) to the region per year, followed by Asia (US$4.2 billion, 14%) and Middle East and North Africa (MENA; US$3.2 billion, 11%). Excluding funding unallocated to a specific region, the share of US funding for SSA accounted for 51% of total bilateral ODA on average between 2015 and 2017.

Between 2015 to 2017, Afghanistan was by far the largest recipient of US bilateral spending, receiving on average US$1.4 billion per year. However, funding to Afghanistan dropped markedly between 2016 and 2017 (-14%). Ethiopia was the second-largest recipient, receiving on average US$998 million per year, followed by Jordan (US$881 million) and Kenya (US$808 million).

In light of ongoing events related to irregular migration at the US’ southern border, in December 2018 the US committed US$4.8 billion in development assistance for southern Mexico (home to many of Mexico’s poorest communities) and US$5.8 billion to strengthen government and economic development in other parts of Central America. According to the US statement, these funds aim to promote a “safer and more prosperous Central America” by enhancing security, governance, and economic prosperity. This type of spending clearly aligns with current development priorities emphasizing the protection of US security and national interests.

For a deeper understanding of funding at the recipient level, please consult data from the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI). IATI is a reporting standard and platform on which organizations and governments voluntarily publish data on their development cooperation, including more recent activity than is available through OECD data. Data can be searched by recipient country, the ‘publisher’ (including funders that do not report to the OECD), and...
Multilateral spending centers around health, with strong support for the Global Fund

As a result of its focus on promoting national interests and strengthening bilateral relationships, the US channels a lower share of its total ODA to multilaterals than other OECD DAC donors. Core funding to multilateral organizations stood at US$4.7 billion in 2017, down from US$6 billion in 2016 (although funding for key recipients, such as the World Bank’s International Development Association and UN agencies, remained stable). This accounts for 13% of total ODA, significantly lower than the OECD DAC average of 40%. However, in absolute terms, the US is the fourth-largest provider of core contributions to multilateral organizations. This is a two-spot drop from 2016, and the US now ranks behind the UK, Germany, and France. In addition to core contributions, the US provided US$6.4 billion in earmarked funding to multilaterals for specific projects or regions (this is reported as bilateral ODA), bringing the total amount of ODA in 2017 channeled to or through multilateral organizations to US$11.1 billion.

Key recipients in 2017 were the World Bank (US$1.2 billion, 26%), UN agencies (US$1 billion, 21%), and regional development banks (US$378 million, 8%). The US has traditionally been a strong supporter to the Global Fund, committing US$4.3 billion for 2017 to 2019. In FY2018 and FY2019, contributions totaled US$1.4 billion per year. There have been bipartisan calls to increase US funding to the Global Fund in the run-up to its sixth replenishment conference to be held in October 2018, although by law the US cannot contribute more than 33% of total Global Fund financing. Historically, its contributions have hovered near this ceiling: from 2001 to 2018, US funding accounted for 32% of all Global Fund contributions, far surpassing the second-largest donor, France (12%).

Since its inception, the US has also been a strong supporter of Gavi. The first large multi-year financial pledge was made in June 2011 for US$450 million and met through contributions in 2012 through 2014. A second pledge was made in January 2015 for US$1 billion over four years. Congress met this pledge with its Gavi appropriations between FY2015 and FY2018, with its FY2018 contribution being the US’ highest ever at US$290 million.
THE US' BILATERAL ODA BY SECTOR, 2017
Total: US$30,723 million

- Health & Population: 29.4% (US$9,023m.)
- Humanitarian aid: 22.7% (US$6,979m.)
- Government & Civil Society: 9.4% (US$2,887m.)
- Donor Admin Costs: 9.2% (US$2,827m.)
- Education: 5.1% (US$1,596m.)
- Refugees in Donor Countries: 4.7% (US$1,495m.)
- Agriculture*: 4.1% (US$1,299m.)
- Other: 15.4% (US$4,743m.)

OECD CRS. Gross disbursements. *Includes agriculture, forestry, fishing, and rural development. In 2017 prices.

THE TOP 10 RECIPIENTS OF THE US’ ODA
average 2015-2017, excluding debt relief; US$ millions.

- Afghanistan: 1,440
- Ethiopia: 898
- Jordan: 661
- Kenya: 906
- South Sudan: 696
- Syrian Arab Republic: 672
- Pakistan: 622
- Nigeria: 592
- Uganda: 529
- Democratic Republic of the Congo: 529

OECD CRS. Gross disbursements, in 2017 prices.
THE US' BILATERAL ODA BY INCOME-GROUP, 2015-2017

average 2015-2017: US$29.6 billion

- Unallocated by income 36.1% (US$10.96bn.)
- Low-income countries 36.2% (US$10.74bn.)
- Upper middle-income countries 11.3% (US$3.34bn.)
- Lower middle-income countries 16.3% (US$4.81bn.)

OECD CRS: Gross disbursements, in 2017 prices.
Who are the main actors in the United States' development cooperation?

The president. Donald Trump (Republican), sets overarching policy orientations for US foreign assistance, including for development. The president is assisted by several White House offices. The most important for development issues are the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the National Security Council (NSC). In consultation with executive agencies, OMB produces the president’s budget request, which outlines policy and funding priorities. The NSC is the principal forum for the president to consider matters of national security and foreign policy.

Approximately 25 government institutions contribute to funding or implementing US foreign assistance and development cooperation. Key institutions include:

Government departments

The US Department of State (State Department), headed by the secretary of state (currently Mike Pompeo), is primarily responsible for foreign policy but is also an important party to development policy-setting. Under direction from the White House, it has sole- or joint-policy authority on issues including peacekeeping, democracy, global health, and food security. The State Department manages or co-manages a wide range of bilateral development programs as well as funding to international organizations. In countries where the US has strong foreign policy and national-security interests, the State Department and its embassies play an active role in informing overall development policy in that country. While different approaches and mechanisms are deployed depending on which governmental agency is implementing, the State Department has Integrated Country Strategies (ICS) that strive to encapsulate the government’s foreign-policy objectives into one high-level strategy.

Several offices oversee the State Department’s development-related activity:

- Deputy Secretary of State, currently John Sullivan, is the second-ranking officer at the Department of State.

Other institutions are involved in foreign assistance. They include:

- Other departments: Department of Energy, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Labor, Department of Transportation, and Department of the Treasury.
- Office of US Foreign Assistance Resources is led by the director of US Foreign Assistance Resources. This office assists the secretary of state in providing strategic direction to foreign assistance resources and coordinates policy and planning of the State Department and USAID.
- The Office of the US Global AIDS Coordinator and Health Diplomacy (OGAC) administers the State Department’s HIV/AIDS funding and coordinates the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). PEPFAR programs are implemented by other US agencies, including USAID, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). OGAC is currently headed by Ambassador Deborah Birx.
- Under-Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights (vacant) is responsible for US efforts to address threats to civilian security such as extremism, mass atrocities, and weak governance, as well as refugee, migration, and population issues.
- Under-Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, Manisha Singh (Acting) leads efforts on policies related to economic growth, energy, environment, science, and technology.
- Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) leads on the US’ work with refugees, migrants, and victims of conflict. It also engages with multilateral organizations. PRM is currently led by Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary Carol Thomson O’Connell.
Other key State Department stakeholders include the special representative for Global Food Security (vacant) and the US ambassador to the UN, Jonathan Cohen (acting). To date, many of the political positions remain unfilled at the State Department, limiting political leadership of the department’s work.

**US Department of Defense (DOD)**, currently led by Patrick M. Shanahan (acting), manages aid-funded military assistance programs, some humanitarian assistance, and programs on disease surveillance and health research and development.

**US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)**, currently led by Secretary Alex Azar II, implements global health programs, including a portion of PEPFAR. HHS has four independent agencies that are especially active in global health: the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, further details below), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the Health Services and Resources Administration (HRSA).

**US Department of the Treasury (Treasury)**, currently led by Secretary Steven Mnuchin, leads US efforts to promote economic growth and poverty reduction in developing countries through the Office of Development Policy and Debt. This office manages US contributions to and participation in the World Bank (along with the US executive director to the World Bank) and other multilateral and regional development institutions.

**US Department of Agriculture (USDA)**, currently led by Secretary Sonny Perdue, provides food assistance and finances the ‘Food for Peace Program’, the US’ largest provider of food assistance (see ‘Sector: Agriculture’ and ‘Sector: Nutrition’).

**Government agencies**

**US Agency for International Development (USAID)** is headed by USAID Administrator Mark Green. The agency is technically independent but operates within the parameters of foreign policy guidance from the president, the secretary of state, and the NSC. The agency leads the implementation of US global development programs, though it often shares responsibility for strategy and implementation with the State Department. USAID is organized around programmatic as well as country programs, managed by offices in partner countries (called USAID missions), which are supported by headquarters in Washington, DC. Based on analysis of each partner country, USAID’s overseas missions develop five-year Regional or Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS) in cooperation with Washington headquarters and local stakeholders. At the country level, USAID mission directors exercise discretion on some aspects of strategy and implementation.

USAID is currently undergoing a reorganization (see ‘What are the US’ priorities for global development?’ for more information) to create a more field-oriented and functionally-aligned agency through eight new thematic bureaus and merged policy and budget functions. It is also working towards partner country self-reliance, helping countries to transition from development assistance. USAID also includes the **Development Credit Authority (DCA)**, which implements risk-sharing agreements between lenders and small businesses to mobilize local private capital for small businesses. This function will be transferred to the new US development finance institution, the DFC.

**Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)**, part of HHS, is the largest government agency worldwide working in disease control and prevention. It operates both within the US and abroad. The Center for Global Health (CGH) was established in 2007 to drive CDC’s work globally. CGH has four divisions: 1) Division of Global HIV/AIDS, 2) Division of Parasitic Diseases and Malaria, 3) Division of Global Health Protection, and 4) Division for Global Immunization. CDC’s Office of Infectious Diseases (OID), comprising three national centers, also participates in US global health efforts.

**National Institutes of Health (NIH)** are a collection of 27 research institutes under HHS that comprise one of the world’s top global health research institutions. NIH conducts basic research on diseases and disorders for improved diagnosis, prevention, and treatment.

**Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)** is an initiative to provide development assistance for economic development to low-income countries and lower-middle-income countries that have committed to political, economic, and social reforms. The programs are administered through partner-country compacts, each of which establish a Millennium Challenge Account for implementation. It is legally authorized to enter into five-year commitments known as ‘compacts’ with partner countries.
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How is the United States’ ODA budget structured?

The US federal budget is divided into budget ‘functions’, which include all spending on a particular issue across departments or agencies and can include funding lines from multiple appropriations bills. The US does not have a dedicated ODA budget, but most development-related spending sits in Function 150 (referred to as the International Affairs Budget). Function 150 comprises both ODA-related and non-ODA funding, such as funding for operating embassies, military assistance, and promotion of US exports. In FY2019, the final budget for Function 150 was approved for US$56.1 billion.

The vast majority of funding (around 96%) included under Function 150 comes from the State-Foreign Operations (SFOPs) appropriations bill. The remainder comes primarily from the agricultural appropriations bill for food security and food-assistance funding. In FY2018, the SFOPs was enacted at around US$54 billion, while the FY2019 budget slightly increases SFOPs funding by 0.03%. The SFOPs bill is divided into ‘titles’, each covering a different budget envelope (see Table 2). The money in these envelopes is mainly, but not exclusively, managed by the State Department and the US Agency for International Development (USAID). Relevant titles related to global development include:

- **Title I: State, Broadcasting & Related Agencies** largely funds the management and running of the State Department. It also contributes to the US’ assessed contributions to 44 international organizations, including the UN’s regular budget and its specialized agencies.

- **Title II: United States Agency for International Development (USAID)** provides operational funds for USAID.

- **Title III: Bilateral Economic Assistance** covers much of the US’ foreign assistance and development activities, accounting for just under half of the entire SFOPs. By far the largest share goes to global health (36% in FY2018). This includes most of US support to combat HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, maternal and child health, and health systems strengthening, as well as the US’ contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Programs funded under this envelope are jointly managed by the State Department and USAID. Most funding is channeled through the ‘Development Assistance (DA)’ envelope, which goes broadly to foster economic progress and social stability in partner countries, and the ‘Economic Support Fund (ESF)’, which aims to provide assistance to allies and countries in transition to democracy, support the Middle East peace process, and finance economic stabilization programs.

- **Title IV: Multilateral Assistance** includes money for US voluntary contributions for various multilateral organizations, including to the World Bank and global environmental funds.

Beyond titles, US foreign assistance is divided into two types: enduring funds and Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO; see Table 2). Enduring funds are meant to cover all base functions within US development cooperation, while OCO funds were originally for emergency support to activities related to the ‘Global War on Terror’. They are managed by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the State Department. Recently, however, they have been used for base budget activities of the DOD and the State Department.

Around one-quarter of the International Affairs Budget was funded through OCO in FY2018, including operations related to the response and prevention of crises, including armed conflict, and man-made and natural disasters. OCO funds are not subject to the same procedural limits on discretionary funding in congressional budget resolutions as regular foreign assistance but are appropriated simultaneously with it. For some budget lines, OCO funds comprise the primary source of funding.

Table 2 features the breakdown between base and OCO funding for the SFOPs for FY2019 as enacted, the latest year for which a detailed breakdown is available (as of March 2019).

In FY2019, Congressional approval of final appropriations levels was delayed to February 2019 from October 1, 2018. This delay came largely as a result of the 35-day partial US government shutdown and lack of agreement on certain appropriations bills, including the SFOP. The President’s FY2020 budget requests — normally delivered to Congress in the first week of February — was delayed by the government shutdown. The FY2020 budget, released on March 11, 2019, once again proposed large cuts to foreign assistance, which are likely to be rejected again by Congress in its approval of final appropriation levels (theoretically meant to take place by October 1, 2019).
Table 2. State-Foreign Operations Appropriations overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US$ millions</th>
<th>FY 2018 (total enacted)</th>
<th>FY 2019 (total conference package)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title I. State, Broadcasting &amp; Related Agencies</strong></td>
<td>15,923</td>
<td>11,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>1,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13,074</td>
<td>9,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title II. Admin of Foreign Assistance (USAID)</strong></td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title III. Bilateral Economic Assistance</strong></td>
<td>24,402</td>
<td>21,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Programs (GHP), State &amp; USAID</td>
<td>8,690</td>
<td>8,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Assistance</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Disaster Assistance (IDA)</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>3,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Fund</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration &amp; Refugee Assistance</td>
<td>3,359</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Refugee &amp; Migration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent agencies</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Treasury</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title IV. International Security Assistance</strong></td>
<td>9,025</td>
<td>8,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title V. Multilateral Assistance</strong></td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank: GEF</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Climate Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank IDA</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank IBRD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAFSP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations &amp; Programs</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title VI. Export Assistance</strong></td>
<td>-310</td>
<td>-336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52,517</td>
<td>44,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Congressional Research Service, State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs: FY2019 Budget Analysis
ODA levels and main funding lines can be influenced at various times during the budget process

The US fiscal year runs from October 1 to September 30. The budget process begins 12 to 14 months (or more) prior to the start of the fiscal year. The majority of federal spending consists of ‘mandatory spending’ and ‘discretionary spending’ (see box); foreign assistance falls under discretionary spending. The budget process for discretionary spending can be categorized into three separate phases:

1. development of the president’s budget request,
2. congressional budgeting, and
3. congressional appropriations.

Phase 1: Development of the president’s budget request (May - February)

Government departments and agencies begin developing budgets in May and submit funding requests in September/October: From May to September, departments and agencies develop their budgets and set broad parameters for spending on specific programs. The US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the State Department, for example, negotiate major funding levels and policy decisions for each budget line and then share the proposal with the White House’s Office of Management and Budget (OMB). From September to November, OMB negotiates funding levels with the heads of government departments and agencies. Engagement with OMB from August to September is important. At this time, it can receive external input to inform its engagement and negotiation with departments and agencies.

Under normal circumstances negotiations can take between two and four weeks before the OMB officially passes back the budget request for agency review. In recent years, this stage has taken months rather than weeks, delaying the release of the budget request.

OMB works to finalize budget request in late fall and president submits it in February: In November/December, the OMB finalizes the budget request before the president signs off in late December/early January. Traditionally, the president submits his budget request to Congress the first Monday in February. This date is often delayed, particularly when a new administration takes office.

Phase 2: Congressional budgeting (February - April)

Congress sets spending limits for main budget areas: Once the president’s budget request is submitted to Congress, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) evaluates the request. Then, the House and Senate each develop, debate, and (in theory) pass a joint congressional budget resolution before April 15. The resolution sets the overall level of discretionary funding for the next fiscal year. This ceiling (called a “budget cap”) is sent to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Unlike the president’s budget request, which is a detailed proposal – the budget resolution is a short, high level document. It is not a bill that is signed into law, but instead provides the binding budget cap that appropriators use in allocating discretionary spending. The president’s budget request is a key opportunity for advocates to engage in discussion on the foreign affairs budget with key stakeholders including with Congress, government agencies and departments, and the White House, through meetings, letters, and media outreach.

Phase 3: Congressional appropriations (April - September)

Congress considers appropriations bills that allocate funding to government functions, including foreign assistance, from April 15 to September: After the final budget resolution is agreed to, or after April 15 (whichever comes first), Congress must draft, debate, and pass 12 different appropriations bills, which correspond to different government functions. This includes the appropriations bill for State-Foreign Operations (SFOPs),

Types of spending in US federal budget

- Mandatory spending – refers to programs such as Social Security and other social programs, for which legislation defines criteria for participation, and the government allocates funds for all who are eligible regardless of annual costs to the Treasury.
- Discretionary spending – refers to the share of the budget that Congress decides annually in an appropriations process. This is further divided into defense and non-defense discretionary spending (including foreign and development assistance).
which funds most development programs (see Question 4: ‘How is the US’ ODA budget structured?’). During the spring, each of the relevant committees and subcommittees holds several hearings on the president’s budget request to debate, amend, and rewrite (‘mark-up’) the appropriations bills. Prior to this phase, there are a number of advocacy opportunities, including meetings on Capitol Hill, letters to Appropriations Committee chairs, events, and participation in hearings.

House and Senate negotiate final budget; president signs: Once an appropriations bill has passed the House and Senate, a conference committee is formed with representatives from the Appropriations Committees to negotiate the differences between the House and Senate-passed bills. If the House and Senate cannot find an agreement by the end of September, Congress needs to enact an emergency short-term measure – usually a ‘continuing resolution’ – to provide temporary funding to ensure the government continues to operate while the appropriations bills are finalized. Any spending bills are then sent to the president for approval or for veto; vetoes are rare and require an override from two-thirds of both chambers of Congress.

### Examples of appropriations bills

An appropriations bill is legislation that allocates funding to federal departments, agencies, and programs in the US government. Appropriations bills are passed by the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Bills must originate in the House of Representatives and be passed by both chambers of Congress before being signed by the president. The main types are:

- **Regular appropriations bills**: 12 bills covering funding for the government for one fiscal year (October 1–September 30).

- **Omnibus bill**: A single appropriations bill that combines any number of individual appropriations bills on diverse subjects into one large bill. Because of their size and scope, omnibus bills limit opportunities for debate and scrutiny. SFOPs is often part of such an omnibus funding measure.

- **Continuing resolution (CR)**: If Congress has not passed a regular appropriations bill in time, it can pass a CR, which generally continues pre-existing funding levels set during the previous year’s budget.

- **Supplemental appropriations**: These add additional funding beyond what was originally appropriated at the beginning of the year; often used for things like disaster relief.
Further readings


The US’s global health ODA

The US is the largest donor to global health, with funding concentrated on flagship interagency initiatives

The United States (US) is by far the world’s largest donor to global health, spending a total of US$10.0 billion on health official development assistance (ODA) in 2016 (the latest year in which full data is available), according to data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This represents half (50%) of all health ODA provided by OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donor countries.

Global health is a cornerstone of US development assistance: the US spends more of its development assistance on global health than any other donor. In 2016, 28% of total ODA was allocated to global health programs. Broadly, priorities within health include HIV/AIDS; infectious diseases; and preventing maternal and child deaths.

For fiscal year (FY) 2019, Congress appropriated a total of US$11.0 billion for global health. This is US$147 million more than FY2018 levels and US$2.1 billion more than the president’s FY2019 budget request (US$6.7 billion). This account represents the majority of US global health assistance. The President’s FY2020 budget request proposes a cut of approximately US$2.5 billion to global health assistance to US$6.3 billion, which would be the lowest funding level since FY2007. To date, however, Congress has rejected President Trump’s budget requests and global health spending has remained largely stable.

The US has several large interagency global health initiatives which underpin US global health assistance. The President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the umbrella program for all US HIV/AIDS activities, is the linchpin of US global health activities: About two-thirds of US funding for global health is channeled through the initiative. PEPFAR covers bilateral funding for HIV/AIDS, as well as US contributions to the Global Fund and the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS).

PEPFAR is also particularly important to the global HIV response. According to the Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF), the US accounted for 73% of all international assistance to HIV from donor governments in 2018. In 2017, the Secretary of State introduced the PEPFAR Strategy for Accelerating HIV/AIDS Epidemic Control (2017-2020). Under this strategy, PEPFAR continues to operate in 50 countries but has a particular focus on achieving epidemic control in just 13 (see box). The new strategy has been controversial: critics have raised concerns about what this means for the other countries, especially high-burden countries such as Nigeria, which need the most assistance.

Between FY2004 and FY2019, the US provided more than US$90 billion through PEPFAR. In FY2019, the US provided US$6.8 billion (US$5.4 billion for bilateral HIV programming and US$1.4 billion for the Global Fund), a slight increase compared to FY2018. The President’s FY2020 budget request proposed US$4.9 billion in total funding for PEPFAR, a cut of US$1.9 billion (-27%) compared to the FY2019 level.
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USAID’s MNCH focus countries:
- **Africa**: DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia
- **Asia**: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan
- **Caribbean**: Haiti

PEPFAR focus countries:
- Botswana, Côte d’Ivoire, Haiti, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe

PMI focus countries:
- Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mekong region, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe
Tuberculosis funding is counted as part of PEPFAR. In FY2019, US funding for bilateral TB efforts was US$306 million.

The US is also the largest funder of global anti-malaria efforts. According to KFF data, bilateral malaria funding amounted to US$984 million in FY2019. US malaria efforts, including bilateral programs, are achieved primarily through the President’s Malaria Initiative (PMI). PMI is an interagency initiative led by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) that focuses on 24 countries in Africa and three programs in the Greater Mekong region in Asia. Overall, the US provides bilateral malaria support to more than 30 countries through the PMI and other activities. The president’s FY2020 budget proposed US$871 million for malaria funding, a cut of US$113 million (-12%) compared to the FY19 level.

In recent years, the US has increasingly focused on the Global Health Security (GHS) agenda, an interagency initiative by the US’ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and USAID to drive progress on preventing, detecting, and responding to infectious disease threats. Spending in global health security totaled US$504 million in 2019. In May 2019, the White House released the US Global Health Security Strategy, which established a three-pronged approach to global security: 1) strengthening partner country global health security capacities, 2) increased international support for global health security, and 3) a homeland prepared for and resilient against global health security threats.

Another significant focus of USAID’s work is support for maternal and child health, which now focuses on 25 countries (see box) and prioritizes five areas of intervention: maternal health, newborn health, immunization, child health and water, and sanitation and hygiene. USAID’s new report, ‘2019 Acting on the Call’, describes how USAID’s ‘Journey to Self-Reliance’ (in other words, using foreign assistance towards the goal of ending its need to exist; see Key Question 2: What are the US’ strategic priorities for development? for more details) will be applied at the country level to prevent maternal and child deaths. This shift towards promoting self-reliance raises the possibility of reorienting funding and approaches in the sector. US support for maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) has increased over time (for more information on nutrition, see ‘Sector: Nutrition’). In FY2019, funding for MNCH totaled $1.4 billion, comprised of US$1.2 million for MNCH and US$458 million for nutrition.

Despite the emphasis on MNCH, funding for family planning (FP) is currently highly controversial within US foreign assistance policy. Funding levels to the area have thus far remained stable. While the president’s FY2019 budget request slashed funding in half for FP and reproductive health (RH), Congress rejected these cuts and ultimately provided US$608 million, which includes US$575 million for bilateral programs and $33 million for UNFPA. The president’s FY2020 budget again requests a 57% cut in funding for FP (from US$608 million in FY2019 to US$259 million in the FY2020). Congress is likely to again reject this proposed cut.

Additionally, for the third year in a row, the State Department invoked the ‘Kemp-Kasten’ amendment, which withholds all funding for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). Funding for UNFPA in FY2019 was expected to total US$33 million. As per US law, any funding withheld from UNFPA under the policy will now be made available to other family planning, maternal health, and reproductive health activities.

In 2017, the Trump administration reinstated and expanded the ‘Global Gag Rule’. The rule, also known as the Mexico City policy, blocks US global health funding for both non-US non-government organizations (NGOs) directly involved in abortions or abortion rights advocacy or those who fund or support other groups which provide or discuss abortion. As a result, FP organizations such as International Planned Parenthood Federation and Marie Stopes International have lost significant US funding by refusing to comply, and numerous reports have noted the policy’s adverse effects on other NGOs that provide HIV/AIDS services. In 2019, the rule was expanded to prohibit covered organizations from funding groups that provide abortions services or information, even if those groups received no US assistance. The full effect of the expanded rule has not yet been ascertained.

The US provides most of its funding for global health bilaterally

Most of US ODA funding for health is delivered through bilateral programs. According to OECD data, US$9.0 billion of the US’ health ODA in 2017 was provided bilaterally, up from US$8.3 billion in 2016. This spending pattern mirrors the PEPFAR and PMI approach to HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria programming. In line with the priorities outlined above, according to OECD data, bilateral health ODA in 2017 focused on STD control, including HIV/AIDS (64%, or US$5.8 billion), followed by infectious disease control (8%, or US$691 million), reproductive health care (8%, US$678 million), malaria control (6%, US$330 million), and family planning (5%, US$476 million).

In 2016 (the latest year for which full data is available), the US channeled 17% or US$1.7 billion of its health ODA multilaterally. In absolute terms, this makes the US the largest donor to global-health multilateral organizations. However, the share of its ODA allocated to multilateral health programs is far below the DAC average for 2016 (56%), mainly due to the US’ immense bilateral global health investments.

The Global Fund was a key recipient of US multilateral health ODA in 2016, receiving 66% of the US’ multilateral health funding. The US is the Global Fund’s single largest donor, with contributions totaling US$15.0 billion from 2001 to 2019. This amounts to almost a third of all contributions received for that period (US$49 billion, according to Global Fund data), in line with US legislation that prevents the US from providing more than one-third of the Global Fund’s total contributions. For the 2017-2019 funding period, the US pledged US$4.3 billion. In the
The US is the third-largest donor to Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance (Gavi), after the United Kingdom and Norway. Total contributions to Gavi amount to US$1.9 billion from 2000 to 2018. The US pledged US$1.1 billion in direct contributions for 2016 to 2020, according to Gavi’s own data. According to KFF, the US’ contribution to Gavi in FY2018 amounted to US$290 million. The US is also the largest public donor to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (GPEI). According to GPEI data, the US has contributed US$3.3 billion since 1985.

**Congress decides funding levels; multiple government departments and agencies are involved in the design and implementation of US global health programs**

Overall policy direction for global health comes from the executive branch (see Key Question 3: ‘Who are the main actors in the US’s development cooperation?’). Several governmental departments and agencies participate in the decision-making and implementation of the US’ global health programs.

**USAID** is the primary development agency for the US. It is the main implementer of PEPFAR programs and is responsible for other global health-related programs such as MNCH, nutrition, family planning and reproductive health, other infectious diseases, nutrition, and water and sanitation. USAID leads on PMI through the US Global Malaria Coordinator, appointed by the president, and implements it jointly with the Centre for Disease Control (CDC).

**The State Department** provides some policy direction for USAID. Most of the State Department’s global health work is overseen by the Office of the US Global AIDS Coordinator (OGAC), which coordinates all US HIV/AIDS-related activities.

**The Department for Health and Human Services (HHS)** works mostly domestically but does have a global function through the Office of Global Affairs (OGA). HHS has two primary executing agencies:

- CDC is largest government agency working in disease control and prevention and health promotion. The CDC implements some PEPFAR and PMI programs.
- **National Institutes of Health (NIH)** conducts basic research on diseases and disorders. It is a PEPFAR implementing agency and leads on the US’ malaria research and development (R&D) activities (see ‘Sector: Global Health R&D’).

**Department of Defense (DOD)** conducts a wide range of US global health activities and plays a critical role in disease surveillance, in health-systems capacity building through military and international training, and in US global health R&D efforts (see ‘Deep Dive: Global Health R&D’ for more information)

**Congress** controls global health funding levels through multiple appropriations bills, which fund several departments and agencies. Over 15 congressional committees oversee US global health engagement. In addition, around ten caucuses (informal congressional groups) focus specifically on issues related to global health.

---


2 Congressional Global Health Caucus, Congressional HIV/AIDS Caucus, Tuberculosis Elimination Caucus, Congressional Caucus on Malaria and Neglected Tropical Diseases, Senate Caucus on Malaria and Neglected Tropical Diseases, House Hunger Caucus, and Senate Hunger Caucus.
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The US’ global health R&D

The US is the largest funder of global health R&D, with a focus on HIV/AIDS

The US’ funding for research and development (R&D) on poverty-related and neglected diseases (PRNDs), referred to in this profile as ‘global health R&D’, stood at US$1.6 billion in 2017, according to G-FINDER. The US is by far the largest public funder to global health R&D, contributing 69% of all public funding in 2017 (the second-largest funder, the UK, contributed US$186 million). Funding was largely stable between 2016 and 2017, increasing by just US$23 million.

In 2017, US global health R&D funding focused primarily on HIV/AIDS (US$837 million), representing 52% of total US global health R&D spending. Other focus areas included tuberculosis (TB; US$266 million, 17%) and malaria (US$215 million, 13%), followed by diarrhoeal diseases (US$149 million, 3%), kinetoplastids (US$48 million, 3%), and dengue fever (US$47 million, 3%). These figures may differ from the trend numbers presented in the chart due to changes in the scope of the G-FINDER survey from year to year.

In terms of product development, the US allocated its funding in 2017 to preventative vaccines (US$625 million, 39% of total funding), basic research (US$464 million, 29%), drugs (US$254 million, 16%), and microbicides (US$122 million, 8%).

Funding for US global health R&D efforts is likely to remain steady going forward. The FY2019 appropriations bill rejected cuts to global health R&D proposed in President Trump’s FY2019 budget request.

Multiple agencies lead on global health R&D, chiefly the NIH

Currently, the US does not have an overarching strategy for global health R&D. Funding comes from and is implemented through, a variety of programs across several agencies. These are listed below, in order of the amount of funding provided in 2017.

National Institutes of Health (NIH) comprises 27 institutes under the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS; see question three: ‘Who are the main actors in the US’ development cooperation?’). NIH is the biggest funder of global health R&D in the world. It is also the leading US agency for medical research and provided US$1.4 billion for investment in global R&D, 87% of the total US funding in 2017. Within NIH, the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) leads on research for infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, Ebola, and Zika.

Department of Defense (DOD) is also a central actor in US global health R&D efforts, mostly addressing infectious diseases and other neglected health conditions that US service members may encounter while stationed overseas. The department provided US$93 million, or 6%, of US global health R&D funding in 2017.

US Agency for International Development (USAID), the US’ lead development agency, provided US$85 million, or 0.1%, of the US’ global health R&D funding, led by its Bureau for Global Health. USAID focuses funding on TB, malaria, and neglected tropical diseases; global health security; nutrition; maternal, newborn, and child health; HIV/AIDS; family planning and reproductive health; and water, sanitation, and hygiene, including air pollution. The agency houses the Malaria Vaccine Development Program.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) make up the largest government agency worldwide working in disease surveillance, control, and prevention. CDC operates under HHS. In 2017, CDC spent US$23 million in global health R&D funding. In 2010, the CDC established the Center for Global Health, which oversees all of CDC’s global health operations, and focuses on topics such as women’s health, HIV/AIDS, malaria, refugee health, and
health systems strengthening. CDC leads the TB Trials Consortium and is an implementing partner of the PMI, the USAID’s Neglected Tropical Diseases program, and PEPFAR.
The US is the 2nd-largest donor country to education; new basic education strategy launched in 2019

The US was the second largest donor country to education in 2016, having spent US$1.7 billion on education official development assistance (ODA), according to data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This amounts to only 5% of the US’ total ODA, meaning that the share it spends on education is below the average of 8% spent by OECD donor countries.

Though education represents a small portion of US ODA, the US is active in the sector. In 2018, as a result of the READ Act of 2017, P.L. 115-56, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) released a new strategy on basic education for 2019 to 2023, which focuses on 1) improving learning outcomes, and 2) expanding access to basic education for all, with a focus on marginalized and vulnerable populations. The strategy recognizes the potential for investments in international education to “serve as a force multiplier” for other development efforts, by paving the way for greater economic growth, improved health outcomes, sustained democratic governance, and more peaceful and resilient societies. As part of the new education policy, USAID has announced its plans to expand funding to private and religious schools in developing countries, citing the need to provide access to education to children who lack access to public schools.

The US has prioritized girls’ access to education. The Let Girls Learn Initiative was launched in 2015 by First Lady Michele Obama and provided more than US$1 billion in funding in more than 50 countries. The program was discontinued in 2017, although a spokesperson for the Trump administration said that education efforts would be ongoing. In early 2019, President Trump signed a law authorizing USAID to protect girls’ access to education in vulnerable settings and collect better disaggregated data on girls’ education. The law also created a new position at USAID: senior coordinator of US Basic Education Assistance, responsible for the development, implementation, and coordination of US basic education programs.

President Trump’s budget proposals have repeatedly called for deep cuts to basic education ODA, but these have been consistently rejected by Congress. In the State and Foreign Operations (SFOPs) appropriations bills of fiscal year 2018 (FY2018) and FY2019, basic education was funded at US$800 million. The appropriations were passed through omnibus bills in March 2018 and February 2019, respectively (See Key Question 4: ’How is the US budget structured?’). Although the FY2020 SFOPs appropriations are not yet final, the House has approved US$925 million for FY2020, including US$125 million for multilateral partnerships in education. The McGovern-Dole Food for Education program, which the president’s FY2019 budget zeroed out, was increased slightly from US$208 to US$210 million from FY2018 to FY 2019 in the Agriculture-Rural Development-FDA appropriations bill. The House passed FY2020 appropriation increased the budget to US$235 million. As of August 2019, the Senate has not yet acted on either appropriations bill for FY2020.

Bilateral ODA focuses on basic education, in line with USAID’s new strategy for the sub-sector

The US provided US$1.6 billion of its education ODA as bilateral funding in 2017, according to OECD data. The
biggest share of this was allocated to programs for basic education (US$1.2 billion, or 80% of bilateral education ODA), making the US by far the largest donor to this area. The focus is almost entirely on primary education (US$1.2 billion, 94% of funding to basic education), in line with USAID’s new strategy for the sub-sector. Another funding focus in 2017 was post-secondary education (US$219 million, or 14% of bilateral education ODA), which has received increased funding in recent years (up by 31% from 2015 to 2017).

The US is a founding donor to Education Cannot Wait and is the ninth-largest donor to Global Partnership for Education

In 2016, US$165 million, or 10% of the US’ overall education ODA, came from core contributions to multilaterals. The bulk of this funding (US$120 million, or 73%) went to the World Bank’s International Development Association (IDA) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD; US$15 million, 9%). In addition, the US is the ninth-largest donor to the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), having contributed US$199 million (as of December 2017) since joining GPE as a donor in 2009. For the organization’s 2018-2020 replenishment period, the US has pledged US$75 million. The US reports funding to GPE as bilateral ODA. In addition, the US participates on GPE’s board, sharing a constituency seat with Australia, Japan, and South Korea. USAID participates in ‘Local Education Groups’, a forum for coordination of GPE and education-related work in more than 40 GPE-funded countries and is a coordinating agency for GPE’s work in eight countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Somalia).

The US is also a founding donor to ‘Education Cannot Wait’, an international initiative launched in 2016 that aims to improve access to education services in humanitarian emergencies and crises. The US had committed US$21 million to the fund as of May 2019, making it the eighth-largest donor (top donors are Denmark, Canada, the UK, Germany, Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands).

USAID’s education bureau drives global education policies; Congress sets funding levels, influences priorities, and authorizes programs

Several US agencies fund and implement education programs, including USAID, Peace Corps, Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), and the departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and the Interior.

USAID shapes and implements education foreign assistance in close coordination with the Department of State, under the guidance of the White House.

The Peace Corps is a volunteer program run by the US government that provides technical assistance and facilitates cultural exchange by placing volunteers in communities in developing countries.

The MCC provides multi-year development compacts to countries that have committed to political, economic, and social reforms on economic development with the goal to reduce poverty through economic growth.

Congress can also set priorities through legislative directives and authorize new programs and initiatives with the potential to significantly shape US development assistance. Important Congressional committees for US global education engagement include the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs and their subcommittees as well as the Appropriations Committees of both chambers (for funding levels, including those for education).
THE US’ ODA TO EDUCATION

US$ millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Multilateral education ODA</th>
<th>Bilateral education ODA</th>
<th>Education ODA as % of total ODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,187</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OECD CRS, and imputed multilateral contributions to the education sector:
DAC secretariat estimations. In 2017 prices.

THE US’ BILATERAL ODA TO EDUCATION ACROSS SUB-SECTORS, 2017
Total: US$1,556 million

- **Basic education**: 79.7% (US$1,240.1m.)
- **Post-secondary education**: 14.1% (US$218.7m.)
- **General education**: 4.9% (US$76.8m.)
- **Vocational training**: 1.3% (US$20.3m.)
- **Secondary education**: 0.1% (US$1.6m.)

OECD CRS. In 2017 prices.
The US’ agriculture ODA

Agriculture integrated into overarching food-security focus

The US is the largest donor to agriculture and rural development, disbursing US$1.7 billion in official development assistance (ODA) to the sector in 2016, according to data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This represents 19% of the total agriculture ODA provided by OECD donor countries in 2016. However, relative to the size of its overall development funding, the US spends less than the average spent by members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (US: 5%, DAC average: 7%).

Food security is a key theme of the US’ work on agriculture. The focus on food security is reflected in the updated Strategic Plan FY2018-2022 from USAID and the State Department, which cites the US Global Food Security Strategy 2017-2021 as an instrument to implement its overall strategic objectives. US food security efforts encompass food assistance, agricultural and rural economic development, and nutrition.

The US’s flagship initiative is Feed the Future, which was codified in the Global Food Security Act of 2016 and in the Global Food Security Reauthorization Act of 2018. Feed the Future is the US’ largest bilateral agriculture program and uses a whole-of-government approach to align and coordinate various food and agricultural programs. USAID is the lead agency for the program. According to the US Government Global Food Security Strategy 2017-2021, Feed the Future focuses on 1) inclusive agriculture sector growth, 2) gender integration, 3) improved nutrition, 4) private sector, 5) research and capacity building, and 6) resilience. It places a special emphasis on smallholder farmers, especially women, the extreme poor, youth, other marginalized communities, and small and medium enterprises in 12 focus countries.

A critical part of the US’ agricultural and food security efforts are food assistance initiatives (in-kind food transfers and cash-based programs that provide means to acquire food). These functions, now part of Feed the Future, were authorized through 1) the Food for Peace Act (FFPA, also known as PL 480), 2) the Food for Progress Act, 3) the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (McGovern-Dole Program), and 4) the Emergency Food Security Program, a growing component of US food aid (see table 1).

For FY2019, Congress once again rejected the president’s proposed cuts to agriculture and international food assistance, including Food for Peace and the McGovern-Dole program. Funding for the Food for Peace program stayed level at US$1.7 billion. There was a small increase in the McGovern-Dole program, raising the overall level to US$210 million in FY2019 from US$208 million in FY2018. In addition, the FY2019 State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriations for the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) remained level at US$30 million. The House-passed FY2020 Agriculture-Rural Development-FDA appropriation bill increased Food for Peace to US$1.9 billion and the McGovern-Dole program to US$235 million. The Senate has not yet acted on either appropriations bills for FY2020.

In 2017, US$1.3 billion of US ODA to agriculture was disbursed bilaterally, according to OECD data. The top investment area was agricultural development, which received US$697 million, or 56% of US bilateral agriculture ODA. Other investment priorities include agricultural policy and administrative management (US$293 million, or 23%), agricultural alternative development (US$114 million, or 9%), and rural development (US$93 million, or 7%); this is more than double the amount the sub-sector
received in 2016). Agricultural alternative development describes projects which reduce illicit drug cultivation through other agricultural marketing and production opportunities. This is representative of the US’ overall policy focus on US national security concerns.

In addition to its bilateral support, the US provided US$276 million, or 16%, of its total agricultural ODA, in the form of core contributions to multilateral organizations in 2016. Well below the DAC average of 45%, this low share is mainly due to the US’ large bilateral portfolio on agriculture and food security. Key multilateral recipients are the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the African Development Fund (AfDF), the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), and the African Development Bank (AfDB).

The US was the largest funder to the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), a G20 initiative launched during the US presidency in 2009 to help implement the food-security pledges made that year. After providing a total of US$653 million to GAFSP between 2010 and 2017, the US announced in November 2017 that it would no longer fund the organization. Appropriations for FY2018 and FY2019 gave zero funding to GAFSP.

**USAID and Department of Agriculture lead food assistance and agriculture initiatives**

According to government data, US global agriculture efforts are implemented by 11 agencies. Key entities involved in decision-making and implementation are listed below.

**USAID** leads on strategy and implementation of the US’ food security and agriculture programming, primarily through Feed the Future. USAID coordinates the initiative through its administrator, who serves as the US Global Food Security Coordinator. USAID’s Bureau for Food Security (BFS) was established to manage Feed the Future, and the deputy coordinator for development for Feed the Future acts as the assistant to the administrator of the Bureau. If approved by Congress, the reorganization of USAID will create a new unit, the Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, which will include BFS.

**US Department of Agriculture** primarily provides international food assistance through its various programs. It is also responsible for some training, capacity-building programs, and research activities in the US food-security portfolio. The Foreign Agricultural Service is the department’s main international arm. It implements Food for Progress and the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, as well as the Agricultural Research Service (ARS).

**Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)** administers the country-based Millennium Challenge Accounts, based on compacts to provide development assistance to low-income countries and lower-middle-income countries that have committed to political, economic, and social reforms on economic development.

**US Congress** is responsible for authorizing, overseeing, and funding the US’ agriculture and food security programs. There are several important congressional committees responsible for the authorization of programming: the Senate’s Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee and the House’s Agriculture Committee. As some food assistance is also authorized in foreign-assistance legislation, the Appropriations Subcommittees on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs in both chambers are also responsible for making relevant funding decisions.

Other institutions of relevance include the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC; to be replaced by the US’ new Development Finance Corporation, the DFC, in October 2019), as well as the Department of Commerce, Department of State, Department of the Treasury, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Environmental Protection Agency, Peace Corps, African Development Foundation, the US Geological Survey, the National Science Foundation, and the National Institutes of Health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food for Peace Act (FFPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II: Economic Assistance and Food Security</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture (FAS)</td>
<td>Provides funding for concessional sales program and Food for Progress (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II: Emergency and Private Assistance</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Provides agricultural commodities for nonemergency assistance through eligible organizations and authorizes agricultural commodities for both emergency and development food assistance programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III: Food for Development</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Enhances food security and supports long-term economic development in the least-developed countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V: Farmer-to-Farmer</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Provides voluntary technical assistance to farmers, farm groups, and agribusinesses in developing and transitional countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for Progress</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture (FAS)</td>
<td>Provides commodities on credit terms or on a grant basis to developing countries and emerging democracies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture (FAS)</td>
<td>Aims to reduce hunger and improve literacy and access to primary education, especially for girls, through the provision of school meals and teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP)</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>Provides cash-based food assistance in response to international crises to complement FFPA Title II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: US international food assistance programs and implementing agencies
THE US' ODA TO AGRICULTURE
US$ millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Multilateral agriculture ODA</th>
<th>Bilateral agriculture ODA</th>
<th>Agriculture ODA as % of total ODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,771</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OECD CRS, and imputed multilateral contributions to the agriculture and rural development sector: DAC secretariat estimates. In 2017 prices.

Total: US$1694 million

- Bilateral: 83.7% (US$1,418m.)
- Other: 7.2% (US$122m.)
- IDA: 9.1% (US$156m.)

OECD CRS and imputed multilateral contributions to the agriculture sector: DAC secretariat estimates. In 2017 prices.
The US is the largest donor to nutrition globally; funding is mainly provided through US global health and food security programs

The US is the single largest donor to global nutrition efforts, disbursing US$3.2 billion in 2016 for both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions (see box), according to the Global Nutrition Reports from 2014-2018. USAID leads the US’ nutrition efforts. There are several key documents that guide the US government’s work on nutrition:

- The Joint Strategic Plan FY2018-2022 of the State Department and USAID refers to food security, including nutrition, as a cross-sectoral, cross-agency priority.
- USAID’s Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy 2014-2025 sets goals across US nutritional initiatives, addresses direct and underlying causes of malnutrition, and highlights the importance of linking development and humanitarian assistance to increase the impact of US global nutrition efforts. Broadly, it identifies three priorities in line with the 2025 World Health Assembly Nutrition Targets: 1) decrease chronic malnutrition, measured by stunting, 2) maintain Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) below 15%, and 3) decrease malnutrition in women of reproductive age and children under five, with a focus on the 1,000-day window between the beginning of pregnancy and the child’s second birthday.
- The US Government Global Nutrition Coordination Plan 2016-2021 aims to strengthen the impact of the diverse US nutrition portfolio “through better communication, collaboration, and linking research to program implementation”.
- The 2016-2025 Food Assistance and Food Security Strategy, from USAID’s Office of Food for Peace within the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance, outlines two key strategic objectives for the program:
  1. improving and sustaining food security and
  2. embracing nutritional security. It supports Feed the Future and other nutrition-related strategies and objectives.

The US government has made several commitments to international nutrition initiatives over the past years. The US was integral to the founding of the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), housed at the World Bank, during the US’ G20 presidency in 2009. According to GAFSP records, the US disbursed US$653 million in total to GAFSP as of December 2017. In 2017, the US announced that it would no longer fund GAFSP and has not appropriated money to it since that time. According to data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the US provided US$151 million in basic nutrition support in 2017, up from US$142 million in 2016. US funding to nutrition increased significantly between 2010 and 2017, largely due to Feed the Future, a whole-of-government initiative to drive economic and agricultural development and food security (see ‘Sector: Agriculture’). Since 2009, the government has had a nutrition-specific budget line in the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs (SFOPs) bill, which provides funding to basic nutrition, channeled bilaterally.

In FY2019, basic nutrition was funded at US$145 million, a US$20 million increase from FY2018. President Trump continues to propose significant cuts to nutrition programs, with his FY2020 budget again requesting just US$79 million. The House SFOPs FY2020 bill funds basic nutrition at the same level as FY2019. The Senate has yet to take up the SFOPs bill.

USAID leads nutrition efforts, coordinating a ‘whole-of-government’ approach

USAID leads the US’ nutrition efforts, which are largely integrated through the agency’s work in global health, food security and assistance, and agriculture. US global nutrition activities primarily occur within the frame-
work of Feed the Future, and for food assistance through Food for Peace. In addition, USAID’s Bureau for Global Health (which houses the Office of Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition) and for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (which houses the Office of Food for Peace) also help implement nutrition and food-security cooperation. If Congress approves the proposed USAID reorganization, a Center for Nutrition will be housed in the new Bureau for Resilience and Food Security.

The US Department of Agriculture funds Food for Peace, implemented by USAID, as well as the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program. The Department of Agriculture implements the latter through the Foreign Agricultural Service. Other US development cooperation programs, such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, also provide some nutrition support both in terms of financing and implementation.

Congress authorizes, oversees, and funds the US government’s nutrition-specific funding as well as related programs within Feed the Future through its annual SFOPs. It does not specify an overall funding level for Feed the Future, but rather allocates funds separately for related activities and accounts, including nutrition, global health programs (implemented by USAID), bilateral food security and agriculture activities (implemented by USAID, MCC, and other agencies), and related multilateral organizations.
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