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InterAction Member Organizations

1,000 Days
ACDI/VOCA
Action Against Hunger USA
Adventist Development and Relief Agency International (ADRA)
African Methodist Episcopal Service and Development Agency (AME-SADA)
Aga Khan Foundation USA
Airlink
All Hands and Hearts - Smart Response
Alliance for Peacebuilding
Alliance to End Hunger
American Jewish World Service
American Red Cross International Services
American Refugee Committee
American Relief Agency for the Horn of Africa (ARAH)Americares
AmericasRelief Team
Amref Health Africa, INC.
Ananda Marga Universal Relief Team (AMURTEL)
Association of Volunteers in International Service, USA (AVSI-USA)
Asylum Access
Baitulaal
Bank Information Center
Baptist World Alliance
Basic Education Coalition (BEC)
Bethany Christian Services Global, LLC
Better World Fund
Bread for the World
Bread for the World Institute
Bridge of Life
Brother's Brother Foundation
Buddhist Tzu Chi Foundation
Build Change
CARE
Catholic Relief Services
CDA Collaborative Learning Projects
Center for Civilians in Conflict (CIVIC)
Center for Health and Gender Equity (CHANGE)
Child Aid
ChildFund International
Church World Service
Coalition for Integrity
Combat Blindness International
CONCERN Worldwide U.S., Inc.
Congressional Hunger Center
CORE Group
Creative Learning
Development Gateway
Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF)
Doctors of the World USA
Embrace Relief
Episcopal Relief & Development
Ethiopian Community Development Council
Feed the Children
Food for the Hungry
Friends of ACTED
Friends of the Global Fight
FXB USA
Giving Children Hope
Gleaning For The World
Global Communities
Global Health Council
Global Impact
Global Links
Global Washington
Good Neighbors
Habitat for Humanity International
Headwaters Relief Organization
Healey International Relief Foundation
Heart to Heart International
Heartland Alliance
Heifer International
Helen Keller International
HelpAge USA
Helping Hand for Relief and Development
HIAS
Himalayan Cataract Project
Humentum
The Hunger Project
IHC Global Coalition for Inclusive Housing and Sustainable Cities
iMAP
INMED Partnerships for Children
Institute for Sustainable Communities
Interchurch Medical Assistance, Inc. (IMA World Health)
International Budget Partnership
International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)
International Center for Not-for-Profit Law
International Center for Research on Women (ICRW)
International Eye Foundation USA
International Lifeline Fund
International Medical Corps
International Medical Health Organization (IMHO)
International Orthodox Christian Charities (IOCC)
International Relief Teams
International Rescue Committee (IRC)
International Social Service—United States of America
International Training Corporation
International Youth Foundation
IntraHealth International, Inc.
Islamic Relief USA
 Jesuit Refugee Service/USA
Jipiego – an affiliate of The Johns Hopkins University
Keystone Human Services International
Life for Relief and Development
Lutheran World Relief
Management Sciences for Health (MSH)
Medical Care Development
MedShare International
Mennonite Central Committee U.S.
Mercy Corps
Mercy-USA for Aid and Development
Mercy Without Limits
Mobility International USA
National Association of Social Workers
The Nature Conservancy
NCBA CLUSA
Near East Foundation
Norwegian Refugee Council USA
ONE
Operation USA
Oxfam America
PATH
Pathfinder International
PCI
Perkins International
Physicians for Peace
Plan International USA
Planet Aid
Plant with Purpose
Population Communication
Presbyterian Disaster Assistance and Hunger Program
Project C.U.R.E.
Project Hope
Refugees International
Relief International
RESULTS
ReSurge International
Rise Against Hunger
Save the Children
Seva Foundation
Society for International Development (SID)
Solar Cookers International
Solidarity Center
SPOON
Syrian American Medical Society Foundation
The Syrian Forum
Syria Relief and Development
Team Rubicon Global
Trickel Up Program
Unitarian Universalist Service Committee
United Methodist Committee on Relief
United Muslim Relief
U.S. Climate Action Network (USCAN)
U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants
U.S. Fund for UNICEF
USA for UNHCR
Village Enterprise
Volunteers for Economic Growth Alliance (VEGA)
WaterAid America
Water for South Sudan
WEEMA International
WellShare International
Women for Women International
World Animal Protection
World Concern
World Connect
World Food Program USA
World Hope International
World Institute on Disability
World Learning
World Rehabilitation Fund
World Renew
World Vision
Worldwide Orphans Foundation
Zakat Foundation of America

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University
Crown Agents Foundation
GBG Foundation
International Development, Community, and Environment Dept., Clark University
Public Interest Registry (PIR)
RTI International
Transnational NGO Initiative of the Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs at Maxwell School of Syracuse University
War Child Canada

(as of 2/1/18)
Choose to Invest FY 2019 Cover Letter

In the face of humanitarian crises, increasing violent conflict, and famine, American leadership is needed now more than ever in the world. Standing with those living in the poorest and most vulnerable places around the world, the world’s most vulnerable and poor, is an investment in the kind of future we want for our country and our world.

As the nation’s leading policy advocate for development and humanitarian relief programs, representing over 190 U.S.-based nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and a combined annual donor base of $15 billion, InterAction is proud to present Choose to Invest, our funding recommendations for Fiscal Year 2019. Published annually since 2012, Choose to Invest represents our community’s funding recommendations and justifications for U.S. global development and humanitarian programs to the President and Congress.

On February 12, President Trump proposed a 30% cut to the foreign assistance budget from Fiscal Year 2017. InterAction, joining with members of the humanitarian and development community rejected these proposed cuts to poverty-focused development and humanitarian assistance programs that have already proven to save lives and American taxpayer dollars.

In contrast to the President’s budget proposal, Choose to Invest is our community’s recommendation for a reasonable and responsible topline and sector-specific International Affairs Budget. Our top-line recommendations, are:

- Urging overall funding for the foreign assistance budget be no less than $59.1 billion for Fiscal Year 2019;
- Funding for poverty-focused international affairs programs not come at the expense of other poverty-focused development, global health and humanitarian programs that, together, engender a safer and more prosperous world, and;
- Sector specific recommendations, which can be found here.

Building on decades of experience by our InterAction members in nearly every country in the world, each account justification addresses how to maintain U.S. global leadership within the account’s sector through sustained funding, the impact of proposed cuts, and how to catalyze American leadership through increased funding.

As Congress moves to finalize Fiscal Year 19 appropriations, we urge you to choose to invest in foreign assistance and hope that this will be a valuable and education tool.
Dear Member of Congress,

The undersigned members and partners of InterAction urge support for full funding in Fiscal Year 2019 for poverty-focused international development and humanitarian assistance accounts at no less than the levels outlined in the attached recommendations. These funding levels reflect the minimum requirements needed to maintain American leadership in these vital areas, and could be achieved with an International Affairs Budget of $59.1 billion. Funding for each of these programs must not come at the expense of other poverty-focused development, global health and humanitarian assistance that works together to serve the common goal of creating a safer and more prosperous world.

As implementing organizations and advocacy partners, we also believe that there are opportunities for Congress to step up and invest additional funding to better meet unprecedented global challenges and catalyze American leadership.

It's clear that U.S. investments have had an instrumental impact, creating healthier, safer, and more stable societies. Polio has nearly been eradicated. In the last 30 years, we have halved the number of preventable under-five child deaths, the number of people living in poverty, and the number of children and adolescents out of school. In the past five years, USAID programming has ended hunger for 1.7 million more households. Eighty-seven percent of the world’s population has access to safe, affordable, and sustainable drinking water and sixty-one percent have access to improved sanitation. Results like this show that American engagement matters and is consistent with the values and generosity of the American people.

Despite this progress, U.S. leadership and engagement continues to be critical to address ongoing global crises. While budgetary resources are not enough to meet these challenges, they are necessary to address the needs of the most vulnerable. Currently, 135.7 million people need humanitarian assistance. Of this number, 65 million people have been forced from their homes. An estimated 76 million people will need emergency food assistance in 2018, and famine-like conditions are expected to impact a growing number of countries. Public health threats in the last year have included outbreaks of cholera in Yemen, diphtheria among refugees from Myanmar, and the bubonic plague in Madagascar. While crisis response remains urgent, we must also invest in programs that help populations resist shocks and prevent crises in the first place.

At less than one percent of the total U.S. federal budget, poverty-focused development and humanitarian assistance programs are essential to support lifesaving work and promoting U.S. global leadership. Through these programs, U.S. investments: build sustainability; fight disease; respond to disasters; improve global health and nutrition – particularly for mothers and children; help smallholder farmers; educate children;
support democracy and good governance; promote human rights; strengthen civil society; protect people from exploitation; provide access to clean water and better sanitation and hygiene; foster equitable growth; advance gender equality; empower women and girls; and safeguard the environment.

These programs are accountable to American taxpayers, with increasingly well-measured and transparent outcomes that assure assistance delivers results and saves lives. Effective programs also galvanize efforts from other nations, donors, the private sector, and civil society in partner countries. Efforts to reduce poverty and end human suffering are more effective and help transition to sustainable and independent economies that can responsibly grow beyond the need for U.S. assistance. Private American organizations, including members of InterAction, leverage $15 billion in funding to address these needs but rely on the U.S. government to open doors. Continued American leadership is necessary as these programs are in the national interest – now is not the time to back away.

Thank you for your consideration of these requests. Please do not hesitate to reach out to Kevin Rachlin Krachlin@interaction.org, Soshana Hashmie shashmie@interaction.org, or Sara Nitz snitz@interaction.org
1. ACDI/VOCA
2. ARAHA
3. Action Against Hunger
4. Action Corps NYC
5. ACTED
6. Adventist Development and Relief Agency International (ADRA)
7. Alliance for Peacebuilding
8. Alliance to End Hunger
10. American Jewish World Service
11. American Red Cross
12.Americares
13. American Heart Association
14. Association of Volunteers in International Service, USA (AVSI USA)
15. Bank Information Center
16. Basic Education Coalition
17. Better World Fund
18. Bread for the World
20. Borgen Project
21. BRAC USA
22. CARE
23. Christian Connections for International Health
24. Childfund International
25. Church World Service
26. Concern Worldwide US
27. CORE Group
28. Creative Learning
29. Doctors Of the World USA
30. Elizabeth Glasser Pediatrics Aid Foundation
31. Education Development Center
32. Episcopal Relief and Development
33. Feed the Children
34. Food for the Hungry
35. Foreign Policy America
36. Friends of ACTED
37. Franciscan Action Network
38. Frontline Health Workers Coalition
39. FXB USA
40. Global Communities
41. Global Health Council
42. Global Health Technologies Coalition
43. Global Impact
44. Global Campaign for Education—US
45. Habitat for Humanity International
46. Headwaters Disaster Relief Organization
47. Heart to Heart International
48. Heifer International
49. Helen Keller International
50. Humentum
51. Housing Works Inc.
52. Humanity and Inclusion
53. IMA World Health
54. InterAction
55. International Center for Research on Women (ICRW)
56. International Center for Not-for-Profit Law
57. International Eye Foundation
58. International Orthodox Christian Charities
60. International Medical Corps
61. International Rescue Committee
62. Internex
63. Intrahealth International
64. Islamic Relief USA
65. Jesuit Refugee Service/ USA
66. J Street
67. Jon Snow Inc.
68. Lutheran World Relief
69. Management Sciences for Health
70. Mennonite Central Committee U.S.
71. Mercy Corps
72. Mercy-USA for Aid and Development
73. National Peace Corps. Association
74. NCBA CLUSA
75. Norwegian Refugee Council USA
76. ONE
77. One Acre Fund
78. Oxfam America
79. Outreach Aid to Americas, Inc.
80. PAI
81. PATH
82. Plan International USA
83. Planet Aid
84. Plant with Purpose
85. Planned Parenthood Federation of America
86. Population Action International
87. Presbyterian Church (USA)
88. Project Concern International
89. Project HOPE International
90. Refugees International
91. Relief International
92. RESULTS
93. ReSurge International
94. Rise Against Hunger
95. RTI International
96. Save the Children
97. Solar Cookers International
98. Solidarity Center
99. Shot at Life
100. STAND
101. SPOON
102. The Hunger Project
103. The Nature Conservancy
104. U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants
105. U.S. Fund for UNICEF
106. United Methodist Church, General Board of Church & Society
107. United Methodist Committee on Relief
108. United Nations Association of the USA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Volunteers for Economic Growth Alliance (VEGA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Village Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Water Aid America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Water for South Sudan, INC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>WEEMA International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>WellShare International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Women’s Refugee Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Women Thrive Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>World Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>World Hope International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>World Education Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>World Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>World Renew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Yemen Peace Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Zakat Foundation of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## InterAction Key Accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Minimum Requirement (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title I—Department of State and Related Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to International Peacekeeping Activities</td>
<td>$1,907.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title II—USAID</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$1,347.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title III—Bilateral Economic Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and Child Health</td>
<td>$829.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>of which Gavi</strong></td>
<td>$290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio in all accounts</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning in all accounts</td>
<td>$622.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Children</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>$755.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>$261.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected Tropical Diseases</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (USAID)</td>
<td>$330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR (State)</td>
<td>$4,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis &amp; Malaria</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Assistance</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Disaster Assistance</td>
<td>$4,427.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund</td>
<td>$4,681.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and Refugee Assistance</td>
<td>$3,359.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
<td>$905.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title IV—International Security Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Operations</td>
<td>$659.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title V—Multilateral Assistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Organizations and Programs</td>
<td>$363.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to International Development Association</td>
<td>$1,197.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Climate Fund</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Agriculture and Food Security Program</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title VII—General Provisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfinance</td>
<td>$265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation, Clean Energy, and Sustainable Landscapes</td>
<td>$476.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>$269.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Programs</td>
<td>$2,308.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed the Future</td>
<td>$1,000.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water in all accounts</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality <em>(allocated within the above accounts)</em></td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food for Peace Title II</td>
<td>$1,716.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern Dole</td>
<td>$207.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Local and Regional Procurement</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LABOR – HHS APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of International Labor Affairs</td>
<td>$86.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Global Health</td>
<td>$535.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging &amp; Zoonotic Infectious Disease</td>
<td>$584.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**These numbers represent the highest amount allocated in FY17 Omnibus, FY18 Omnibus or FY18 House or Senate Appropriations**
Due to Congress’ s decision in FY’ 17 to maintain a 25% cap on U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping operations, the U.S. is already in arrears on its peacekeeping dues. The $1.9 billion figure would not allow the U.S. to pay prior year shortfalls in FY17&18.

Failing to pay our peacekeeping assessments in-full withholds financial reimbursement to countries who contribute the bulk of troops thereby weakening the missions as the Troop Contributing Countries have fewer resources for training, equipment, and patrolling.

By causing the U.S. to accumulate arrears, it puts American taxpayers on the hook for back dues for years to come. Unilaterally reducing U.S. funding for peacekeeping also undermines our ability to push for new reforms at the UN, a stated priority of the Trump Administration.

The Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account funds the United States’ assessed contributions to UN peacekeeping missions.

Justification for Funding

⇒ There are currently over 106,000 UN peacekeepers – soldiers, police and civilians – serving on 15 peacekeeping missions across three continents.

⇒ UN peacekeeping operations advance American interests by stabilizing conflict zones, protecting civilians from violence, facilitating delivery of humanitarian aid, disarming and reintegrating former combatants, training local police forces to ensure law and order, and supporting free and fair elections and peaceful transitions of power.

⇒ UN peacekeeping missions are extremely cost-effective. A February 2018 GAO analysis found that the cost to American taxpayers of financing a UN peacekeeping mission is eight times cheaper than deploying a comparable U.S. force.

⇒ UN peacekeeping operations are a prime example of global burden-sharing. While the U.S. is the largest financial contributor, as a permanent member of the Security Council, the U.S. also has veto power over all UN peacekeeping missions.

Costs of Cuts Below $1.9 billion

⇒ Due to Congress’s decision in FY’17 to maintain a 25% cap on U.S. contributions to UN peacekeeping operations, the U.S. is already in arrears on its peacekeeping dues. The $1.9 billion figure would not allow the U.S. to pay prior year shortfalls in FY17&18.

⇒ Failing to pay our peacekeeping assessments in-full withholds financial reimbursement to countries who contribute the bulk of troops thereby weakening the missions as the Troop Contributing Countries have fewer resources for training, equipment, and patrolling.

⇒ By causing the U.S. to accumulate arrears, it puts American taxpayers on the hook for back dues for years to come. Unilaterally reducing U.S. funding for peacekeeping also undermines our ability to push for new reforms at the UN, a stated priority of the Trump Administration.

*Assessed contribution of 25% of UN peacekeeping activities
Impact of 35% More Funding

- Funding at this level will allow the United States to pay its FY19 peacekeeping dues in full and pay back $505 million in cap-related arrears accrued in FY17 and FY18.
- This funding will promote civilian protection: a 2013 study by researchers in the U.S. and Sweden found that deploying a sufficiently large force of UN peacekeepers dramatically reduces civilian killings in armed conflicts.
- UN peacekeepers have been able to claim noteworthy achievements in recent years. Long-running UN missions in Liberia (UNMIL) and Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI) have played a crucial role in fostering stability, facilitating free and fair elections, and creating conditions allowing hundreds of thousands of civilians displaced by conflict to return home. This has allowed these two missions to close by March 2018.

Justification for Additional Funding

- In South Sudan, UN forces are protecting more than 200,000 civilians who have fled a devastating civil war and sought refuge at UN bases.
- In Mali, peacekeepers working to secure the country’s vast northern region have increasingly come under threat from armed extremist groups, including a regional affiliate of al-Qaeda, with more than 158 UN personnel killed in attacks.
- UN peacekeepers are also working to neutralize armed groups that target civilians in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a country that is witnessing renewed political upheaval and where nearly 13 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance.

$2.4 billion
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

$7.3 billion
Is the entire UN peacekeeping budget, which represents 0.5% of global military spending.
The NED makes more than 1,700 grants every year to support the projects of non-governmental groups abroad who are working for democratic goals in more than 90 countries. The U.S. government’s political and financial support of the NED is critical to maintain positive change across the globe. NED-supported programming supports a vibrant civil society that ensures human rights, an independent media, and the rule of law.

The National Endowment for Democracy (NED) supports the growth and strengthening of democratic institutions – political parties, trade unions, and business organizations and civil society.

Justification for Funding

- The NED supports democracy and rights work in some of the world’s most difficult environments, both through its four core institutions and with direct funding to local organizations.
- For 35 years, the NED has advanced democracy efforts by supporting freedom-seekers in their pursuit of good governance, strong democracy, and the dignity afforded by human rights. NED enables civil society by supporting U.S., international, and foreign nonprofit organizations and their far-reaching networks of local citizens who advocate to governments for greater accountability and more personal freedom.

Costs of Cuts Below $170 million

- The NED makes more than 1,700 grants every year to support the projects of non-governmental groups abroad who are working for democratic goals in more than 90 countries. The U.S. government’s political and financial support of the NED is critical to maintain positive change across the globe. NED-supported programming supports a vibrant civil society that ensures human rights, an independent media, and the rule of law.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
While global democracy has slid backwards in recent years, it remains at a historic peak and positive change, such as democratic headway made in Myanmar, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, and Tunisia, among others, it is a reminder that democracy efforts work and deserve long-term U.S. investment.

Impact of Full Funding

- With the emergence of actors, such as Russia, who aim to destabilize democracies and electoral processes, the need to support all aspects of civil society has never been more paramount. NED, through its grant partnerships, seeks to support freedom of information, rule of law, political processes, civic education, freedom of association, the strengthening of institutions, human rights, and developing market economies. The NED, given its operating independence from the U.S. government, provides for support to partners with programming for all aspects of society, while maintaining respect for sovereignty in local communities.

$170 million
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

Justification for Full Funding

At 24, Ji Seong-ho escaped North Korea in a perilous journey through China, Laos, and Thailand to South Korea and became a human rights activist and founder of NED grantee organization Now, Action & Unity for Human Rights. President Trump recognized Seong-ho’s efforts during the 2018 State of the Union Address.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Brian Wanko, bwanko@interaction.org

InterAction
A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
CHOOSE TO INVEST FY 2019

USAID Operating Expenses

$1.3 billion*  
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

USAID Operating Expenses is the operating foundation from which U.S. development and humanitarian assistance rises.

Justification for Funding

⇒ Over the last decade, USAID has transformed into an evidence-based and results-oriented organization, setting a high standard for U.S. Government agencies on increasing effectiveness and efficiency and on striving to obtain the best results for the American taxpayer.
⇒ USAID has improved its analytical precision, transparency, internal learning, and decision-making mechanisms, and ability to leverage its resources through public-private and other partnerships to strengthen development and humanitarian programs.
⇒ Focusing on economic solutions and market-based approaches has helped communities to lift themselves out of poverty, promote good governance, bring prosperity to the disadvantaged, and raise global health standards, as well as respond to global disasters.

Costs of Cuts Below $1.3 billion

⇒ Reductions in USAID staff between 1990 and 2008 contributed a notable decrease in USAID’s technical expertise and a significant outsourcing of much of the work that had previously been performed in-house.
⇒ The FY19 budget must sustain USAID staffing levels necessary to carry out humanitarian and development assistance programs effectively, provide the necessary oversight to carry billions in aid programming, as well as maintain the technical capacity to remain flexible in a changing global environment.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of 8% More Funding

More recently, through much-needed increases in funds for operating expenses, USAID has made progress in restoring critical in-house expertise and capabilities, including its ability to design and implement intelligent development programming. It is vitally important that the agency receive appropriate levels of funding to continue to undertake these crucial reforms and to attract and retain top-tier talent.

USAID operating expenses help ensure U.S. taxpayer dollars are spent transparently, efficiently, and properly.
Bilateral Economic Assistance
Cuts to the MCH account would compromise progress made to date towards ending preventable child and maternal deaths.

Rolling back funding could similarly compromise efforts in health system strengthening and the ability to leverage shared service delivery platforms, thereby potentially having an adverse impact on infection and mortality rates.

Studies show that a decrease in maternal and child mortality rates is associated with increases in GDP in the countries where MCH funding is invested.

According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, a cut in the MCH account of $30 million would result in 14,000 more maternal, newborn and child deaths each year.
Impact of 10% More Funding

⇒ Additional resources are critical to promoting rapid scale-up of proven interventions and ensuring sustained quality of interventions, including medical products, to improve the health of women and children around the world and address treatable causes of death and disability.

⇒ These interventions include immunizations; improving nutrition; improving access to and use of clean water, sanitation, and hygiene practices; addressing neglected tropical diseases as well as providing medical products such as insecticide-treated mosquito nets.

⇒ Increased investments also improve access to skilled birth attendants and emergency obstetric care, training for frontline health workers, and research and development of new lifesaving tools and medical products.

⇒ With increased focus and investment by USAID under the Child Survival Call to Action, 13 African countries have launched sharpened national strategies, set national targets, and developed scorecards to track progress in MCH. In the last two years alone, 24 priority countries – of which 16 are in Africa – have achieved an 8% reduction in under-five mortality, saving 500,000 lives.

18,000 more children and 650 more mothers will survive today than each day in 1990 due to USAID investments in maternal and child health.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact: Soshana Hashmie, shashmie@interaction.org
For every cut of $10 million in U.S. international FP/RH assistance, the following would result:

- 414,000 fewer women and couples would receive contraceptive services and supplies;
- 123,000 more unintended pregnancies, including 55,000 more unplanned births, would occur;
- 52,000 more abortions would take place (the majority of which are provided under unsafe conditions); and
- 250 more maternal deaths would occur.

Conversely, every additional dollar spent on contraceptive services will save $2.22 in pregnancy-related care.

Investments in FP/RH are integral to the future progress of U.S. global health programs, in particular achieving the goals of important initiatives to improve maternal, newborn and child health and combat HIV/AIDS (President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief [PEPFAR] and DREAMS).
Impact of Additional Funding

⇒ In FY17, the U.S. invested $607.5 million in international FP/RH. These investments have a significant impact and made it possible to achieve the following:
  ⇒ 25 million women and couples receive contraceptive services;
  ⇒ 7.4 million unintended pregnancies are averted;
  ⇒ 3.1 million induced abortions are averted, the majority of which are provided in unsafe conditions; and
  ⇒ 15,000 maternal deaths are averted.

Impact of Additional Funding

⇒ This recommended level positions the U.S. as the leader in the global effort to fulfill unmet needs for modern contraception for 214 million women in developing countries.
⇒ The 140 percent increase above the minimum need figure is calculated based on the funding targets agreed to at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development, which specified that one-third of the financial resources necessary to provide reproductive health care should be furnished by donor countries and two-thirds by the developing nations themselves.
⇒ The U.S. share of the cost based on its percentage of total donor country income equals $1.5 billion. Other donor governments and developing nations would be responsible for $9.5 billion.
⇒ Scaling up voluntary family planning between 2013 and 2020 in the U.S. government’s 24 priority countries would avert 7 million newborn and child deaths and 450,000 maternal deaths by preventing unintended and high-risk pregnancies.

70,000 fewer maternal and 500,000 newborn deaths would occur if the unmet need for contraception decreased unintended pregnancies by 70% and unsafe abortion by 74%.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
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Nutrition in Global Health Programs

$125 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

Nutrition during the 1,000 days between pregnancy and a child’s second birthday is the most critical building block for a child’s health and future well-being. Malnutrition is linked to nearly half of all child deaths.

Justification for Funding

⇒ The impact of nutrition investments is expansive: for every $1 that is spent, up to $35 is returned through decreased healthcare costs and improved economic productivity.

⇒ When a child does survive, chronic childhood malnutrition puts him or her at risk of stunted physical and mental development with irreversible consequences later in life. This account plays a central role in targeting interventions during the 1,000 day window.

⇒ Nutrition deficits have life long impacts on well being and the economy. On average, stunted children complete fewer years of education and perform less well in school than their well-nourished counterparts, reducing their income-earning capacity as adults.

⇒ We have seen that nutrition interventions make a difference. Children who get the right nutrition in their first 1,000 days are ten times more likely to overcome life-threatening childhood diseases. Between 2009 and 2016, stunting within USAID’s 19 nutrition priority countries decreased from 40 percent to 34 percent. More than 27 million children under 5 were reached by nutrition interventions in 2016 alone.

Costs of Cuts Below $125 million

⇒ A 40% cut to nutrition funding, as proposed by the Administration’s fiscal year 2019 budget, would result in 11 million children not being reached with vital nutrition interventions.

⇒ The long-term economic growth and ability of low-income countries to emerge from poverty and crisis will be limited if the nutrition of future generations is not a priority.

⇒ In order to reach globally agreed nutrition targets by 2025 for stunting, wasting, breastfeeding, and anemia, an additional $70 billion of global investment is required.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of Additional Funding

⇒ The current levels of funding are unable to reach the number of people in need. In fact, only one third of acutely malmnourished children worldwide currently have access to treatment.
⇒ One in 4 children are stunted, a consequence of chronic malnutrition. Fifty-two million children are acutely malmnourished, and 500 million women suffer from anemia.
⇒ Malnutrition is linked to 2.6 million child deaths each year and 1 in 5 maternal deaths.

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ This additional funding would accelerate progress toward meeting global targets on stunting, breastfeeding, anemia, and wasting and would contribute to the realization of other U.S. development assistance objectives such as resilience and economic growth.
⇒ Priority could be given to cost-effective breastfeeding and anemia interventions, both of which are ready to be scaled up immediately & for which the U.S. has a strong platform for delivery.
⇒ The total need for these two targets is fairly low. According to internal calculations, an increased U.S. investment of $125 million will meet a third of the annual global need (fair share) at fairly low costs: $9 per case of anemia each year, and $4.70 per newborn.
⇒ Breastfeeding boosts a child’s immune system, protects from diseases, and increases cognitive ability. Scaling up breastfeeding could save over 800,000 lives per year. The global cost of lower cognitive ability associated with not breastfeeding is $300 billion each year.
⇒ Anemia impairs women’s health and economic productivity, while contributing to maternal death and serious health consequences for infants.
⇒ This funding could also be used to improve the accessibility of treatment for acute malnutrition.

$70 billion
the additional amount of money the world needs to invest by 2025 in order to reach globally agreed nutrition targets.
An estimated 8 million children live in institutions. 152 million children are engaged in child labor, with 73 million working in hazardous conditions, and 24.9 million people are subject to forced labor.

More than 30 million children are internally displaced as a result of conflict or persecution. Cuts to this account would impact international efforts to reduce the number of separated from their families.

Based on DCOF-funded research in Cambodia, the number of children living in orphanages has doubled since 2005. Cuts to these programs would inhibit U.S. efforts to deinstitutionalize these children.

USAID has focused on children in institutional care, those affected by war, or those living and working on the street, as well as children with disabilities and other highly vulnerable children.

DCOF, through the Vulnerable Children account, ensures that children reach their developmental milestones, are protected from violence, and grow up in family care. Through coordination, research, and technical capacity building, DCOF is empowering the next generation of leaders.

The plan has three goals: (1) create strong beginnings for children; (2) ensure a family for every child; and (3) protect children from abuse, exploitation, violence, and neglect.

The Vulnerable Children account, which is provided via the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund (DCOF), supports the care and protection of vulnerable children around the globe, particularly those who have been separated from their families or are at risk of separation.

Justification for Funding

- USAID has focused on children in institutional care, those affected by war, or those living and working on the street, as well as children with disabilities and other highly vulnerable children.
- DCOF, through the Vulnerable Children account, ensures that children reach their developmental milestones, are protected from violence, and grow up in family care. Through coordination, research, and technical capacity building, DCOF is empowering the next generation of leaders.
- The plan has three goals: (1) create strong beginnings for children; (2) ensure a family for every child; and (3) protect children from abuse, exploitation, violence, and neglect.

Costs of Cuts Below $23 million

- An estimated 8 million children live in institutions. 152 million children are engaged in child labor, with 73 million working in hazardous conditions, and 24.9 million people are subject to forced labor.
- More than 30 million children are internally displaced as a result of conflict or persecution. Cuts to this account would impact international efforts to reduce the number of separated from their families.
- Based on DCOF-funded research in Cambodia, the number of children living in orphanages has doubled since 2005. Cuts to these programs would inhibit U.S. efforts to deinstitutionalize these children.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of 10% More Funding

Research has shown that adverse childhood experiences, including institutionalization, impacts the healthy brain development of children, effecting future education and employment opportunities.

Children with disabilities – over 93 million children – are less likely to attend school, more likely to be institutionalized, at higher risk of physical abuse, and may be more likely to experience ill health and malnutrition. More funding would enable DCOF to reach more children with disabilities living in institutions or at risk of family separation.

$237 million
the amount DCOF has provided to support vulnerable children in more than 45 developing countries since its inception in 1989
Cuts to the malaria accounts could compromise progress made to date towards preventing, controlling, and eliminating malaria. Rolling back funding could similarly compromise efforts in research and development as drug- and insecticide-resistance grows, thereby potentially having an unintended deleterious impact on our future anti-malarial efforts. Studies show that a decrease in malaria morbidity and mortality rates increases GDP in the respective countries of which malaria funding is invested.
Impact of Full Funding

The benefits of ending malaria would be significant: lower health care costs, higher productivity, increased capacity to respond to other disease outbreaks, and a blueprint that could be used against other diseases of poverty. Only with sustained support of U.S. government malaria programs, coupled with the use of existing tools and the development of new ones, will we be able to eradicate malaria altogether – the only reasonable course of action if we want to put an end to the recurring costs of fighting this disease.

Further Justification for Funding

- Additional resources are critical to the President’s Malaria Initiative’s new country programs in Cameroon, Cote d’Ivoire, Niger, and Sierra Leone, and its existing program in Burkina Faso and 19 other countries.

- Resources are also critical to make greater investments in malaria R&D for new tools to accelerate progress towards ending malaria, such as next-generation diagnostics, novel insecticides, and vaccines.

For more information, please contact:
Soshana Hashmie, shashmie@interaction.org
Proposed budget cuts would mean a failure to treat 100,000 TB cases and 40,000 MDR-TB cases, resulting in many new TB and MDR TB cases due to transmission.

Urgent-needed research for better TB treatments would be curtailed.

World leaders are increasingly recognizing the impact of TB, and innovations are transforming the response, yet funding reductions would undermine this momentum.

Investing in programs to prevent drug-resistant TB globally can help prevent costly outbreaks of this airborne disease. An outbreak of MDR-TB or even a single case of XDR-TB can bankrupt the public health budget of a US city or locality.

As an airborne disease, Tuberculosis (TB) presents a unique threat that knows no borders, impacting many countries with long-standing U.S. ties.

Justification for Funding

⇒ The continued spread of multi-drug-resistant tuberculosis (MDR-TB) is a serious global health security threat. In FY18, USAID projected to contribute to 120,000 MDR-TB patients initiated on treatment, out of 600,000 in need.

⇒ An estimated 1 million children are suffering from TB, and TB is among the five leading causes of death for women of reproductive age in low-income countries.

⇒ Schools are TB transmission hot spots, and an estimated 1.78 million young people develop TB every year.

⇒ In the 23 priority countries new cases have fallen by 20% since 2000 – more than twice as quickly as countries that do not receive U.S. bilateral TB assistance.

⇒ New approaches are revolutionizing the field, including new medications for TB and rapid diagnostics.

Costs of Cuts Below $261 million

⇒ Proposed budget cuts would mean a failure to treat 100,000 TB cases and 40,000 MDR-TB cases, resulting in many new TB and MDR TB cases due to transmission.

⇒ Urgent-needed research for better TB treatments would be curtailed.

⇒ World leaders are increasingly recognizing the impact of TB, and innovations are transforming the response, yet funding reductions would undermine this momentum.

⇒ Investing in programs to prevent drug-resistant TB globally can help prevent costly outbreaks of this airborne disease. An outbreak of MDR-TB or even a single case of XDR-TB can bankrupt the public health budget of a U.S. city or locality.

*FY18 Omnibus Enacted Appropriation
Impact of 50% More Funding

⇒ **Tuberculosis sickens 10.4 million people a year**, and it is now the single biggest infectious disease killer, killing 1.7 million people a year. It is in the interest of the United States that countries rapidly transition to effective TB approaches and end the epidemic.

⇒ USAID strengthens the capacity of national TB programs, in 23 focus countries, to provide high-quality prevention, diagnosis and treatment services. 53 million lives have been saved from TB 2000-2016, showing an enormous return on investment.

⇒ With this increase, USAID could boldly accelerate progress, ensuring treatment for 90% of people with TB and 60% of people with drug resistant TB by 2022. This would dramatically boost TB prevention, because once a patient is on effective treatment, the disease rapidly becomes non-infectious.

Impact of 50% More Funding

⇒ **About 40% of people with TB are “missing” and not registered and treated by national health programs.** In 2016, USAID provided training in TB for 46,000 health workers, and, with increased funding, this training could be expanded and more patients reached.

⇒ USAID has already significantly increased case notification, for instance contributing to a 20% increase in the Philippines.

⇒ USAID could accelerate its work in improving the market for MDR-TB medications and strengthening the emergency warning system for stockouts of drugs. **Already, with USAID efforts, the cost of MDR-TB regimens has declined 50% since 2012.**

1 out of 3

proportion of anti-microbial resistance (AMR) deaths that are attributed to TB

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
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**Neglected Tropical Disease**

$100 million*

Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

The USAID Neglected Tropical Disease (NTD) program was established in 2006 and has made important and substantial contributions to the global fight to control and eliminate seven of the most common NTDs.

**Justification for Funding**

- Many of the most common NTDs are combated using medicines that are safe and effective. USAID funding enables medicines to reach people at-risk, which contributes to NTD prevention, control, and elimination. However, treatment options for NTDs with the highest death rates, including human African trypanosomiasis, visceral leishmaniasis, and Chagas disease, are extremely limited.

- Since its start in 2006, **USAID has supported the distribution of 1.42 billion safe and effective NTD treatments to more than 935 million people in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.**

- Investments are urgently needed to support R&D for new tools, including diagnostics, drugs, and vaccines, for all NTDs. Addressing the link between health and other sectors, along with increased R&D, are necessary to meet the World Health Organization’s (WHO) NTD 2020 goals.

**Costs of Cuts Below $100 million**

- **NTDs are responsible for as many as 534,000 deaths every year.** Additionally, over 800 million children are impacted by NTDs leading to blindness, deformities, and malnutrition.

- A decrease in funding would have implications for these statistics worsening due to less aid and resources available to treat or prevent NTDs among vulnerable populations. There could also be a decrease in the gains made to reduce and eliminate NTDs in the countries where the program has been implemented over the past ten years.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of 25% More Funding

- The USAID NTD provides direct funding support, technical assistance, and training to 31 national NTD programs, while informing the global policy dialogue on NTDs.
- Since 2014, the program has been investing in research and development to ensure that promising new breakthrough medicines for parasitic filarial diseases can be rapidly evaluated, registered, and made available to patients.
- **Without an increase in funding, the goals of the NTD program to eliminate seven of the most common NTDs by 2020 would not be met;** level funding will not allow the program goals to advance.

Impact of 25% More Funding

- With 25% increase in funding for FY2019, the program can maximize the benefits of increased drug donations received from pharmaceutical companies; to ensure that all countries supported by USAID’s program can reach national scale and maintain the great progress towards 2020 control and elimination targets; and to continue urgently needed investments in research and development for new tools – including diagnostics, drugs, and vaccines – for all NTDs to ensure that new discoveries make it through the pipeline and become available to people who need them most.

As a result of USG funding for NTDs and other global support, **198 million** people are no longer at risk for lymphatic filariasis or elephantiasis and **85 million** people are no longer at risk for blinding trachoma.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
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Over 15 million people living with HIV still do not have access to antiretroviral therapy, and 1.8 million people became newly infected with HIV in 2016.

Within the HIV epidemic, certain populations still lag behind. Girls and young women account for 74 percent of new HIV infections among adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa. Less than half of 2.1 million children living with HIV have access to lifesaving ARVs.

Slowing down or capping HIV testing and treatment enrollment could actually fuel the spread of HIV instead of ending it. Analysis shows that $800 billion in proposed cuts to PEPFAR could result in over 1 million HIV treatment disruptions, resulting in almost 150,000 AIDS-related deaths including over 7,000 children.

When PEPFAR began, only 50,000 people in Africa were on life-saving HIV treatment. AIDS was a death sentence, with 1.9 million people dying annually around the world, and the disease was quickly spreading out of control.

The President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) is the largest commitment in history made by a nation to a single disease. Because of PEPFAR’s historic investment, the number of HIV-related deaths has been cut by nearly half to 1 million in 2016. And new HIV infections in many populations are on the decline.

Over 15 million people living with HIV still do not have access to antiretroviral therapy, and 1.8 million people became newly infected with HIV in 2016.

Within the HIV epidemic, certain populations still lag behind. Girls and young women account for 74 percent of new HIV infections among adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa. Less than half of 2.1 million children living with HIV have access to lifesaving ARVs.

Slowing down or capping HIV testing and treatment enrollment could actually fuel the spread of HIV instead of ending it. Analysis shows that $800 billion in proposed cuts to PEPFAR could result in over 1 million HIV treatment disruptions, resulting in almost 150,000 AIDS-related deaths including over 7,000 children.

$4.32 billion* (PEPFAR)

of which $330 million* (USAID HIV)

Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

The Global Health Program account includes two budget lines that provide funding for the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), the cornerstone bilateral program to end the most deadly infectious diseases ravaging our world today.

Justification for Funding

Costs of Cuts Below $4.32 billion

Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
At a time when the global HIV/AIDS response needs additional investment to capitalize on the gains made over the past decade, the progress fueled by U.S. funding of global HIV/AIDS programs is in jeopardy.

Analysis shows that just a 10% increase in U.S. funding, together with ambitious domestic spending in country, and focused attention on optimizing resources, can avert up to 22 million HIV infections and save 2.3 million lives in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Former President George W. Bush wrote in a 2017 op-ed about PEPFAR: “When we confront suffering — when we save lives — we breathe hope into devastated populations, strengthen and stabilize society, and make our country and the world safer... The American people deserve credit for this tremendous success and should keep going until the job is done.”

In 2016, around 53% of all people living with HIV had access to life-saving treatment.
The Administration’s proposed cut of $425 million would translate to:

- 565,250 fewer lives saved through Global Fund-supported programs
- Loss of potential to prevent 8 million new HIV, TB and malaria infections

The Administration’s proposal to cut the Global Fund is based on a currency fluctuation issue which can be addressed by including on a one-time basis, appropriations or authorizing language that clarifies the 33% U.S. legislative cap on contributions, to address the highly unusual currency swings leading up to the September 2016 Replenishment.

If other donor-countries see the U.S. back away from our historic leadership role at the Global Fund then others are likely to follow, and we will have missed a historic opportunity to end the epidemics of HIV, TB, and malaria.

The Global Fund is a 21st century public-private partnership designed to accelerate the end of AIDS, tuberculosis (TB) and malaria as epidemics.

**Justification for Funding**

- U.S. leadership through the Global Fund and bilateral programs have supported incredible progress in the fight against the three most deadly infectious diseases. To date, the Global Fund partnership has:
  - Saved 22 million lives
  - Helped 11 million people access ARV therapy
  - Tested and treated 17.4 million people for TB
  - Distributed 795 million insecticide-treated bed nets

**Costs of Cuts Below $1.35 billion**

- The Administration’s proposed cut of $425 million would translate to:
  - 565,250 fewer lives saved through Global Fund-supported programs
  - Loss of potential to prevent 8 million new HIV, TB and malaria infections

- The Administration’s proposal to cut the Global Fund is based on a currency fluctuation issue which can be addressed by including on a one-time basis, appropriations or authorizing language that clarifies the 33% U.S. legislative cap on contributions, to address the highly unusual currency swings leading up to the September 2016 Replenishment.

- If other donor-countries see the U.S. back away from our historic leadership role at the Global Fund then others are likely to follow, and we will have missed a historic opportunity to end the epidemics of HIV, TB, and malaria.

**CHOOSE TO INVEST FY 2019**

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, & Malaria

$1.3 billion*

Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
$1.3 billion
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

Justification for Full Funding

⇒ The Global Fund is a 21st century public-private partnership designed to accelerate the end of AIDS, tuberculosis (TB), and malaria as epidemics. Since 2002, the Global Fund partnership has saved more than 22 million lives and has maintained U.S. bipartisan support for its highly efficient and collaborative work with U.S. bilateral programs, its ability to leverage domestic and donor investment in global health, protect U.S. health security, and spur economic growth.

⇒ Even with remarkable progress, **AIDS, TB, and malaria still claim more than 2.5 million lives annually, over half a million of which are children.** With scientific and service delivery advances, ending these epidemics could and should be a signature 21st century accomplishment.

Impact of Full Funding

⇒ Every $100 million invested in Global Fund-supported programs:

  ⇒ Saves 133,000 lives
  ⇒ Averts 1.9 million new HIV, tuberculosis, and malaria infections
  ⇒ Provides antiretroviral therapy for 107,000 people
  ⇒ **Provides treatment for 31,000 women to prevent passing HIV to their babies**
  ⇒ Provides TB treatment and care for 153,000 people
  ⇒ Provides 4,300 people with treatment for multidrug-resistant TB
  ⇒ Distributes 6.2 million mosquito nets to protect children and families from malaria
  ⇒ Provides indoor residual spraying for 1.2 million households to protect children and families
  ⇒ Spurs implementing countries own domestic investment of $300 million toward the three diseases
  ⇒ **Creates $2.2 billion in long-term economic gains**

Growing drug-resistance and a **population under 15 in Africa projected to double by 2050 threaten** a resurgence of the 3 diseases absent U.S. leadership.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Soshana Hashmie, shashmie@interaction.org
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Development Assistance

$3 billion*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

Development Assistance account is the bedrock of U.S. investments to help the world’s poorest people. The overarching account funds bilateral economic assistance through core sectoral and targeted country specific programming implemented by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Department of State.

Justification for Funding

⇒ The Development Assistance account funds core sectoral work at USAID and State Department to:
  ⇒ obtain access to education and clean water
  ⇒ grow nutritious food and promote sustainable agriculture practices
  ⇒ promote economic development
  ⇒ support good governance and create more sustainable, self-sufficient democratic societies
  ⇒ build community resilience to be able to respond to environmental shocks
⇒ $3 billion is consistent with the amount appropriated in Fiscal Year 2018

Costs of Cuts Below $3 billion

⇒ Cuts to Development Assistance would jeopardize the effectiveness and efficiency of core sectoral programming and Congressional priorities at USAID and the Department of State.
⇒ Effective programs like Feed the Future, Power Africa, and the Global Partnership for Education as well as initiatives to support public—private partnerships, engagement with faith based organizations, support orphaned, abandoned, or displaced children, and combat human trafficking.

*Enacted FY 18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of Full Funding

⇒ Leverage additional resources from developing countries through support for the Global Partnership for Education.
⇒ Continued funding for Development Assistance allows for the continued improvement of incomes and food and nutrition security in low-income countries by boosting agricultural productivity through Feed the Future programs.
⇒ Development Assistance programs also work to demonstrate how green infrastructure, such as planting trees, can address growing urban challenges, including storm-water run-off and air pollution, and also protect vulnerable coastal communities from natural disasters.

USAID has trained more than 9,800 domestic election observers and officials, and provided voter and civic education for more than 6.5 million people.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact: Sara Nitz, snitz@interaction.org
International Disaster Assistance is one of the primary funding streams that the U.S. government uses to respond to humanitarian needs, which have reached levels not seen since World War II. IDA funds USAID’s Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) and Office of Food for Peace (FFP).

Justification for Funding

- The UN estimates that in 2018 humanitarian assistance will need to be provided to 135.7 million men, women and children. The UN also estimates that the number of forcibly-displaced people is the highest in recorded history: **65.6 million people**, including **40.3 million internally displaced people**, and trends indicate this number is likely to continue to grow.

- Despite strong global response to address the threat of famine in 2017, FEWS NET reports that at least **76 million people will need emergency food assistance in 2018**, in large part because of the impact of conflict in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, Yemen, Syria, and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

- IDA has been used by Congress to ensure coordination across other humanitarian accounts to appropriately address changing contexts in humanitarian emergencies, including by using transfer authorities provided in past years by Congress for FFP Title II and Migration and Refugee Assistance.

Costs of Cuts Below $4.4 billion

- The President’s proposed cuts would leave approximately **14 million people** without humanitarian assistance.

- Proposed cuts to market-based emergency food assistance in IDA and in-kind food assistance from FFP Title II consistent would leave **20 million without lifesaving food assistance**.

- The President’s budget assumes the existence of carryover funding that simply does not exist. Emergency famine funding in FY17 has been spent. In fact, USAID has contributed more than **$3.3 billion in humanitarian assistance annually since 2015** outside of famine contexts, as demand for humanitarian assistance far outstrips the funding available.
Due to armed conflicts, violence, drought, and natural disasters, the United Nations is predicting global humanitarian needs to increase by five percent in 2018 – a number estimated to be conservative by many non-governmental organizations.

This increase considers the continued and immediate threat of famine conditions in Northeast Nigeria, the Horn of Africa, South Sudan, and Yemen, as well as a deepening crisis in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Last year, Congress responded to similarly dire global needs with roughly $1 billion in supplemental funding, which staved off famine in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.

Emergency supplemental funds have been exhausted. Without additional resources, people affected by conflict, displaced, and facing severe food insecurity will not receive necessary life-saving assistance.

135.7 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance worldwide.
The Economic Support Fund (ESF) uses economic assistance to advance U.S. political and strategic interests. Historically, funds under the ESF account are more flexible than funds used under Development Assistance, and this flexibility allows the U.S. government to respond more easily to developments, such as political instability or economic crises, to support U.S. interests abroad.

- ESF funds help communities living in the poorest, most violent, and most vulnerable places in the world access programs supporting the rule of law, strengthening civil society participation, increasing the role of the private sector, and making governments more accountable.

The Economic Support Fund is the main account to provide development assistance to fragile and conflict-affected states with the goal of meeting short- and long-term political and economic needs.

**Justification for Funding**

- **Food Insecurity:** ESF funds programs that address the root causes of hunger, poverty, and food crises by investing in agricultural development and nutrition in Feed the Future focus countries and Feed the Future aligned countries.

- **Instability:** ESF funds provide support for democracy, rights, and governance, including assistance to civil society actors who seek freedoms and rights that align with U.S. morals and principles.

- **Global Health:** ESF funds provide important support for a number of global health programs including maternal and child health, polio, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, and nutrition.

**Costs of Cuts Below $4.68 billion**

- **Food Insecurity:** ESF funds programs that address the root causes of hunger, poverty, and food crises by investing in agricultural development and nutrition in Feed the Future focus countries and Feed the Future aligned countries.

- **Instability:** ESF funds provide support for democracy, rights, and governance, including assistance to civil society actors who seek freedoms and rights that align with U.S. morals and principles.

- **Global Health:** ESF funds provide important support for a number of global health programs including maternal and child health, polio, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, and nutrition.

*Enacted FY17 Appropriation*
ESF provides families living in countries like Liberia, Lebanon, Afghanistan, and Nepal with a number of vital services such as increasing access to basic education, growing nutritious food, strengthening health systems, promoting economic development and entrepreneurship, and supporting good governance.

Funds are used for enterprise, education, housing, health care, and alleviating household shocks, such as those from macroeconomic instability or periodic droughts, and other climate-related issues. The recommended appropriation level would also provide additional funding for worthwhile programming, such as preventing violent extremism, trade capacity-building, technology, innovation, and evaluation.

Increased funding levels allow the U.S. to take the necessary steps to address global challenges, including increasing levels of violence that drive growing levels of human displacement and roll back development gains.

The Global Transitional Justice Fund relies on ESF funds to restore the relationship between citizens and the formerly abusive state institutions and provide accountability for human rights violations and atrocities.
Migration and Refugee Assistance is the primary account in the U.S. budget that deals with refugee crises overseas and supports efforts to address broader displacement. At a time of record numbers of forcibly displaced persons and refugees, the humanitarian assistance, refugee resettlement and humanitarian diplomacy functions funded by this account are needed now more than ever.

Justification for Funding

- UNHCR estimates that as of the end of 2016 the number of forcibly-displaced people was the highest in recorded history: **65.6 million people**, including **22.5 million refugees**, more than half of whom are under 18 years old. **20 people are forcibly displaced every minute as a result of conflict or persecution.**

- In 2016, the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) contributed more than **$3.4 billion** to humanitarian efforts, positioning the U.S. as a leader in responding to global crises by providing shelter, education, food, water, and protection to displaced populations.

- The recommended funding level of $3.359 billion would ensure assistance continues in conflict-affected areas of the world, such as the Middle East, that often receive less yet face similar human suffering. It would also enable continued support for multilateral partnerships.

Costs of Cuts Below $3.4 billion

- The President’s budget cuts would imperil assistance for **3.2 million** refugees and IDPs globally.

- Of the 6.4 million school-age children (5-17) under UNHCR’s mandate, more than half – **3.5 million** – are out of school, while education is one of the **least-funded** humanitarian sectors. Cuts in PRM funding would rob even more children of learning.

- The President’s budget assumes carryover funding that has dwindled to low levels. However, demands on PRM’s account are only increasing with the mass displacement of Rohingya from Myanmar since August 2017 and several other refugee crises worsening in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
$3.6 billion
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ More than 688,000 Rohingya have crossed the border from Myanmar to Bangladesh, representing one of the most rapidly developing refugee crises seen in years.

⇒ In 2017, displacement crises accelerated in South Sudan, with conflict producing an additional 1 million refugees in just one year’s time between January 2017 and January 2018. The appeal for this regional refugee crisis is currently only 34% funded.

⇒ The situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) has also rapidly deteriorated, deepening a displacement crisis in central Africa. Currently, there are 623,000 refugees from the DRC across the region and a total of 4.35 million internally-displaced people, a figure that has doubled since 2015.

Impact of 7% More Funding

⇒ Additional funding beyond FY18 would begin to address the massive, new crisis in Myanmar and Bangladesh.

⇒ There are an 22.5 million refugees worldwide at the end of 2016 – a number which will certainly increase when final 2017 estimates come in with multiple cross-border displacements occurring during the year. This represents an increase of at least 1.2 million from 2015, 3 million from 2014, and 6.5 million from 2007.

⇒ 84% of refugees are hosted in developing countries, with 28% hosted in countries considered among the least developed in the world. Increased support to refugees and host communities will help alleviate the strain on host countries, which imperil development objectives.

65.6 million
people have been forcibly displaced as of the end of 2016 — the highest number in recorded history.
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A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance

$50 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

The Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance (ERMA) fund is a drawdown account designed to ensure that the U.S. government has sufficient resources for refugee assistance in unanticipated and urgent humanitarian crises.

Justification for Funding

⇒ ERMA funds are used to support the State Department Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) response to the needs of refugees who flee crises.

⇒ In recent years, **ERMA funding has been used to respond to unanticipated needs in countries such as Mali, South Sudan, Sudan, and Syria.**

⇒ Outlays from the ERMA account have met new obligations in recent years, **demonstrating demand for ERMA funding** despite cumbersome requirements to pull funding from the account.

Costs of Cuts Below $50 million

⇒ Without continued flexibility to respond to unanticipated humanitarian crises, additional burdens will be placed upon accounts like Migration and Refugee Assistance and International Disaster Assistance, whose funding streams are already largely spoken for.

⇒ Without such flexibility, the United States would be forced to make trade-offs between funding existing and planned-for refugee responses or sudden onset responses — such as the displacement of the Rohingya from Myanmar to Bangladesh.

*Enacted FY17 Appropriation
Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ InterAction recommends that Congress increase the authorized ceiling for the ERMA account to $250 million and fully fund the current ceiling of $100 million.

⇒ InterAction recommends a series of reforms to improve ERMA. ERMA has been funded at a much lower level than its authorized cap in recent years, leaving it as an underutilized resource in the face of growing humanitarian needs – particularly refugee assistance.

⇒ To enhance U.S. capacity to respond quickly and effectively to unanticipated crises, the Secretary of State, rather than the President, should be given the authority to use ERMA funds to speed response to emergencies.

⇒ The current requirement of a presidential certification is cumbersome and too often results in unnecessary and costly delays in delivering critical assistance.


135.7 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance worldwide.
The MCC’s work has produced constructive, sustainable policy changes in both countries implementing compacts and in those seeking to qualify for MCC candidacy. Without robust funding, countries may be hesitant to undergo reforms in order to qualify for MCC high standards.

In December 2017, the Millennium Challenge Corporation selected Timor-Leste as a compact and The Gambia for a threshold program. The MCC will need continued robust congressional support to finalize these and other partnership agreements; if current funding trends continue, the MCC may not have the funds necessary to achieve these countries’ growth potential.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is an innovative, international assistance agency charged with reducing global poverty by enhancing economic growth.

**CHOOSE TO INVEST FY 2019**

**Millennium Challenge Corporation**

$905 million*

Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

**Justification for Funding**

- The MCC provides program-oriented partnerships with developing countries committed to the principles of good governance, economic freedom, and investment in their citizens.

- **The MCC works with the poorest countries in the world striving for positive development.** The MCC signs agreements – known as compacts – with countries competitively selected based on independent, transparent policy indicators. The development agendas are country-led and country-driven; the selected countries identify their priorities for achieving sustainable economic growth and implement their own programs.

- The MCC enables private sector investment. **For example, MCC investments in Benin, Ghana, and Jordan totaled nearly $1.1 billion.** These investments laid groundwork that helped mobilize an additional $5 billion in private investments.

**Costs of Cuts Below $905 million**

- The MCC’s work has produced constructive, sustainable policy changes in both countries implementing compacts and in those seeking to qualify for MCC candidacy. Without robust funding, countries may be hesitant to undergo reforms in order to qualify for MCC high standards.

- In December 2017, the Millennium Challenge Corporation selected Timor-Leste as a compact and The Gambia for a threshold program. The MCC will need continued robust congressional support to finalize these and other partnership agreements; if current funding trends continue, the MCC may not have the funds necessary to achieve these countries’ growth potential.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of 10% More Funding

⇒ Using rigorous data analysis as the basis for its investment decisions, the MCC is a leader in pioneering many best practices in international development, including transparency, gender integration, and country ownership. Additional funds would help to spearhead this work.

MCC Effect

The high standards required by MCC have created the MCC Effect as countries strive to meet MCC standards as a goal for their own reform and development actions.

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ The MCC partners with countries that are showing signs of positive development by providing threshold programming that helps those countries take the steps necessary to be fully eligible for a compact. Partner countries value the effects of MCC assistance and the potential for partnership provides incentive for reform. Countries work proactively to increase their levels of transparency, efficiency, and governance capability so that they may become eligible for MCC funding.

⇒ InterAction supports legislative authority for the MCC to create concurrent, multi-country compacts to further leverage U.S. and international private sector investments in regional infrastructure projects. The regional projects would provide development opportunities where, despite national divides, markets and communities are economically and socially integrated.
CHOOSE TO INVEST FY 2019

Peacekeeping Operations

$659 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

The Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) account funds multilateral UN and regional peacekeeping and security forces, as well as training programs that increase the capacity of relevant countries to participate in PKO forces.

Justification for Funding

- U.S.-funded programs that train, equip, and support the deployment of foreign security forces for international peacekeeping operations are essential to improving international security, sustaining and consolidating peace settlements, promoting institutions that preserve rule of law, and enhancing the protection of civilians in conflict areas.
- A peacekeeping operation is the single most effective way to reduce the security dilemma that pervades post-conflict settings. Without their assistance, few countries are able to break the cycle of violence and make it out of civil war.
- This account assists the U.S. government’s Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI), which has facilitated the deployment of more than 197,000 personnel from 38 countries to 29 peace operations around the world. PKO also supports the African Union mission in Somalia (AMISOM) which works to help stabilize Somalia and defeat al-Shabaab.
- PKO funds the African Peacekeeping Rapid Response Partnership (APRRP), which will build the rapid peacekeeping response capacities of six African countries, and aiding quick deployment, which is essential to stabilizing volatile regions.

Costs of Cuts Below $659 million

- Failing to properly fund PKO will make the U.S. less able to enhance the capabilities of our partner nations and expand the pool of properly trained peacekeepers, and promote international security.

*Enacted FY17 Appropriation
PKO is also a critical source of voluntary funding for the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). In recent years, Congress has also used PKO to fund assessed contributions for the UN Support Office in Somalia (UNSOS), which, due to the capacity constraints of AU forces, provides equipment and logistical support to the AMISOM.

AMISOM continues to work to stabilize Somalia and help Somali security forces push back against Al-Shabaab, a terrorist organization that has pledged fealty to Al-Qaeda and poses a serious threat to regional stability. Al-Shabaab has carried out a number of attacks targeting civilians in recent years, including a horrific truck bombing in Mogadishu last October that killed more than 500 people. It is in our national interest to counter Al-Shabaab, and shortchanging PKO would limit our ability to do that.

197,000
number of foreign military personnel deployed facilitated by PKO funding
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CHOSE TO INVEST FY 2019

International Organizations and Programs

$363 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

The International Organizations and Programs (IOP) account funds U.S. voluntary contributions to the budgets of important international organizations and specialized agencies.

Justification for Funding

⇒ Through this account, the U.S. Government supports agencies that leverage other resource to reduce poverty, promote global health, strengthen democracy and governance, promote human rights, and respond to humanitarian crises. Maintaining U.S. investment in these international organizations advances U.S. strategic, development and humanitarian goals across a broad spectrum of critical areas, and allows the U.S. to work with other countries to address problems that benefit from international coordination. Examples:

⇒ UNICEF acts as a global champion for children, and works to ensure the survival and well-being of children worldwide. **FY 2019 minimum request: $132.5 million**

⇒ OCHA (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs) coordinates international responses to humanitarian crises to better provide assistance to survivors. **FY 2019 minimum request: $2.5 million**

⇒ UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund) supports a range of programs, including voluntary family planning information and services, training and deployment of skilled birth attendants and midwives, and ending the child marriage and female genital mutilation. **FY 2019 minimum request: $37.5 million**

Costs of Cuts Below $363 million

⇒ Cutting back – or eliminating – the International Organizations and Programs account would severely impact the ability of these organizations to maintain important and lifesaving operations, and hurt their ability to partner with the United States on important global programs that serve U.S. national interests. Funding from this account cannot be replaced by any other account, and funding from this ac-

*FY18 Senate-Approved Appropriation
Impact of 17% More Funding

⇒ U.S. contributions have had an impact. UNFPA and its partners have helped reduce the annual number of maternal deaths by 44% between 1990 and 2015. In 2015, 61% of all maternal deaths took place in 35 countries that are affected by humanitarian crises or fragile conditions.

⇒ In 2016, OCHA led global advocacy for people affected by humanitarian crises, securing financial support for humanitarian action and facilitating operations in crisis situations around the world.

Impact of 17% More Funding

⇒ Increasing the IOP request by 17% from its minimum requirement, to $425.5 million, would allow the U.S. Government to provide $100 million to UNFPA. This amount would allow the United States to provide its fair share of support to UNFPA’s efforts to fill unmet needs for voluntary family planning, helping save lives of millions of women, girls and babies.

In partnership with the U.S. Government, and with strong U.S. support, UNICEF helped cut the number of under-five child deaths from 12 million a year in 1990 to 5.6 million in 2016, a 53% drop.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact: Kevin Rachlin, krachlin@interaction.org

InterAction
A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
Largely as a result of U.S. leadership, the IDA18 financing package included a specific focus on governance and institutions, continuing IDA's work on strengthening weak systems that are indispensable to deliver on all other development commitments.

Rolling back U.S. funding to The International Development Association would compromise the World Bank's ability to assist the world's poorest countries in responding to food insecurity, famine, and unprecedented numbers of refugees, as well as addressing cycles of fragility and conflict—which can have a direct impact on U.S. interests.

**Contributions to International Development Association**

$1.19 billion*

Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

The International Development Association (IDA) is known as the World Bank's “Fund for the Poorest.” One of the largest development financiers in the world’s least-developed countries, IDA supports antipoverty programs with long-term, no-interest loans.

**Justification for Funding**

- In 2016, donors committed a record $75 billion to the 18th International Development Association replenishment (IDA18).
- The International Development Association provides significant and stable funding for basic services such as health and nutrition, as well as exceptional value for donors to increase their reach and development impact.
- The International Development Association is a critical facilitator and financier of development in areas such as access to affordable and reliable energy and strengthening fragile and conflict-affected states. It leverages the efforts of other donors to help countries develop the systems and capacity they need to use donor funds effectively, such as social protection mechanisms.

**Costs of Cuts Below $1.19 billion**

- Largely as a result of U.S. leadership, the IDA18 financing package included a specific focus on governance and institutions, continuing IDA’s work on strengthening weak systems that are indispensable to deliver on all other development commitments.
- Rolling back U.S. funding to The International Development Association would compromise the World Bank’s ability to assist the world’s poorest countries in responding to food insecurity, famine, and unprecedented numbers of refugees, as well as addressing cycles of fragility and conflict—which can have a direct impact on U.S. interests.

*FY17 Enacted Appropriation
Impact of 8% More Funding

⇒ U.S. funding for IDA supports U.S. security objectives by addressing the root causes of extremism and conflict.

⇒ U.S. influence is key to ensuring IDA’s continued focus on results. Since IDA’s creation, the U.S. has been instrumental in effecting key reforms that enhance its transparency, accountability, and effectiveness, including an independent Inspection Panel that assesses compliance with World Bank policy.

Impact of 8% More Funding

⇒ This additional funding would support IDA18 to reach its expected outcomes, for example:

- 400 million people receiving essential health and nutrition services
- 45 million people receiving access to improved water sources
- 300 million children receiving better education from 9-10 million better trained teachers

⇒ This additional funding can be used not only to further leverage IDA dollars for critical, life-saving work, but also to help pay down U.S. arrears to IDA. The U.S. is behind in payments for past commitments to IDA as well as the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative (MDRI), which provides certain low-income countries with debt relief from IDA and the African Development Fund.

⇒ This additional funding is consistent with the pledge made by the U.S. to IDA18 in 2016. Following through on this commitment will strengthen U.S. leadership and credibility at the World Bank.

Between 2011 and 2017, 602 million people received access to health services as a result of IDA assistance.

CHOSE TO INVEST FY2019
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A reduced investment in IFAD will mean that 7 million or more rural producers will not benefit from services, including training in improved agricultural production practices, rural, financial, and business development services.

The lack of access to these services will result in 3 million fewer smallholder farmers with improved production and market access.

As of April 2018, the U.S. has not pledged a contribution to the eleventh replenishment of IFAD resources to support programming from 2019 – 2021. The overall program of loans and grants may be proportionately smaller as a result.
Impact of Full Funding

⇒ The demand for IFAD financing and non-lending services is growing, according to IFAD’s in-house analysis. Given the Fund’s current size, it cannot satisfy this demand.

⇒ The U.S. is the largest shareholder in IFAD, having contributed 12% of the total contributions over IFAD’s history. It played a pivotal role in the establishment of IFAD and has been a preeminent Member State throughout IFAD’s 40 years.

⇒ Around the world there is a growing need for IFAD’s targeted programs and projects. Food insecurity is on the rise, with about 815 million people suffering from hunger in 2016—38 million more than in 2015. The rise in hunger figures is the consequence of an increasing number of conflicts and climate shocks, such as droughts and floods.

Impact of Full Funding

⇒ Based on an assessment of potential demand from borrowers and IFAD’s delivery capacity, with additional funds IFAD could double the size of the three-year program of work from the current $6 billion to $12 billion.

⇒ This investment could be achieved with a 20% increase in Member State contributions and would result in a corresponding 20% increase in the number smallholders reached.

⇒ In total, IFAD has supported 1,037 programs and projects in 123 countries. These activities have empowered some 459 million people to grow more food, learn new skills, better manage their land and other natural resources, start small businesses, build strong organizations, and gain a voice in the decisions that affect their lives.

Since inception in 1974, IFAD has supported 1,037 programs and projects in 123 countries.
Climate-friendly economic development doesn’t happen on its own. Many developing countries now stand at the crossroads between high-carbon and low-carbon futures, and the GCF is designed to help countries chart a path toward sustainable societies.

The initial U.S. pledge to the GCF in 2014 leveraged billions in contributions from both developed and developing countries. Were the U.S. to stop funding the GCF altogether, it could jeopardize pledges from other countries, as well.

The GCF has had a global impact.

⇒ In Eastern Africa, $10 million was matched by others to create a $200 million equity fund to finance off-grid solar power in Rwanda and Kenya where 70% of the population lacks access to grid electricity.

⇒ In Latin America, $215 million loan guarantee was matched to create a $700 million energy efficiency green bond focused on small- to medium-sized energy firms to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions by 13 million tons annually.

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) was established in 2010 by the global community to assist developing countries to reduce carbon emissions and increase resilience to climate change.

Justification for Funding

⇒ The GCF is the world’s largest climate-specific development fund, focused on projects with “transformative” impact with significant economies of scale. Central to the GCF’s design is its “Private Sector Facility” to leverage private dollars.

⇒ The GCF has a broader base of contributors compared to other funds and a policy of funding a 50/50 split between adaptation and emissions reduction projects.

⇒ The GDF has had a global impact.

⇒ In Eastern Africa, $10 million was matched by others to create a $200 million equity fund to finance off-grid solar power in Rwanda and Kenya where 70% of the population lacks access to grid electricity.

⇒ In Latin America, $215 million loan guarantee was matched to create a $700 million energy efficiency green bond focused on small- to medium-sized energy firms to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions by 13 million tons annually.

Costs of Cuts Below $500 million

⇒ Climate-friendly economic development doesn’t happen on its own. Many developing countries now stand at the crossroads between high-carbon and low-carbon futures, and the GCF is designed to help countries chart a path toward sustainable societies.

⇒ The initial U.S. pledge to the GCF in 2014 leveraged billions in contributions from both developed and developing countries. Were the U.S. to stop funding the GCF altogether, it could jeopardize pledges from other countries, as well.

*FY17 Senate Approved Appropriation
Impact of 50% More Funding

⇒ Every dollar pledged by the U.S. to the GCF has attracted billions in additional funding by other donor nations. Additional U.S. funds will, in turn, leverage substantial new commitments. In short: where we lead, others follow.

⇒ The GCF is the preeminent global fund helping to confront the challenge of climate change.

⇒ By 2050, 50 million more people – equivalent to the population of Spain – will be at risk of going hungry because of climate change.

⇒ By 2050, there could be 25 million more malnourished children under the age of five compared to a world without climate change – that’s the equivalent of every child under the age of five in the U.S. and Canada combined.

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ Greenhouse gas emissions are continuing to rise, making the globally-agreed target of keeping atmospheric temperature below 2°C more and more difficult to achieve.

⇒ The GCF is working to develop the next generation of transformative, large-scale climate investments by working with the private sector and other donors.

⇒ The GCF’s future success will be proof-positive that the world can build low-carbon economies that protect the world’s poorest and most vulnerable.

⇒ If the U.S. turns its back on the GCF – and its historic mission – this critical work becomes all the more imperiled.

A 2017 GCF Request for Proposals shortlisted 30 projects (from 350) with the potential to leverage more than $3 million in private capital per dollar invested by the GCF.
Illegal logging in foreign countries costs the U.S. timber industry more than $1 billion annually. GEF works with the U.S. Forest Service to reduce illegal logging in places such as the Amazon and Congo Basins.

Water shortages can lead to instability and conflict. GEF safeguards water resources through participatory agreements and targeted conservation programs.

The United States imports 86% of its seafood. The GEF invests in sustainable management of imported commercial fish stocks. This maintains healthy oceans and ensures U.S. consumers can choose high-quality seafood for years to come.
Illegal wildlife trafficking creates billions of dollars annually that finance extremist groups, which threaten U.S. security interests. The GEF works with both supply and demand countries to strengthen national legislations to enhance wildlife law enforcement and improve monitoring of illegal wildlife trade.

Maintaining the U.S. government’s contribution is especially important for leveraging and expanding private investment in more sustainable development.

Every dollar America invests in the GEF generates another $40 from other countries, the private sector, and other partners.

For example, along with Mars Incorporated and Kraft Foods, the GEF has helped bring 10% of global cocoa production under certified, biodiversity-friendly production. These practices result in higher production and earnings for local farmers while protecting natural resources and enabling U.S. corporations to sell higher quality products to U.S. and global consumers.

“The GEF support has been vital in promoting cooperation amongst governments, industry and the environmental community.”

- Chris Lischewski, President and CEO, Bumble Bee Seafood
The Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) actively works to provide predictable, transparent, long-term investments that lead to increases in agricultural production, link farmers to markets, reduce risk and vulnerability, improve rural livelihoods, and provide technical assistance to governments.

**Global Agriculture & Food Security Program**

$23 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

**Justification for Funding**

- GAFSP is unique in how it delivers and channels aid, making innovative, catalytic, and integrated investments to achieve transformational change in agriculture and food security. Its programs are strategically positioned to build on existing mechanisms and target funding.

- Between 2009 and 2015, GAFSP allocated **$1.2 billion to country-led agriculture investments in 41 countries**.

- GAFSP programs are focused on combating gender inequality. **Over half of GAFSP projects support improved nutrition and one-third of project beneficiaries are women.**

- Since GAFSP’s inception in 2009, **the US has provided $613 million** to fund programming. U.S. contributions to GAFSP leverage donations from other international donors including contributions from the public sector and private sector. **Smallholder farmers are the largest private sector investors in developing country agriculture**, and targeted public investments remain critical to supporting them in reaching their productive potential.

**Costs of Cuts Below $23 million**

- Less funding for GAFSP would mean a widening financial gap in agricultural sectors of developing countries who rely on the grants, loans, and equity investments provided by GAFSP.

- In addition to agriculture, **62% of GAFSP public projects generate full-time jobs.** A loss in funding for GAFSP would lead to a decrease in job provisions and an increase in unemployment throughout developing countries.

*Enacted FY17 Appropriation
Food insecurity is on the rise, with about 815 million people suffering from hunger in 2016 - 38 million more than in 2015. The rise in hunger figures is the consequence of an increasing number of conflicts and climate shocks, such as droughts and floods. Continued funding for GAFSP allows for the continued improvement of incomes and food and nutrition security in low-income countries by boosting agricultural productivity.

Despite the global need for food security assistance programs, in 2017 the U.S. chose not to pledge additional funds to GAFSP. This was in direct contrast to past pledging efforts. In October 2012, the U.S. pledged to contribute $1 to GAFSP for every $2 from other donors. This pledge leverages donations from other donor countries, as U.S. contributions to GAFSP have successfully done in the past. In 2015, the U.S. fully funded its original pledge.

Impact of Full Funding

Maintaining a budget of $23 million dollars for GAFSP permits the organization to continue to mobilize and modernize agricultural sectors as well as bolster economies in developing countries such as Ethiopia. Ethiopia is one the least developed countries in Africa with a per capita GDP of $541 growth in agriculture, with the assistance of GAFSP is critical for the Ethiopian economy.

Approximately 75% of the world’s poor live in rural areas and most depend on agriculture for their livelihoods. In fishing villages, such as Agbonou in Togo, where the rural poor do not have access to utilities such as refrigerators, fishermen are found constantly throwing away fish they were not able to sell during the day. When GAFSP began to invest into the rural community, fishermen were now able to preserve their produce; allowing for a maximization of profits.

In Togo, GAFSP investment has reached to 60,000 farmers, 13,000 livestock raisers, 1,600 fishermen, and 500 fish traders across the country.
Very little private foreign microfinance investment goes to the countries with the greatest need – or to the most marginalized populations in them.

In sub-Saharan Africa, the region with the highest percentage of people living in extreme poverty, almost two-thirds of adults do not have an account at any formal financial institution.

Microfinance provides the world’s poorest and most marginalized people with access to financial services like credit, savings, and insurance.

Justification for Funding

⇒ Microfinance enables poor families to start businesses or meet health, education, or emergency needs, thus helping them lift themselves out of poverty. An estimated 2 billion people have no access to formal financial services.

⇒ Microfinance began as a way to finance self-employment ventures by poor people who lacked employment or income-generating opportunities, or could not obtain credit. It has since expanded to include poor households’ management of their finances through savings, credit, and insurance; these financial tools can be used for enterprise, education, housing, health care, and alleviating household shocks, such as those from macroeconomic instability or periodic droughts, and other climate-related issues.

Cost of Cuts Below $265 million

⇒ Very little private foreign microfinance investment goes to the countries with the greatest need – or to the most marginalized populations in them.

⇒ In sub-Saharan Africa, the region with the highest percentage of people living in extreme poverty, almost two-thirds of adults do not have an account at any formal financial institution.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
By implementing pro-poor microfinance services in conjunction with health, nutrition, livelihood, and other development interventions, USAID microenterprise funding plays a critical role in expanding financial opportunities for the underserved, and ensuring safety nets are in place for the most vulnerable.

Strong congressional support has demonstrated U.S. leadership in microfinance and microenterprise development, recognizing these tools as a cost-effective way to reduce poverty and promote economic growth. In FY2015, U.S. microenterprise assistance helped provide approximately 5,986,845 people with access to a microfinance loan or savings account, allowing them to engage in the global economy and help them lift themselves out of poverty.

By implementing pro-poor microfinance services in conjunction with health, nutrition, livelihood, and other development interventions, **USAID microenterprise funding plays a critical role in expanding financial opportunities** for the underserved, and ensuring safety nets are in place for the most vulnerable.

U.S. microfinance assistance should focus on improving access to these financial services for the very poor (those living on less than $1.25 a day), and the people most marginalized by the societies in which they live. **Public funding is critical** for reaching this population.

67%

The percentage of microfinance institutions partnering with USAID that achieved financial sustainability in 2015
**Global Education**

- Globally, **264 million** children and youth are out of school. Nearly **40% of the world’s children** of primary age fail to acquire even basic literacy and numeracy skills.
- The current USAID Education Strategy focuses on improving reading skills for 100 million learners, to develop **the global workforce** and **build self-reliance**.
- In conflict and crisis, USAID supports **safe learning opportunities for millions of kids**.
- Since 2011, U.S. funding has supported **151 basic education programs**, reaching over **50 million learners in 51 countries** and trained over **460,000 teachers**, annually.
- Support for the Global Partnership for Education has contributed to enrolling **64 million** more children in primary school, and a 10% increase in primary school completion rates.

**Costs of Cuts Below $800 million**

- **Progress will be less sustainable across all sectors**. Basic education is a force multiplier, readying the youth for the workforce and decreasing future dependence on aid.
- Without continued gains in girls’ secondary education, likelihood of **child marriage, early pregnancy, sex-trafficking and HIV infection** will increase.
- **Students living in conflict and crisis** regions will miss out on the stabilizing influence, peace-building and conflict prevention skills gained in school.
- If not fully addressed, the effects of the **“learning crisis”** - unemployment, poverty, inequality and instability - could undermine entire economies and societies.

*FY18 Enacted Omnibus Appropriation*
Impact of 15% More Funding

⇒ Build brain power early by increasing the number and quality of pre-primary programs.
⇒ Increase equity by investing more in girls’ secondary education.
⇒ Expand focus of current programs to include math, science, and critical thinking.
⇒ Create sustainability by extending the duration of educational programs for areas of protracted conflict and crisis situations.
⇒ Leverage additional resources from developing countries through support for the Global Partnership for Education.

A single USAID program in Kenya more than tripled the percentage of students able to reach with fluency in English from 12% to 47%.

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ 250 million children, globally, are failing to meet their early development milestones. USAID programs need to increase investments to reach children earlier.
⇒ Increasing levels of displaced children are in urgent need of the stability and hope provided by safe learning opportunities.
⇒ If current trends continue, by 2030, less than 10% of young people in low-income countries will be on track to gain secondary level skills and contribute to the global workforce.
⇒ The READ Act of 2017 prioritizes basic education in U.S. foreign assistance and signals a pivotal moment for increased coordination and effectiveness of basic education programs.

Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Kevin Rachlin, krachlin@interaction.org
Adaptation, Clean Energy, Sustainable Landscapes

$476.8 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

Adaptation, clean energy and sustainable landscape bilateral assistance programs help economically vulnerable communities gain access to secure electricity, prepare for natural disasters, and protect threatened forests and farmlands.

Justification for Funding

- **Clean energy programs support cleaner air and increase energy access** and security in developing countries. By leveraging private sector and non-governmental investment, this fulfills Congress’ vision of lifting people out of poverty through access to electricity.

- Adaptation programs reduce the impact of severe weather and natural disasters on critical infrastructure, agricultural productivity, and public health. Enhancing developing countries’ ability to better prepare for disasters saves lives – and is vastly cheaper than responding to disasters once they have occurred.

- Tropical forests continue to be one of the most threatened ecosystems in the world, but efforts funded in part by Congress are advancing conservation in these areas. **Sustainable Landscapes programs incentivize developing forested countries to curb deforestation** while addressing rural poverty and improving the way lands are managed and harvested.

Costs of Cuts Below $476.8 million

- **U.S. leadership is vital to gathering support of the rest of the world. Cuts in U.S. commitment could motivate other donor countries to follow suit.** These programs leverage huge amounts of funding from other donor countries: One of the key Sustainable Landscapes programs, the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF), saw U.S. funding leverage 39 times more funding from other donors, which would all be lost if funded below $476.79 million.

- Cutting adaptation funds also means that key U.S. allies will lose out on cutting-edge information that enables them to adapt to changing weather patterns and storm cycles.

*FY 2018 Senate -Approved Appropriation
Impact of More Funding

⇒ Clean energy funds will allow the U.S. to continue the highly-successful, bipartisan Power Africa program, which is helping provide electrification infrastructure to hundreds of thousands of people.

⇒ Sustainable Landscapes funding means that the U.S. can participate in the goals of the Tropical Forest Alliance 2020, and help achieve deforestation-free supply chains in commodities like palm oil, soy, beef, and paper and pulp.

⇒ Adaptation funding will allow the U.S. to respond to evolving threats to least-developed countries, glacier-dependent nations, small-island developing nations, and other countries most prone to weather-related disasters.

$30

The amount of money leveraged for every $1 spent by the Africa Clean Energy Facility (ACEF)

Justification for Full Funding

⇒ In many countries, these programs administered by USAID and others form the bedrock of our diplomatic relationships -- while protecting and strengthening key allies across the globe.

⇒ Continued funding of these bipartisan programs will allow them to build on existing successes, and leverage new and additional dollars from other governments and the private sector.

⇒ By 2050, 50 million more people – equivalent to the population of Spain – will be at risk of going hungry because of climate change.

⇒ By 2050, there could be 25 million more malnourished children under the age of five compared to a world without climate change – that’s the equivalent of every child under the age of five in the U.S. and Canada combined.

For more information, please contact:
Lindsey Doyle, ldoyle@interaction.org
CHOSE TO INVEST FY 2019

Biodiversity in all accounts

$269 million*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

By protecting some of the world’s most threatened natural landscapes, USAID biodiversity programs help ensure the livelihoods of millions of people who directly depend on natural resources for their survival and economic growth.

Justification for Funding

→ In 2015, USAID projects in approximately 40 countries supported governments in the operation of national parks and reserves; helped communities gain capacity and rights to manage and benefit from forests, wildlife, and fisheries; and supported strategic efforts to stop wildlife crime by protecting wildlife, stopping transit routes, and decreasing demand.

→ Conserving nature helps meet society’s growing needs by providing clean drinking water, food, storm protection, and livelihoods.

→ USAID biodiversity programs are safeguarding coral reefs, mangroves, and fisheries in the Caribbean, which are vital for livelihoods and food security in vulnerable coastal communities.

→ By addressing corruption associated with wildlife trafficking, and maintaining and restoring natural resources that supply fertile soil, clean water, food, and medicine, USAID’s biodiversity programs help reduce conflict over resource scarcity, and improve stability and economic prospects for key trading partners.

Costs of Cuts Below $269 million

→ Reduced investment from the U.S. in international conservation could result in decreased ability to meet our national and economic security objectives due to scarcity and degradation of the natural resources necessary to secure sustainable livelihoods, political stability and good governance in difficult regions of the world.

→ For example, according to a 2009 UNEP report, 40% of intrastate conflicts within the past 60 years have been strongly linked to natural resources and competition over natural resources, resulting in flows of displaced persons and national and regional instabilities.

*FY18 Omnibus Enacted Level
Impact of Full Funding

⇒ Demand for food and water is expected to double globally in the next 30 years. Demand for energy is also rising at rapid rates.

⇒ Small investments in biodiversity have a wider impact. An investment of only $300,000 in a USAID public-private collaboration to conserve forests in Colombia’s East Cauca Valley watershed secured clean water for 900,000 people.

⇒ In just one year, an investment by USAID Tanzania trained over 500 women and 350 youth on natural resource governance, leading to a Women Rights Leadership Forum in 12 villages.

⇒ With support from USAID, the proportion of illegally killed elephants declined by 53% in 4 years, from 81% in 2012 to 38% in 2015. Despite these successes illegal wildlife poaching continues to be a security threat.

⇒ U.S. investment in international conservation promote our national and economic security by supporting sustainable livelihoods, political stability and good governance in difficult regions.

Justification for Full Funding

⇒ With U.S. leadership, we will be able to protect land and water, encourage sustainable development, and create sustainable supplies of food and water. We will reduce negative environmental impacts while promoting sustainable economic growth.

⇒ We will demonstrate how green infrastructure, such as planting trees, can address growing urban challenges, including storm-water run-off and air pollution, and also protect vulnerable coastal communities from natural disasters.

$8.9 trillion

in global economic activity per year could be protected through source water conservation.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Lindsey Doyle, ldoyle@interaction.org
Democracy, Rights, and Governance

$2.3 billion*
Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

Democracy, Rights, and Governance (DRG) programming supports civil society, credible and responsive institutions, and the pursuit of freedom, dignity, economic prosperity, and security.

Justification for Funding

⇒ Democracy assistance is a cost-effective investment in U.S. foreign policy goals. Stable democracies make for better trading partners, provide new market opportunities for U.S. businesses, improve global health outcomes, and advance economic freedom and regional security. Unaccountable governments give rise to corruption and squander assistance dollars. In this interconnected world, what happens inside countries transcends borders and regions, especially when it comes to terrorism, disease, and the flow of refugees. Democracy assistance helps protect our national security and reduce the likelihood of costly U.S. military engagement.

⇒ The U.S. Government works with non-profit partners to implement DRG assistance. This programming expands space for a vibrant civil society and independent media; strengthens political and government institutions to be responsive to citizens’ needs; promotes transparency and accountability; cultivates the rule of law; fosters equitable economic growth; promotes tolerance and inclusiveness; protects human and labor rights; and supports credible elections.

Costs of Cuts Below $2.3 billion

⇒ Without U.S. support, emerging democracies may backslide into dangerous terrorist havens. Already destabilized places like Syria will sink further into chaos and undermine American security interests.

⇒ U.S. companies will struggle to gain market share and sell products where the business environment exudes pervasive corruption, weak rule of law, and other anti-competitive qualities.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
$2.3 billion
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

Justification for Full Funding

⇒ DRG assistance is a **critical investment in a more stable, prosperous world**. Like-minded governments assist each other in regional and international arenas, support each other militarily when interests align, protect citizens and trade, and respond together in times of disaster and instability.

⇒ Good governance provides stability that enhances investment climates, eases the movements of goods and ideas, promotes economic opportunities, and enriches the wellbeing of citizens. In the long-term, **countries that strengthen democracy experience more positive economic reforms**, a reduction in social conflict, an increase in private investment, and more opportunities for women, youth, persons with disabilities, and other marginalized groups. At a time when export opportunities represent such critical growth potential for the U.S. economy and domestic job creation, it is essential for the U.S. to be working to create and strengthen competitive markets throughout the world for American businesses and their products.

⇒ Political landscapes are often fluid and require long-term strategies for sustainable solutions. Continued commitment is necessary to build upon initial investment. **DRG promotes American values and supports efforts to achieve economic and political self-determination**, and realize individual rights.

⇒ **An overwhelming number of Americans feel that the U.S. should participate in efforts to maintain peace, protect human rights, and promote economic development.** A small financial investment in DRG yields invaluable returns in the form of a more stable and prosperous world.

73 years

In 2017, Liberia held elections that paved the way for the first peaceful transfer of power in 73 years. U.S. support provided support for civic engagement, election infrastructure, and the neutral observation of polling stations.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Brian Wanko, bwanko@interaction.org

InterAction
A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
Proposed reductions in funding for Feed the Future has already had an impact and limited the number of countries that receive comprehensive program investments. The number of Feed the Future target countries was reduced from 19 to 12 in 2017.

Hunger and malnutrition prevent millions of people in developing countries from living healthy, productive lives and stunt the mental and physical development of future generations.

Since 2011, Feed the Future programs have achieved impressive progress in combating food insecurity and poverty in the targeted program areas of the original 19 focus countries.

- There has been a 19% drop in poverty and a 26% reduction of stunting.
- 9 million more people are living above the poverty line, 1.7 million more households are not suffering from hunger, and 1.8 million more children are free from stunting.

Feed the Future catalyzes local country ownership of agriculture production. In Africa, Feed the Future partner governments have outpaced their neighbors’ domestic investments in agriculture and increased their investments by an average of 35%.

Feed the Future leverages partnerships with the private sector, U.S. research universities and American farmers to advance science, technology, and innovation to deliver cost-effective and results oriented development solutions.

Costs of Cuts Below $1 billion

- Proposed reductions in funding for Feed the Future has already had an impact and limited the number of countries that receive comprehensive program investments. The number of Feed the Future target countries was reduced from 19 to 12 in 2017.
- Hunger and malnutrition prevent millions of people in developing countries from living healthy, productive lives and stunt the mental and physical development of future generations.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of Full Funding

⇒ With full funding at the authorized level of $1 billion, *Feed the Future would be able to fully invest in existing target programs and expand the impact of the work.*

⇒ With full funding, in the upcoming second phase of Feed the Future (2017-2021), the interagency will focus on:

⇒ Targeted investments in **12 target countries**.

⇒ Elevating the **importance of nutrition programs**, especially in the key first 1,000 days between a woman’s pregnancy and her child’s second birthday.

⇒ Better **integrating water, sanitation, and hygiene** needs into programs.

⇒ Increases focus on **strengthening resilience among people and systems**.

⇒ Better connecting *Feed the Future programs throughout the entire agriculture and food system*.

Since 2011, *Feed the Future farmers have achieved higher product yields and earned $2.6 billion in new agricultural sales.*
Many countries important to the US strategic interests will face higher risk of instability and state failure because of water issues, experience exacerbated regional tensions, and will be distracted from working with the US on critical policy objectives in security and economic growth.

Globally, women and girls already spend as much as 200 million hours every day collecting water. And in Asia and Africa, women walk an average of 3.7 miles per day to collect water. This time spent away from school and earning an income could very well increase if the U.S. reduces funding.

Without funding WASH services, healthcare workers and communities are at risk for outbreaks of Ebola and many other infectious diseases.
$660 million
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ Investments in water and sanitation sector services, governance, and capacity building would accelerate the rate of transition of developing countries from donor dependence.

⇒ As of 2015, funding for Water in All Accounts has provided more than 7.6 million people with improved access to drinking water supply, more than 4.3 million people with improved sanitation, and more than 3.1 million people with the benefits of improved agricultural water management.

⇒ This investment, in turn, enhances U.S. national security by preventing pandemic disease, conflict over water resources, and regional instability. Support for WASH and addressing related governance issues, opens new markets for U.S. exports, aligns market access, and promotes U.S. job creation.

Impact of 60% More Funding

⇒ In order to achieve the intermediate-term goal of $660 million in annual water appropriations by FY2021, increases of approximately 20%, or $86.7 million, each year is needed. With this funding, USAID would be able to reach an estimated 867,000 additional people with safe drinking water and sanitation.

⇒ According to World Bank economists, capital investments in safe water and sanitation will need to be tripled to a global total of $114 billion per year to reach universal access by 2030. This requires increased domestic resource mobilization by developing countries, public-private partnerships in both the developing countries and the developed nations, and assertive leadership from the United States.

$222.9 billion
Total cost to the global economy due to lack of access to sanitation in 2015, up from $182.5 billion – an increase in cost of 22% from 2010.

For more information, please contact:
Soshana Hashmie, shashmie@interaction.org

A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
CHOICE TO INVEST FY 2019

Gender Equality in all accounts

$1.3 billion*

Minimum Requirement for American Leadership

Decades of research and experience show that investing in the empowerment of women and girls is critical to reducing global poverty and increasing peace and security at home and abroad.

Justification for Funding

⇒ Women and girls are disproportionately affected by the world’s greatest development and humanitarian challenges. They are more likely to live in poverty, die in a natural disaster, experience gender-based violence in conflict and emergency settings, be forced into child marriage, trafficked for labor and sexual exploitation, and be denied educational and economic opportunities.

⇒ A peace agreement is 35% more likely to last at least 15 years if women are involved in its creation, according to a study of 40 peace processes in 35 countries over the course of three decades.

⇒ Women with more economic opportunities and freedom from gender-based violence contribute more to their families, communities, and national economies. It has been shown that women invest extra income in their children, providing a route to sustained development.

⇒ More accessible educational opportunities for girls means that they are more likely to avoid child marriage. As a result, they will likely have healthier babies, avoid sexually transmitted infections and domestic violence, and seek out income-generating livelihoods to benefit themselves and their communities.

Costs of Cuts Below $1.3 billion

⇒ The costs of cutting gender funding are stark. Cuts in international development assistance for gender equality would hamstring women entrepreneurs and small shareholder farmer who are involved in village savings and loans associations, employment initiatives, and networking for greater market access.

⇒ Cuts would shrink girls’ access to quality education and continued enrollment into secondary education. Fewer adolescent girls and their social networks would learn about the consequences of HIV transmissions, child marriage, gender norms, and early pregnancy. Efforts to prevent and respond to gender-based violence would be stymied, and life-saving assistance to women and girls in conflict and emergencies would be significantly diminished.

*Enacted FY17 Appropriation
Impact of 46% More Funding

⇒ In Niger, preliminary estimates indicate that eliminating child marriage could, between years 2014 to 2030, lead to benefits valued at more than $25 billion.

⇒ Making agricultural resources and services equally available to women as they are to men could reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 100-150 million.

⇒ A survey of 14 countries reveals that closing the inactivity gap between girls and boys would yield an increase in GDP of up to 5.4%. When accounting for students, wage gaps, and labor demand elasticities, shrinking the joblessness gap between men and women yields a 1.2% GDP increase in a single year.

⇒ In 2015, the McKinsey Global Institute found that if “women participate in the economy identically to men…it would add up to $28 trillion, or 26%, to the annual GDP in 2025 compared with a ‘business-as-usual’ scenario.”

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ The U.S. has become a key player in global efforts to promote gender equality, decrease gender-based violence and child marriage, end maternal mortality and promote women’s participation. Increasing American investments in women and girls are critical to ensuring U.S. global leadership, economic growth around the world, peaceful transitions of power, countering violent extremism, and more.

⇒ The U.S. government’s work with women and girls has proven to have a multiplier effect that magnify the initial investment. Robust funding for gender programming that is strategic, coordinated, and easy to track, monitor, and evaluate, will improve the effectiveness of U.S. assistance and elevate our leadership.

Impact of 46% More Funding

⇒ In Niger, preliminary estimates indicate that eliminating child marriage could, between years 2014 to 2030, lead to benefits valued at more than $25 billion.

⇒ Making agricultural resources and services equally available to women as they are to men could reduce the number of hungry people in the world by 100-150 million.

⇒ A survey of 14 countries reveals that closing the inactivity gap between girls and boys would yield an increase in GDP of up to 5.4%. When accounting for students, wage gaps, and labor demand elasticities, shrinking the joblessness gap between men and women yields a 1.2% GDP increase in a single year.

⇒ In 2015, the McKinsey Global Institute found that if “women participate in the economy identically to men…it would add up to $28 trillion, or 26%, to the annual GDP in 2025 compared with a ‘business-as-usual’ scenario.”

$1.9 billion
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

$8 trillion
Is the estimated global economic impact of gender-based violence

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Tom Buttry, tbuttry@interaction.org

InterAction
A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
AGRICULTURE Appropriations
The Title II Food for Peace program provides emergency food assistance, primarily through in-kind food distribution, to communities impacted by conflict and by natural disasters like droughts and floods. The program also supports multi-year, multi-sectoral development programming that targets the most vulnerable communities and address root causes of hunger.

**Justification for Funding**

- Food for Peace provides emergency in-kind food donations to countries in need, as well as cash and vouchers where this type of aid is most effective. For example, in FY2017, over 810,000 metric tons of food was provided to the four countries that were on the brink of famine - Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen.

- Food for Peace Development Food Security Activities are a central component of the Global Food Security Strategy’s efforts to address extreme poverty, and have helped poor communities restore degraded landscapes which recharge local aquifers, and improve soil quality through new farming practices. They are also the second-largest source of global maternal and child nutrition investments from the U.S. government, and focus on supporting vulnerable communities and households improve livelihoods and develop markets.

**Costs of Cuts Below $1.7 billion**

- Cuts in Food for Peace resources would reduce stability in regions that rely on food aid support, including the Middle East, the Sahel and the Horn of Africa, all of which could impact United States interests in these regions.

- In 2018, 13 countries are expected to have more than one million people in crisis and in need of emergency assistance. Food provided through Food for Peace directly address these needs and keeps many regions from slipping deeper into food insecurity or crisis.

- For countries most at risk of famine, including Nigeria, South Sudan, Somalia, and Yemen, the food provided through Food for Peace plays a critical role in abating a recurrence of this kind of tragedy. When the last major wide scale famine hit Somalia in 2011, and resulted in 285,000 people dying, mainly women and children.

*Enacted FY18 Omnibus Appropriation
Impact of 19% More in Funding

⇒ Additional funding in FY17 was instrumental in responding to increased needs in four countries threatened by famine, and other surrounding countries; these needs have only increased since then and this additional funding will be used to maintain U.S. response in these countries. With even more communities in need, additional resources are needed in 2018.

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ The Famine Early Warning System forecast has estimated that in 2018, 76 million people will need emergency food assistance in 45 countries around the world. They also noted that Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen are again under threat of famine in the absence of assistance.

⇒ In FY17, Congress passed a supplemental funding bill amounting to nearly $1 billion, $300 million of which was used to increase Food for Peace resources to a total of $1.9 billion.

⇒ Past administration proposals that allow greater flexibility to use both cash and commodity assistance would allow the U.S. to reach an additional 2-4 million people at no additional cost to taxpayers.

Impact of 19% More in Funding

⇒ Additional funding in FY17 was instrumental in responding to increased needs in four countries threatened by famine, and other surrounding countries; these needs have only increased since then and this additional funding will be used to maintain U.S. response in these countries. With even more communities in need, additional resources are needed in 2018.

1.7 million metric tons of food provided by Food for Peace to 41 million people in 38 countries

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact: Sara Nitz, snitz@interaction.org

InterAction
A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
The McGovern-Dole Food for Education program facilitates the purchase by the U.S. government of U.S. agricultural commodities that are donated to food insecure countries to establish school feeding programs. These school feeding programs incentivize school attendance with nutritious meals, improving literacy and educational outcomes with what is often the only daily nutritious meal that children receive.

**Justification for Funding**

- The McGovern-Dole program gives school-age children in poverty-stricken countries with what is often their only full meal of the day, and helps protect vulnerable children and their families, especially during societal shocks.
- Since 2003, McGovern-Dole has provided school meals to **over 40 million children** in **40 of the world’s poorest countries**, several of which are in near-famine conditions.
- McGovern-Dole is a small and narrowly targeted program. At just over $200 million annually, McGovern-Dole represents a small fraction of overall global investment in school feeding programs by donor and host country governments, U.S. resources remain critical for low-income countries to continue school feeding programs.

**Costs of Cuts Below $207.6 million**

- Without a reliable source of daily nutrition that McGovern-Dole can provide, young children are vulnerable both to physical stunting and reduced cognitive development. Hungry kids are less able to learn in school and could become less productive workers. Occupational opportunities often go unrealized because of a lack of qualified employees.
- Without food provided through McGovern-Dole, children are more vulnerable to recruitment by terror groups like Al Shabab in Somalia or Boko Haram in Nigeria, who promise access to food.
- Cuts to McGovern-Dole mean sacrificing opportunities to instill a positive view of the American government and its people among the next generations of U.S. allies.
$207.6 million
Opportunity to Catalyze American Leadership

Justification for Full Funding

⇒ Food insecurity is on the rise, with about 815 million people suffering from hunger in 2016 - 38 million more than in 2015. The rise in hunger figures is the consequence of an increasing number of conflicts and climate shocks, such as droughts and floods.

⇒ The United Nations World Food Program calculates that $3.2 billion is needed per year to reach all 66 million primary school-age children that go to school hungry every day.

⇒ Most McGovern-Dole programs are implemented over a multiyear period (3 to 5 years per grant award) that allows better planning for eventual handover to national government ownership.

Impact of Full Funding

⇒ McGovern-Dole programs help to overcome gender inequity in school attendance. Providing meals at schools improves attendance rates, particularly among girls who would likely otherwise be kept at home to perform domestic labor.

⇒ A February 2016 USDA evaluation found that McGovern-Dole increased school enrollment in the Somali state of Ethiopia from 64% to 100%, and in Afar state from 35% to 60%.

⇒ The same evaluation found demonstrated impact in decreased gender disparities in school attendance. 95 girls enrolled for every 100 boys in schools with McGovern-Dole programs, compared to nine girls for every 100 boys in schools that did not have McGovern-Dole programs.

⇒ An October 2015 report on the McGovern-Dole program in Kenya found that students received roughly a third of their daily calories from school meals provided through the program.

3 million children
Number of children that the McGovern-Dole funding fed in in 2015

For more information, please contact:
Sara Nitz, snitz@interaction.org

InterAction
A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
Continuing to not fully fund USDA LRP limits the flexibility of implementing organizations to choose what form of assistance is the most effective particularly during humanitarian crises.

In the event of natural disasters or political conflict, it is imperative that humanitarian assistance arrive quickly to save lives and mitigate other related complexities like migration and displacement.

The Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) at the authorized level of $80 million provides more effective and flexible programming, primarily for developmental (non-emergency) food assistance activities that lift families out of cycles of poverty.

**Justification for Funding**

- USDA LRP practices enable both emergency and non-emergency assistance to be delivered more quickly, at considerable savings, with the ultimate benefit of reaching larger numbers of vulnerable people compared with traditional U.S. food aid shipments.

- USDA LRP programs serve as flexible tools to address the diversity of food insecurity conditions and contexts across the world and U.S.-funded development and humanitarian assistance programs must respond with a range of tools, modalities, and interventions. Resulting in:
  - Expedited food assistance, particularly during food crises and disasters.
  - By purchasing food locally, significant scales of economies can also be realized without the burden of shipping costs, therefore reaching more people in a more cost-effective manner.

- A USDA study of the LRP pilot project shows that food aid purchased locally or regionally arrived, on average, **74 days faster than U.S.-sourced commodities**.

**Costs of Cuts Below $15 million**

- Continuing to not fully fund USDA LRP limits the flexibility of implementing organizations to choose what form of assistance is the most effective particularly during humanitarian crises.

- In the event of natural disasters or political conflict, it is imperative that humanitarian assistance arrive quickly to save lives and mitigate other related complexities like migration and displacement.

*FY18 Senate Committee-Approved Appropriation
Impact of Additional Funding

⇒ Since passage of the 2014 Farm Bill, Congress has appropriated significantly less than the authorized level of $80 million for the Local and Regional Procurement (LRP) Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

⇒ The 2014 farm bill conference report’s statement of managers affirms that the intent of LRP programming is to complement existing food aid programs – especially the McGovern-Dole Food for Education program – and to fill in nutritional gaps for targeted populations, or food availability gaps generated by unexpected emergencies.

⇒ In order to most effectively carry out LRP activities, USDA should collaborate with USAID, per legislative guidance, as the agencies consider program design and the best ways to use this tool.

⇒ LRP also generates important developmental impacts by spurring local economic activity and helping form and strengthen sustainable local markets. For example, a local purchase program in Ethiopia that purchases food from smallholder farmers to use in school feeding programs generated over $16 million for farmers while at the same time keeping children full and focused during class.

A USDA LRP Pilot Program found that buying grains in or near the country where the U.S. donates food aid saved 53% relative to purchasing grains in the U.S. and 25% in the case of legumes and pulses.

CHOOSE TO INVEST FY2019
For more information, please contact: Sara Nitz, snitz@interaction.org
Proposals to end ILAB’s programming would end all U.S. programming to reduce international child labor and would directly impact roughly 150,000 children annually who benefit from ILAB.

The economic costs of child labor amount to 2.4% to 6.6% of the world’s gross national income annually. Child labor reduces future human capital by reducing educational attainment and the ability to secure stable jobs later in life.

ILAB’s work in ensuring U.S. trading partners are effectively implementing labor standards not only assures better conditions, but also gives American workers an opportunity to effectively compete in global markets and helps ensure that products made with forced labor or child labor are not sold to American consumers.

According to the International Labor Organization, 152 million children are engaged in child labor, 73 million work in hazardous conditions, and 24.9 million people are subject to forced labor.

As the sole U.S. agency for combatting exploitative child labor, ILAB has contributed to the global effort that has seen a reduction of 94 million children in child labor since 2000. Since 1995, ILAB projects have withdrawn and provided education to close to 2 million children and supported nearly 170,000 families to meet basic needs without relying upon child labor.

ILAB’s work to monitor and enforce the labor provisions of trade agreements and preference programs helps ensure fair competition and a level playing field for U.S. workers and businesses.

The Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) has worked with partners to provide direct services to nearly two million vulnerable children. ILAB’s efforts have helped reduce exploitative labor, combat forced labor, and provide technical assistance to address worker rights in countries which the U.S. has trade agreements or preference programs.
Impact of 6% More Funding

By restoring historic funding levels, InterAction members estimate Congress can help assure ILAB will reach 10,000 to 15,000 additional children annually in its programming.

Additional funding could also help ensure greater capacity for ILAB to guarantee U.S. trading partners are effectively implementing labor standards, leveling the playing field for American workers in global markets.

$86.13 million represents the historic low-water mark for ILAB funding since the beginning of its programmatic funding.

152 million children are estimated to be engaged in child labor worldwide.

For more information, please contact:
Tom Buttry, tbuttry@interaction.org
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A UNITED VOICE FOR GLOBAL CHANGE
Cut CDC’s technical support to as many as 25 PEPFAR countries that is required to sustain quality care and treatment for more than 3,500,000 existing patients and dramatically reduce the number of new patients receiving HIV treatment, leading to increased risk of global HIV infection.

Create significant setbacks in important progress achieved in towards eradication of polio virus in 2015-2017, at a global cost of $1 billion annually.

Lead to a complete withdrawal of CDC’s global TB expertise in India, Vietnam, and Kenya

Halt training of “disease detectives” in 15 priority countries, which will result in outbreaks that last longer, spread further, and affect more people.

Nonrenewal of funds to implement the Global Health Security Agency will result in CDC reducing disease detection, prevention and response efforts from 39 countries of operation to 10 priority countries—a seventy four percent cut.

* FY18 Senate-Approved Appropriation, of which $535.10 million Center for Global Health and $584.92 million for Zoonotic Infectious Diseases
Impact of 20% More Funding

⇒ CDC’s work is critical for preventing deadly, destabilizing epidemics abroad and for protecting American and global health.
⇒ CDC helps lead the Global Health Security Agenda which builds capacity in 30 low- and middle-income countries to detect, prevent, and respond to global disease outbreaks and other health risks.
⇒ CDC’s global health security investments have helped reduce disease outbreak response time in Cameroon from 8 weeks to just 24 hours.
⇒ CDC’s Field Epidemiology Training Program has trained more than 31,000 epidemiologists in 72 countries on how to detect and respond to infectious disease outbreaks, greatly contributing to Nigeria’s ability to contain the 2014 Ebola outbreak.

Justification for Additional Funding

⇒ More funding will grow global health protection and disease detection efforts, and prevent the roll back of CDC prevention, detection, and response efforts in 40 priority counties currently funded through emergency Ebola appropriations in support of the Global Health Security Agenda.
⇒ It would also grow CDC’s partnership in implementing PEPFAR and PMI, which is critical to expand the number of patients on HIV/AIDS treatment, grow the reach of currently available malaria interventions, and increase evaluation and research and development to ensure interventions are effective and efficient.
⇒ Additional funding would strengthen CDC’s global tuberculosis program. Tuberculosis is the world’s leading infectious disease killer, and currently CDC has no formal funding stream to support this critically important global disease work.
⇒ Strengthen research to enhance identification of, response to, and prevention of diseases like rabies, bubonic plague, Ebola, Zika, and other pathogens that can spread between animals and humans.

CDC works 24/7 to protect Americans and save lives around the world by detecting and controlling outbreaks at their source

Choose to invest FY2019
For more information, please contact:
Soshana Hashmie, shashmie@interaction.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT</th>
<th>FY 17 Enacted (Base)</th>
<th>FY 18 House (Base)</th>
<th>FY 18 Senate (Base)</th>
<th>FY 18 Senate Total</th>
<th>Senate FY18 vs. Total (OCO)</th>
<th>Senate FY18 vs. Total (Base + OCO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II--USAID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>1,361,689</td>
<td>1,133,906</td>
<td>136,555</td>
<td>1,270,461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Programs - USAID</td>
<td>3,054,950</td>
<td>2,651,000</td>
<td>2,651,000</td>
<td>2,920,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglected Tropical Diseases</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS (USAID)</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPFAR</td>
<td>4,320,000</td>
<td>4,320,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB &amp; Malaria</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Disaster Assistance</td>
<td>4,427,786</td>
<td>1,033,483</td>
<td>1,788,203</td>
<td>2,821,686</td>
<td>(142,474)</td>
<td>1,463,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund</td>
<td>4,681,558</td>
<td>1,041,761</td>
<td>2,353,672</td>
<td>3,395,433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and Refugee Assistance</td>
<td>3,359,000</td>
<td>877,802</td>
<td>2,231,198</td>
<td>3,109,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
<td>905,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Operations</td>
<td>659,014</td>
<td>135,041</td>
<td>325,213</td>
<td>460,254</td>
<td>(121,089)</td>
<td>77,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund</td>
<td>4,681,558</td>
<td>1,041,761</td>
<td>2,353,672</td>
<td>3,395,433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and Refugee Assistance</td>
<td>3,359,000</td>
<td>877,802</td>
<td>2,231,198</td>
<td>3,109,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Challenge Corporation</td>
<td>905,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Operations</td>
<td>659,014</td>
<td>135,041</td>
<td>325,213</td>
<td>460,254</td>
<td>(121,089)</td>
<td>77,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V--Multilateral Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Agriculture &amp; Food Security Program</td>
<td>136,563</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environment Facility (GEF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor--HHS Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC Global Health</td>
<td>1,020,043</td>
<td>935,943</td>
<td>935,943</td>
<td>966,543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern-Dole International Food For Education</td>
<td>201,626</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Local &amp; Regional Procurement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor--HHS Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in thousands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>FY 19 President's Budget Request</th>
<th>FY 17 Enacted</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>FY 18 House (Base)</th>
<th>FY 18 House (OCO)</th>
<th>FY 18 House Total (Base + OCO)</th>
<th>FY 18 Senate (Base)</th>
<th>FY 18 Senate (OCO)</th>
<th>FY 18 Senate Total (Base + OCO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Key Poverty Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-American Foundation</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>odel</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Key Transition Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Initiatives</td>
<td>122,834</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>152,834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Key USAID Operating Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Capital Investment Fund</td>
<td>199,985</td>
<td>174,985</td>
<td>374,985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID IG Operating Expenses</td>
<td>70,100</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>139,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Key Development-Enabling Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to International Organizations</td>
<td>1,359,206</td>
<td>1,074,645</td>
<td>2,433,851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Corps</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>398,221</td>
<td>808,221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Credit Authority - Prog Acct (by transfer)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIC (Credit Subsidy only)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Technical Assistance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>25,455</td>
<td>55,455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Choose to Invest - Related Interaction Accounts**
InterAction is a U.S. alliance of nongovernmental international organizations, with members working in every developing country. Our members work with local communities to overcome poverty and suffering by helping to improve their quality of life.

For more information, contact InterAction’s Policy team:

Kevin Rachlin (krachlin@interaction.org)
Soshana Hashmie (shashmie@interaction.org)