

FY 2020 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 9, 2019

Serial No. 116-25

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



Available: <http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/>, <http://docs.house.gov/>,
or <http://www.govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

35-893PDF

WASHINGTON : 2019

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York, *Chairman*

BRAD SHERMAN, California	MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Texas, <i>Ranking Member</i>
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York	
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey	CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia	STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
KAREN BASS, California	SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts	TED S. YOHO, Florida
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island	ADAM KINZINGER, Illinois
AMI BERA, California	LEE ZELDIN, New York
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas	JIM SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
DINA TITUS, Nevada	ANN WAGNER, Missouri
ADRIANO ESPAILLAT, New York	BRIAN MAST, Florida
TED LIEU, California	FRANCIS ROONEY, Florida
SUSAN WILD, Pennsylvania	BRIAN FITZPATRICK, Pennsylvania
DEAN PHILLIPS, Minnesota	JOHN CURTIS, Utah
ILHAN OMAR, Minnesota	KEN BUCK, Colorado
COLIN ALLRED, Texas	RON WRIGHT, Texas
ANDY LEVIN, Michigan	GUY RESCHENTHALER, Pennsylvania
ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, Virginia	TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee
CHRISSY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania	GREG PENCE, Indiana
TOM MALINOWSKI, New Jersey	STEVE WATKINS, Kansas
DAVID TRONE, Maryland	MIKE GUEST, Mississippi
JIM COSTA, California	
JUAN VARGAS, California	
VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas	

JASON STEINBAUM, *Staff Director*

BRENDAN SHIELDS, *Republican Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESS	
Green, The Honorable Mark, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development	8
APPENDIX	
Hearing Notice	61
Hearing Minutes	62
Hearing Attendance	63
STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED FROM A COMMITTEE MEMBER	
Statement submitted for the record from Representative Connolly	64
RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD	
Responses to questions submitted from Chairman Engel	66
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Smith	76
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Sherman	78
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Sires	80
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Titus	82
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Lieu	84
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Houlahan	87
Responses to questions submitted from Representative Malinowski	89

FY 2020 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

**Tuesday, April 9, 2019
House of Representatives,
Committee on Foreign Affairs,**

Washington, DC

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:41 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Eliot Engel (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ENGEL [presiding]. The committee will come to order.

Without objection, all members will have 5 days to submit statements, extraneous material, and questions for the record, subject to the length limitation in the rules.

Welcome, everyone, this morning.

We convene this morning to get answers about the Trump Administration's Fiscal Year 2020 foreign assistance budget request. We will hear testimony from Mark Green, one of our former Members who has moved on to bigger and better things, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and a former Member of this body and this committee.

So, welcome back, Administrator. Thank you for your service.

Welcome to the public and members of the press as well.

I am a firm believer in development as a way to advance American interests and security that is rooted firmly in our values. Foreign assistance shows our country's generosity and compassion. It is a concrete demonstration of our commitment to human rights, to the dignity of all people.

And to fully appreciate these efforts, you need to see them up close. A couple of weeks ago, Ranking Member McCaul and I, along with Mr. Espaillat and Mr. Curtis, and some members of the Judiciary Committee, visited El Salvador. USAID's work there was inspiring. It was helping to foster skills and provide opportunities for desperate families—families who without this bit of help might have no option but to flee the poverty and violence in their communities, who might decide it was a better bet to make the dangerous journey from El Salvador to our own southern border.

But the work we are doing there, at a cost of pennies to the taxpayer, is giving these people a shot at a prosperous, safe life in their own countries. And while we were there, we found out the President decided to cut funding for all these initiatives. That is just one anecdote.

This budget I am holding up, is an entire policy based on the same kind of thinking. It would seek to slash our investment in development by 32 percent. So, it is cutting off your nose to spite your face. It is just silly.

If this budget were put into effect, it would not just be Salvadorans pushed aside by the heartless and harmful approach to foreign policy. It would be victims of flooding in Mozambique; Syrians and Iraqis seeking to protect their communities from the next generation of al-Qaeda or ISIS; citizens of young, unstable democracies where Russia is trying to meddle and interfere, and tuberculosis and malaria and AIDS patients all around the world.

Core humanitarian accounts and democracy and governance programs slashed by 40 percent. Maternal and child health programs cut by a quarter. Food security, nutrition assistance, basic education, all chopped by roughly half. Food for Peace zeroed out completely. What an ugly picture this budget paints of America. And what a signal of withdrawal and disengagement it sends, and you can bet that China, Russia, and Iran are listening.

Mr. Administrator, we should have spared the trees that it took to print these budgets because Congress will not allow the gutting of American development efforts. It was tried in the past 2 years. We fought back on a bipartisan basis, and we are going to do it again.

There are simply too many challenges around the world that demand American leadership. From the flight of more than a million and half Venezuelans to Colombia. And Mr. McCaul and I were on that border last week, the Venezuela-Colombia border, and it was heartbreaking to see so many people getting food—a very little bit of food and just basically starving, and just having no hope for the future. It was just heart-wrenching.

So, we take the flight of more than a million and a half Venezuelans to Colombia and throughout the Americas, to the Rohingya crisis in Burma and Bangladesh, to the remarkable growth of democracy in Ethiopia. There are too many opportunities to build bridges of friendship and understanding. There are too many people struggling and suffering for us to just turn our backs and say, “Figure it out on your own.”

Of course, not everything depends on budget numbers. Dangerous policies like the global gag rule are doing real harm. This approach to women’s health is causing clinics to close, blocking access to HIV tests, and denying women and girls basic health care from doctors and nurses they trust. It amounts to politicians in Washington punishing poor women around the world to score points for our domestic political agenda. It should be reversed.

Mark, I know from your time in the House on this committee, your service as ambassador, and your time at the helm of USAID that you sincerely care about American development efforts. When I heard that you were appointed, I was delighted, and nothing you have done has made me change my mind. But I do not envy your having to defend this budget request.

I know our members are eager for a frank discussion of these matters, and I am grateful that you are with us this morning. So, again, I want to thank you.

Before we hear from you, I will yield to our ranking member, Mr. Mike McCaul of Texas, for any opening remarks he might have.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ambassador Green, for coming here today. It is always good to see a former colleague come back home to the Con-

gress. You have been very engaged with us, and I appreciate our discussions we have had on America's engagement in the developing world.

In particular, for me, a cause I have been fighting for a decade is childhood cancer. It is a priority for me. I look forward to working with you on this challenge in the coming months, and look forward to our trip to Africa as well, and global health issues.

Two weeks ago, as the chairman mentioned, we saw really first-hand USAID's critical work in Colombia. Your agency is working around the clock to help provide lifesaving food and health supplies to those affected by this Maduro crisis. And it was heart-wrenching, as the chairman said, to see these little children and mothers coming across, I think 50,000 per day crossing from Venezuela into Colombia. It is not sustainable, and we will discuss that, I guess, later.

But, in El Salvador, we also saw USAID helping, as you and I talked about, address the drivers of migration and gang violence, particularly at-risk youth and finding employment and ways out of poverty and ways out of MS-13.

So, I am concerned about the decision I read to cut assistance to the Northern Triangle countries. I see it as a prevention side of this. And I understand the President's frustration with the crisis on the southern border. I share that frustration, but I believe this decision, from a policy standpoint, if you really analyze it, could actually make things and the situation worse, not better.

We are going to have an important hearing on this tomorrow. And I want to thank the chairman for scheduling that, to look at the possible effects of this decision.

Like always, though, if there are programs that are not performing, I will be the first to propose reform, cuts, or streamlining. And I agree these countries must demonstrate they are doing their part to address the root causes of the growing migration crisis.

I look forward to working with the chairman on these specific authorizations for the Central American Regional Security Initiative and bilateral aid for the Northern Triangle. We are going to pay particular attention to the anti-gang/anti-drug-trafficking and rule of laws program. USAID and INL, the law enforcement piece of this is critical to protecting the United States.

Taking a wider view on U.S. foreign assistance, Congress plays a vital role to ensure that all these dollars are used effectively, efficiently, and are achieving U.S. strategic objectives. I welcome reforms that are proposed in the administration's budget. In addition, I strongly support your work to better engage the private sector and business community, and to focus on the country's journey to self-reliance.

However, certain cuts can have unintended consequences that cost us more in the medium and long term. This includes deep cuts to our development and humanitarian assistance programs. I believe that we must maintain U.S. leadership and continue supporting programs that spur economic growth, improve health outcomes, promote democracy, and support countries' own ability to provide for their citizens.

I applaud the administration for their focus on Indo-Pacific, for providing robust assistance for Venezuela, and continuing the fund-

ing to counter Russia's influence in Europe. We must continue U.S. leadership on issues such as HIV/AIDS, PEPFAR prevention, food security, and human rights. These efforts are critical, but we need to take the long-term approach about our assistance. We must focus our efforts on prevention, stabilization to get to the root causes of extreme poverty. Unless we better address the underlying causes, we will continue to see radicalization and extremism in vulnerable communities.

And that is why Chairman Engel and I introduced the Bipartisan Global Fragility Act that we are going to mark up later this afternoon, to improve the way the U.S. approaches the fragile States and stabilization efforts. So, I am glad that we are going to mark up that bill later this afternoon.

Sir, I applaud your service to our country, both as Ambassador and now Administrator. I look forward to your testimony.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. McCaul.

Our witness this morning is the Honorable Mark Green, 18th Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, a post he assumed in August 2017. He served as the United States Ambassador to Tanzania from 2007 to 2009, and from 1999 to 2007, served as United States Representative for Wisconsin's 8th District, and a member of this committee for six of those years, also a personal favorite of mine. He also served as Director of Malaria No More, Senior Director of the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition, and President and CEO of the Initiative for Global Development.

Administrator Green, welcome once again. I now recognize you for 5 minutes to summarize your testimony.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARK GREEN, ADMINISTRATOR, UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. GREEN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Ranking Member McCaul, members of the committee. I appreciate this opportunity to summarize my written testimony.

In total, the Fiscal Year 2020 request for USAID fully and partially managed accounts is approximately \$19.2 billion. It represents \$2.4 billion, or 14 percent, more than requested last year. I think the message of this request is straightforward. As has been eluded to, we attempt to balance fiscal responsibility here at home with our leadership role in national security imperatives on the world stage.

In order to capture some of the important work we are doing, I would like to begin by touching upon my most recent travels. I have just returned from Egypt, Jordan, and Senegal.

In Egypt, I had the chance to meet with young entrepreneurs taking part in a USAID-supported agricultural strengthening program. We discussed ways to improve emerging technologies that will strengthen yields and improve import opportunities. I met with civil society leaders to discuss the challenges and opportunities that NGO's face in Egypt and efforts to revise its counterproductive NGO law.

In Jordan, I reviewed initiatives we have supported to both strengthen public-private partnerships and expand access to quality education. I met with Queen Rania and others to explore new ideas in this area. I met with faith-based leaders who are trying to provide humanitarian support to families displaced by regional conflicts like the crisis in Syria.

I, then, traveled to Senegal to lead the U.S. delegation to the inauguration ceremonies for President Macky Sall. Senegal stands as a beacon of hope in the region, an example of what is possible through a commitment to democracy, inclusive growth, and policy reform.

Unfortunately, as you all know, there are many countries that are not moving in that same direction. Democratic backsliding is a significant challenge that we are hard at work trying to address. In modern times, authoritarian leaders rarely oppose elections outright. Instead, as we have seen in capitals from Caracas to Phnom Penh, they use sophisticated tools and methods, often with outside help, to bend elections long before the votes are ever cast. Subverting civil society and independent media, marginalizing opposition voices, and other steps undermine any real hope that citizens might have that they can shape their future through the ballot box.

Venezuela, of course, Mr. Chairman, as you alluded to, is a prime example. Nicolas Maduro's ruthless policies and actions have destroyed Venezuela's economic and political institutions. At Interim President Guaido's request, we have prepositioned humanitarian supplies in the region for eventual delivery into Venezuela. In fact, since February 4th, the U.S. Government has prepositioned nearly 546 metric tons of assistance. We have also provided more than \$195 million in humanitarian and development assistance throughout the region for Venezuelans and to help host communities.

Around the world, the U.S. will continue its role as the leader in humanitarian assistance. While most of such assistance currently goes to places suffering from manmade, regime-driven crises like Venezuela, we are also responding to terrible natural disasters like Idai. Torrential rains there have put nearly 900 square miles of land under water. Five hundred people have lost their lives and 2 million are in desperate need of humanitarian assistance. Across the U.S. Government, we have answered the call, mobilizing approximately \$43 million in supplies and assistance. To prevent the further spread of cholera, we are delivering essential relief supplies, like water treatment units, water storage containers, and latrines.

Then, there is the Ebola outbreak in the DRC, where health officials have recorded at least 1146 confirmed and probable cases and 721 related deaths. The experts of our DART, Disaster Assistance Response Team, are working tirelessly to break the chain of transmission and, ultimately, end the outbreak.

And then, there is the crisis in Burma and Bangladesh. Bangladesh now hosts 1 million Rohingya refugees; 730,000 of them were driven there by the ethnic cleansing campaign conducted by Burmese security forces. Last May, I visited Cox's Bazar myself. I met with government representatives, and I conveyed America's gratitude to Bangladesh for hosting the refugees. But I also encouraged them to allow humanitarian organizations to provide those

refugees with the full range of support necessary for their well-being: access to education, weather-resistant shelter, and livelihood opportunities.

As to Burma, we continue to call on the government to take concrete actions that would allow the voluntary, safe, and dignified return of Rohingya and other vulnerable communities.

This budget significantly expands our investments in another kind of freedom, freedom of conscience and religious expression. In particular, this budget request includes \$150 million to help us continue our assistance to those religious and ethnic minorities in the Middle East whom ISIS sought to extinguish.

Members, I have had the chance to discuss with many of you the rising anti-democratic influence of China and Russia. USAID will soon unveil a framework for countering malign Kremlin influence, especially in Europe and Eurasia. Our Fiscal Year 2020 request prioritizes \$584 million to support that work.

Part of our approach in this region must also be standing firmly with our allies. For example, Mr. Chairman, as you know, Kosovo, a country you care about a great deal, is a strong U.S. ally and should be integrated into the international community. We are committed to helping Kosovo along its journey to self-reliance.

As I know you all agree, America's security and prosperity at home is closely tied to a stable and free Indo-Pacific region. This request includes \$1.2 billion to advance U.S. leadership and promote open, transparent, and citizen-responsive governance across the region.

Members, when I last appeared before the committee about a year ago, I provided an overview with several planned initiatives in our transformation plan. After consultations with many of you and your staff, we have improved those plans and we have, in fact, actually implemented many of them. I look forward to addressing any questions you might have going forward, as we address some of the remaining congressional notifications. I do appreciate that partnership.

In terms of initiatives launched, we launched the agency's first-ever private sector engagement policy. The idea is to move beyond mere contracting and grantmaking to true collaboration, co-financing, codesign of initiatives.

Early this year, we joined others in launching the White-Housed Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative, WGDP. In fiscal 1918, we allocated \$50 million for this initiative. This current budget request goes further and includes \$100 million to support work force development and skills training, greater access to capital, and changes to the enabling environment.

Finally, I would like to say a word about our most precious asset, our human resources. Our dedicated corps of Foreign Service Officers, Foreign Service Nationals, and other team members are truly on the frontlines of that which we do. So, we will continue to staff up and bring our work force into greater alignment with strategic planning numbers and available operating expense budget allocations. We are preparing to hire approximately 140 career track Foreign Service Officers before the end of Fiscal Year 2020. We have also approved 221 new civil service staff positions and have selected 10 finalists for the Donald M. Payne Fellowship Program.

Members, thank you for your support and guidance. I do appreciate it, and I view it as a true partnership.

And, Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to appear again. I apologize if my voice does not hold out very well. But, as always, I appreciate our discussion. And again, thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Green follows:]

**Written Statement of Administrator Mark Green, U.S. Agency for International
Development (USAID)
House Foreign Affairs Committee
April 9th, 2019**

Introduction

Chairman Engel, Ranking Member McCaul, Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss USAID's Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 Budget Request.

The FY 2020 request for USAID fully and partially managed accounts is approximately \$19.2 billion, an increase of \$2.4 billion, or 14 percent, over last year's request. It requests \$6.3 billion for global health and \$5.2 billion for the Economic Support and Development Fund. In terms of USAID's humanitarian assistance, it requests \$6 billion for the new International Humanitarian Assistance Account, which, with likely carryover, will allow us to maintain the highest level ever of U.S. humanitarian assistance programming.

**

USAID remains focused on our core day-to-day work: helping support the world's most-vulnerable populations affected by humanitarian crises; promoting human rights, democracy, and citizen-responsive governance; and improving development outcomes in the areas of economic growth, education, environment, and health worldwide. Every day, our highly professional and dedicated staff work diligently to deliver sustainable development solutions and build self-reliance in partner countries, project American values globally, and advance our foreign-policy and national-security objectives.

I know that I cannot touch upon our work in each country in the limited time afforded me today, so allow me to discuss some of the themes and situations at the forefront of our attention.

Optimizing Humanitarian Assistance

The budget request reaffirms that Americans will always stand with people and countries when disaster strikes or crisis emerges. The FY 2020 U.S. humanitarian request will, with available carryover, provide an average of \$9 billion in both FY 2019 and FY 2020, allowing the U.S. to remain the single largest global donor and maintain the highest level ever of USG humanitarian assistance programming. The U.S. will not only continue our role as the world leader in humanitarian assistance, but we will also call on others to do their part and we will work relentlessly to assure that assistance is delivered as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Over the years, the responsibilities of the two USAID offices leading the bulk of our humanitarian assistance—Food for Peace and the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)—have been sharply increasing. While they have often coordinated, they have worked in parallel, with separate budgets, separate oversight, and different strategies.

Our overseas humanitarian assistance, within USAID’s new Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, supports this Administration’s commitment to optimize humanitarian investments. This will ensure a seamless blend of food and non-food humanitarian USAID assistance, better serving our foreign policy interests and people in need.

The budget also delivers on the President’s commitment to optimize the effectiveness of the U.S. government’s outdated and fragmented overseas humanitarian assistance. The proposal maximizes the impact of taxpayer dollars, helps more beneficiaries, and delivers the greatest outcomes to them by consolidating humanitarian programming in the new bureau at USAID while retaining State’s lead role on protection issues, as well as the U.S. refugee admissions program.

Venezuela

Nowhere is America’s leadership in humanitarian assistance more important, or more timely, than in our continued response to the man-made, regime-driven crisis in Venezuela. As you

know, the illegitimate dictator Nicolas Maduro has repeatedly blocked outside efforts to provide humanitarian relief to the millions of Venezuelan citizens in need. We continue to monitor the situation in Venezuela closely, where Maduro and his cronies have destroyed the country's institutions and economy, and created the largest cross-border mass exodus in the history of the Americas.

In response to Interim President Guaidó's request for assistance that could help him meet some of his people's urgent needs, USAID and State —with support from the Departments of Defense and others— have pre-positioned humanitarian assistance close to the border in Colombia, Brazil. USAID has also pre-positioned humanitarian assistance inside of Curacao, for eventual delivery into Venezuela. Since February 4, the U.S. Government has pre-positioned nearly 546 metric tons of urgently needed humanitarian assistance, including food aid, emergency medical items, hygiene kits, non-pharmaceutical commodities, water treatment units, and nutrition products.

At President Trump's instruction, we have closely coordinated these efforts with the international community. President Iván Duque of Colombia and President Jair Bolsonaro of Brazil, in particular, have been key allies in our efforts. The U.S. is grateful for our allies in the region who have stepped up to help the Venezuelan people in their hour of need.

We will continue to support Interim President Guaidó's efforts to deliver aid to his people in Venezuela, and also continue to support Colombia and other countries that are hosting Venezuelans who have fled. To date, the U.S. has provided more than \$195 million in assistance to Venezuelans and host communities in the region. That funding has supported the provision of urgently needed food, health care, protection, and shelter, to both Venezuelans and host communities. USAID also funds local organizations involved with human rights, civil society, independent media, electoral oversight, and democratic political processes, and the democratically elected National Assembly. We are not alone in this effort. Many of our close allies have pledged support, and many private citizens have already contributed assistance to the region, as well.

The United States stands with those who are yearning for a better life and a true democracy. We know the answer to Venezuela’s crisis must be human liberty and democracy; Venezuelans deserve a return to democracy, rule of law, and citizen-responsive governance.

We also stand with the Cuban people who have suffered for six decades under an authoritarian regime – the same regime plays a crucial and destabilizing role in supporting Maduro and his cronies. The United States funds democracy programs that help the capacity of the independent Cuban civil society, support the free flow of uncensored information to and from the island, and provide humanitarian assistance to political prisoners and their families.

In response to requests by Cuban civil society activities during the Summit of the Americas in April 2018, USAID identified an additional \$750,000 in FY 2017 funds to increase humanitarian support for Cuban political prisoners and their families, and to provide additional communications tools to civil society activists.

Tropical Cyclone Idai

USAID mobilized quickly in response to the devastating impact of Tropical Cyclone Idai on Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and Malawi.

Torrential rains have covered nearly 2,750 square miles of land in water—that’s an area larger than New York City, Philadelphia, and the entire state of Delaware combined. Sadly, nearly 600 people have already lost their lives and nearly 2 million people are in desperate need of assistance.

USAID has deployed a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART), which includes health, food security, shelter, and water, sanitation, and hygiene experts to provide technical advice and make assessments in real time. To prevent the spread of cholera and other waterborne diseases, USAID is airlifting relief supplies including water treatment units, water storage containers, and latrines.

In order to reach those communities who have been cut off by the storm, we've also requested the unique capabilities of the U.S. Department of Defense U.S. Africa Command to provide airlift and logistics support for our humanitarian response. The U.S. military has flown 34 flights and transported nearly 322 metric tons of relief supplies including food and medical supplies, vehicles, as well as USAID disaster experts and aid workers.

Our teams are monitoring the situation closely and will continue to adjust our efforts in close coordination with the Government of Mozambique, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and other response actors to assess needs and provide assistance to the affected populations

Outbreak of Ebola in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

Since the declaration of the outbreak on August 1, 2018, health officials have recorded at least 1089 confirmed and probable cases, including 679 deaths, in DRC's North Kivu and Ituri Provinces as of April 1, 2019. The U.S. Government deployed a Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) to the DRC to augment the ongoing Ebola response efforts. These disaster and health experts from USAID and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), are working with partners to provide robust life-saving assistance and support affected populations. The DART is coordinating with the DRC Ministry of Health, the World Health Organization, other donors, and key actors to support a coordinated effort, encourage sustained resourcing and fair burden-sharing, and ultimately end the outbreak. USAID assistance primarily focuses on breaking the chain of transmission, including through preventing and controlling infections, surveillance and case-finding, contact-tracing, case-management, and raising awareness in communities about how the virus is transmitted.

This response is a priority for the U.S. Government, not only because we are committed to supporting those affected, but also because effective efforts to contain and end the outbreak will prevent it from spreading throughout the broader region and beyond, including the United States.

Rohingya Crisis in Bangladesh and Burma

Bangladesh now hosts one million Rohingya refugees from Burma in the world's largest refugee camp. Over 740,000 of these refugees arrived in the wake of an ethnic cleansing campaign conducted by Burmese security forces that began in August 2017. Last May, I went to Bangladesh and Burma's Rakhine State to observe firsthand the daily burdens and suffering facing Rohingya communities. In many ways, it's the harshest situation I've seen in my time at USAID. The United States is the largest single donor of humanitarian aid to this crisis and stands as a beacon of hope to Rohingya.

Our efforts continue to focus on measures that will improve the situation for Rohingya in Rakhine State, as well as Rohingya refugees and host communities in Bangladesh. While providing life-saving assistance is critical, we also undertake programming to encourage the Burmese government to address the underlying causes of tension and violence, which are essential for there to be lasting justice. It's also a necessary step if that beautiful country is to fulfill the promise of its far-from-fully-realized democratic transition.

Support for Religious and Ethnic Minorities

The \$150 million in USAID and State Department funding that this budget requests will help us continue our important assistance to those religious and ethnic minorities in the Middle East, and other regions, whom ISIS sought to extinguish. We believe that freedom of religion and conscience are an essential part of our national character, and an essential attribute of any country that seeks to be prosperous, democratic, and just.

Democratic Backsliding

Another significant challenge we face in many regions is democratic backsliding. Rarely these days do authoritarian leaders oppose elections outright. Instead, as we've seen in capitals from Caracas to Phnom Penh, they use sophisticated tools and methods to bend elections to ensure their grip on power is maintained. Subverting civil society and independent media, manipulating

vote tabulations, and other anti-democratic ploys are all too often undermining hope for everyday citizens to be able to shape their future through the ballot box. USAID will continue to fund programming that aims to counter authoritarian impulses, nurture the capacity of civil society to advocate for an agenda of liberty, and advance fundamental freedoms worldwide.

Many parts of the world have seen an exponential growth of predatory financing dressed up as development assistance. China and Russia have been by far the greatest, though not the sole, sources of such financing. This form of financing often leads to unsustainable debt, eroded national sovereignty, and even the forfeiture of strategic resources and assets.

As part of an Agency-wide strategic approach, USAID will soon unveil a Framework to help us counter malign Kremlin influence, especially in Europe and Eurasia. This budget request prioritizes \$584 million in State Department and USAID foreign assistance to support that work and our efforts to aggressively communicate the stark differences between authoritarian financing tools and the approach that we and our allied donor nations use.

Our approach is true assistance that helps partner nations build their own self-reliance and a more dynamic, private enterprise-driven future. We aim to help partner countries recognize the costs of alternative models, like those of China and Russia, that can weaken confidence in democratic and free-market systems, saddle countries with unsustainable debt, erode sovereignty, lead to the forfeiture of strategic assets ignore the needs and concerns of local communities, and further the militaristic ambitions of authoritarian actors.

Indo-Pacific Strategy

America's security and prosperity at home is closely tied to a stable and free Indo-Pacific Region, and this request includes over \$1 billion in State Department and USAID foreign assistance to protect U.S. interests and promote open, transparent, and citizen-responsive governance across the Indo-Pacific.

In Asia, USAID plays a key role in advancing the U.S. Government's Indo-Pacific Strategy (IPS), particularly the economic and governance pillars, and the latter's headlining Transparency Initiative. America's vision for a free and open Indo-Pacific region is one in which all nations are sovereign, strong, and prosperous. Together with our U.S. Government partners, and in coordination with like-minded donor partners, USAID helps advance the IPS by strengthening governance in areas critical to achieving this vision—primarily with regard to bolstering economies and free markets, supporting democratic institutions and transparency promoting human rights and empowered citizens, and fostering incentives that address the region's substantial infrastructure gaps—foremost in energy, transportation, and digital connectivity sectors. By promoting open, transparent, rules-based, and citizen-responsive governance across Asia, the IPS mitigates the influence of predatory countries while unlocking private-sector-led growth that helps drive sustainable development and increase partner countries' self-reliance. As part of this strategy, USAID is playing a leading role in the interagency.

**

At USAID, we are proud of our role as the world's premier development agency. We are just as dedicated to ensuring that we maintain that leadership role in the years ahead. In order to prepare ourselves for the future, in late 2017, we initiated a series of interconnected reforms we call *Transformation*. Aimed at shaping a USAID worthy of both American global leadership and the talented, dedicated staff who work for us around the world, *Transformation* will allow us to strengthen our core capabilities, increase efficiency, and ultimately, improve outcomes while reducing costs. This budget request closely aligns with and supports implementation of these plans.

When I last appeared before this Committee on April 24, 2018, I provided an overview of several planned initiatives in our *Transformation* framework. After nearly 100 consultations with many of you, your staff, and colleagues across Capitol Hill, we have since launched our reform agenda and submitted nine Congressional Notifications related to the Agency's new structure. Our structure is closely tied to other internal reforms, and will provide the necessary enabling environment, within USAID, to ensure this vision takes root. I ask for your support on our

remaining Congressional Notifications on our *Transformation*, and am eager to answer any questions you might have.

Country Roadmaps: Defining and Measuring Self-Reliance

In pursuit of our vision of a day when development assistance is no longer needed, we are now orienting our work around the concept of fostering *self-reliance* in partner countries. USAID defines “self-reliance” as a country’s ability to plan, finance, and implement solutions to its own development challenges. In order to understand where a country is going in its journey to self-reliance, we need to understand where they are on that journey and where they’ve come from. To that end, and after consultations with USAID employees, external partners and other shareholders, we pulled together 17 objective, third-party metrics across the political, economic, and social spheres. They fall into two broad categories: commitment, or the degree to which a country’s laws, policies, actions, and formal and informal governance mechanisms support progress toward self-reliance; and capacity, which refers to how far a country has come in its ability to plan, finance, and manage its own development agenda.

We then assembled these metrics, country-by-country, as “Country Roadmaps” for all 136 low- and middle-income countries as classified by the World Bank. These Roadmaps were rolled out in August 2018 for socialization with partner governments.

These Roadmaps serve several purposes. First, again, they help us identify approximately where each country is in its development journey, a crucial first step in orienting our in-country approach around the concept of self-reliance. Second, they help inform our strategic decision-making and resource allocation processes and ensure that we better focus USAID’s investments. As we better align our strategies and our budgets, we look forward to working with you, and your colleagues, to ensure we have the appropriate mix of resource allocations. Third, because they use objective, open-source data, the Roadmaps provide USAID with a common touchstone for use in dialogues with country and development partners. Fourth, the metrics help signal to USAID—and the broader U.S. Government—when a country has made enough development progress such that we should pursue a new, more enterprise-centered phase in our partnership.

In October 2018, we published the Country Roadmaps online at [USAID.gov](https://www.usaid.gov). I welcome you to take a look.

Diversifying Our Partner Base, and Engaging New and Underutilized Partners

Metrics provide us with critical insight, but, ultimately, it is our in-country partnerships that advance our mission. Tapping into the innovation and resources of the private sector, and working with a full breadth of stakeholders, is critical to achieving sustainable development outcomes and building self-reliance. Many locally established actors—such as education institutions, non-profits, faith-based organizations and for-profit enterprises—have long engaged in their own efforts to build capacity, increase accountability, and provide services in countries prioritized by USAID. They are natural allies in our development mission, and this request includes \$20 million towards a New Partnerships Initiatives to expand our partner base.

Historically, these groups have often struggled to compete for USAID funding because of burdensome compliance and solicitation requirements, the imposing dollar size and scope of our awards, and unfamiliarity with USAID’s terminology and practices. On our end, we have admittedly lacked a sustained commitment to mobilizing new and local partners. The result has been a dwindling partner base. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, 60 percent of our obligations went to 25 partners, and more than 80 percent of our obligations went to just 75 partners. The number of new partners has decreased consistently since 2011.

With the launch of USAID’s first-ever Acquisition and Assistance (A&A) Strategy last December, we seek to reverse this trend, and tap into the good ideas and innovative approaches that we know exist in underutilized partners. Included in the core tenets of our strategy are more collaborative approaches to partnership, prioritizing innovation, and building the commitment and capacity of new partners. By diversifying our partner-base, we will not only incorporate new ideas and approaches into our tool-kit, but we will also strengthen locally led development—a core component of each country’s Journey to Self-Reliance.

Strengthening Private-Sector Engagement

While there will always be an important role for traditional contracting and grant-making in our work, we can accelerate and amplify our efforts and outcomes by increasingly applying market-based solutions to the development challenges we aim to address. At USAID, we have long recognized that private enterprise is the most-powerful force on earth for lifting lives out of poverty, strengthening communities, and building self-reliance. But until recently, the Agency lacked a formal, overarching policy to guide and galvanize our engagement with the private-sector.

That changed last December with the launch of USAID's Private-Sector Engagement Policy. The Policy serves as a call to action for all Agency staff and partners to increase and strengthen our work with commercial firms, and embrace market-based approaches to achieve outcomes. We seek ever-greater input from the private-sector, moving beyond mere contracts and grants to include more true collaboration—co-design, co-creation, and co-financing.

As part of this greater focus on private-sector engagement, USAID looks forward to a close partnership with the new Development Finance Corporation (DFC) established by the BUILD Act to mobilize financing, and this request provides \$50 million towards the new DFC. With close integration of tools such as the Development Credit Authority (DCA) and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation's new equity authority and other reforms, the DFC will make private-sector engagement much more effective. We are working closely with OPIC and the White House to make the new DFC a reality. Through collaborative endeavors with our USG partners and the private sector, we seek to join up our respective expertise to tackle problems that neither could fully address alone.

We pursue greater engagement with the private-sector because it is sound development, it achieves better outcomes, and it leverages the vast, largely untapped resources of commercial enterprise throughout the world. But we also pursue it because it is good for American businesses. The world's fastest-growing economies are largely in the developing world. USAID's work to promote regulatory reform already helps level the playing field for American

businesses, by reducing their barrier to entry in these large markets. Combined with financing support from the new DFC, the U.S. can help bring these American businesses directly to the table to tackle specific challenges and further expand their opportunities.

This renewed emphasis on private sector engagement has already borne fruit. For example, last November, I signed a Memorandum of Understanding between USAID and Corteva, one of America's great agribusinesses. Together, we will tackle global hunger while simultaneously cultivating new markets for U.S. technology and expertise. I am excited to see what other partnerships emerge in the months and years ahead.

Women's Economic Empowerment

No country can meaningfully progress in the Journey to Self-Reliance if it has a gender gap that essentially shuns half its population. The development dividends of greater participation by women in the economy are numerous. Our experience shows that investing in women and girls accelerates gains across the full development spectrum, from preventing conflict to improving food security and economic opportunity.

The President's National Security Strategy clearly recognizes women's empowerment as a top foreign policy priority. On February 7, 2019, President Trump launched the Women's Global Development and Prosperity (W-GDP), and signed a Presidential Security Memorandum clearly and decisively linking the ability of women to participate fully and freely in the economy with greater peace and prosperity across the world.

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, we allocated \$50 million for W-GDP. This request goes further and includes \$100 million to support workforce development and skills training, greater access to capital, and changes to the enabling environment so that, around the world, all women have greater opportunities to reach their full economic potential.

Staffing

At USAID, our human resources are our most precious asset. Our professional, experienced, and dedicated corps of Foreign Service Officers (FSOs) are at the frontlines of what we do as an Agency. In recognition of that, USAID will continue to staff up and bring our Foreign Service workforce into greater alignment with strategic planning numbers and available Operating Expense budget allocations. Specifically, we are seeking to expand our overseas Foreign Service capability to better manage financial risk, increase program oversight, provide critical support for the President's Emergency Plan For AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), and fill technical positions that have been chronically short-staffed.

USAID is preparing to hire approximately 140 career-track FSOs between now and the end of FY 2020. Hiring 140 FSOs over the next two fiscal years and adjusting for attrition would bring the total FSO workforce by the end of FY 2020 to just over 1,700 FSOs. For USAID's Civil Service, USAID's Hiring Review and Reassignment Board, has approved the hiring of an additional 221 staff to be added to the General Schedule workforce, which stood at 1,181 U.S. Direct Hires (USDH) as of February 2019. USAID has also selected 10 finalists for the 2019 Payne Fellowship program.

In order to support USAID's mission, we seek to test a non-career personnel system that is more efficient and flexible than our current systems while also better for many program-funded staff, by improving benefits and professional development. Within this budget proposal, USAID is also requesting to pilot an Adaptive Personnel Project (APP) to develop an agile, non-career/at-will USDH personnel system that can rapidly hire, move, and retain a talented, program-funded workforce. APP would be a program-funded, direct-hire mechanism enabling federal benefits and inherently governmental authorities. The overall vision is to improve USAID's ability to hire the right talent, at the right time, in the right place, for the right duration of time.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, and Members of the Committee, I believe we are shaping an Agency that is capable of leveraging our influence, authority, and available resources to advance U.S. interests, transform the way we provide humanitarian and development assistance, and, alongside the rest of the world, meet the daunting challenges we all see today. With your support and guidance, we will ensure USAID remains the world's premier international development Agency and continues the important work we do, each day, to protect America's future security and prosperity.

Thank you for allowing me to speak with you today, and I welcome your questions.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Green. As an alumnus of this committee, we especially are interested in hearing what you have to say.

So, I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes, and I will recognize members for 5 minutes each to ask questions.

Let me start. Administrator Green, as I mentioned in my opening statement, last week I, along with Mr. McCaul, led a congressional delegation to El Salvador where we witnessed firsthand the direct impact of our USAID programs in building a better future for the country and ensuring that children and families are not forced to make the dangerous journey north. I spoke with incredible young people, as did Mr. McCaul, who were learning how to code and become software engineers. It alarms me to think about the future these young people will face if President Trump moves forward with his misguided decision to cutoff aid to Central America.

So, let me ask you, do you believe that our assistance to Central America is in the U.S. national security interest? And if so, does not cutting aid hurt the very aims of reducing violence and other factors that compel people to flee north?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the question.

First off, as a general matter, I think we all agree that our foreign assistance must always be in our national interest. That is something that is a basic principle of what we do.

I will give you a poorly kept secret. The administration, in general, and the President, in particular, is frustrated with the problem of illegal immigration on our southern border. I heard an interview a few days ago with former DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson where he said that the situation is a crisis by anybody's reckoning. And so, that is what led the Secretary, on March 29th, to redirect approximately \$450 million of Fiscal Year 2018 foreign assistance intended for El Salvador and the Northern Triangle countries, and he instructed the State Department to review all existing grants that use Fiscal Year 2017 dollars.

What I would say is that we continue to look for ways to make our programs as effective as we possibly can. In recent months, we have been looking at some of the Customs and Border Protection data that helps us understand better from where these individuals are coming, and we are in the process of trying to make sure that we design the most effective programs we can.

I am very hopeful that, when the President is satisfied that our partner countries are doing all that they can, that we will have an opportunity to further craft these programs and work with you to deploy them and do what we can to address both the issues of migration, but also economic opportunity and freedom in the hemisphere.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Green, are you concerned, as I am, that cutting off ongoing USAID contracts could open up the U.S. Government to litigation and actually cost us more in legal fees and penalties than the programs themselves? That would also seem self-defeating to what the President says is his administration's aims.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that will be part of the review that the Secretary leads over the next couple of weeks, is taking a look at all of the issues

related to the Fiscal Year 1917 dollars, obviously, some of which have been allocated and obligated.

Chairman ENGEL. I appreciate your efforts to make positive changes within USAID structure and tackle long-term issues like procurement and fragmentation of humanitarian assistance in your redesign efforts. However, I remain concerned about the treatment of Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance in the proposal which have been lumped into a much larger, catch-all bureau. So, how would you ensure democracy and governance is appropriately prioritized in USAID? And can you commit to including democracy and governance in the new Conflict and Stabilization Bureau, since we have seen time and time again how governance is so clearly a root cause of fragility and conflict?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that you asked the question because, as you know, it is a priority for both of us, making sure that our work on democracy, responsive government, civil society is strong and prioritized. So, democracy has always been part of a larger bureau, but I think what we do with our transformation plans is, quite frankly, to elevate it. We have also made various aspects of civil society and citizen-responsive governance key metrics in our roadmaps. So that, as we have our conversations and do our strategic planning with host countries, that it is always at the forefront. And as you heard me say in my opening statement, I am particularly concerned about the new methods being deployed by authoritarians as they seek to bend democracy to their will long before election day. And so, I commit to working with you, to making sure that all of our programs in the democracy area are elevated, sharpened, prioritized, and that we, in fact, take on some of these new methods and technologies that authoritarians are using to subvert the people's will. So, I share your concerns and your priorities.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. McCaul.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just say that, as a former chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, no one has been a stronger proponent of border security than I have. In my home State of Texas, I see the problem firsthand, and it is a crisis. But I also think we have to deal with the root causes of the problem that the chairman has reference to. And that is poverty, violence, gangs, destabilization. And so, we will have more discussions, I know, on that issue.

I wanted to kind of shift toward the Sahel. As we saw one of the last battles of ISIS taking place in Syria, we are seeing extremism rear its ugly head in Libya, Northern Africa, and particularly the Sahel. So, the Global Fragility Act that Mr. Engel and I introduced would be a true partnership at the Federal level between USAID, State, and Department of Defense.

This, again, it is the same concept. You want to stabilize these nations, so that you do not have radical efforts. In Central America, it is more gangs and cartels. In Africa, it is extremism and terror groups. And so, how do you see the USAID working under this bill that we intend to mark up this afternoon?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman. And honestly, thank you and the chairman and others for taking up this important set of

issues. Quite frankly, I do not think it has received the attention that it deserves over the years, and this is over multiple administrations.

Ungoverned spaces are dangerous spaces. And as we see the flow of displaced communities, as we see the move of those fleeing the battlefield in some of the pitched battlefields right now moving into those places, it creates new risks for all of us.

So, at USAID, we have been looking to develop tools that will strengthen responsive governance, but also provide some economic opportunity. I continue to believe that the Feed the Future Initiative, which was launched by the previous administration, is one of the best development tools that we have seen in a long time. I think it is a way of creating some vibrant opportunity in pretty quick terms in some of these areas. Food security addresses problems of desperation in the obvious sense of hunger and poverty, but also in terms of economic opportunity.

So, we look to strengthen our food security work in the Sahel region and help deploy some of the tools that will help communities deal with the repeated shocks and crises that they have faced that has often created the desperation that extremists feed upon. I think there are a number of ways in which we can help make a difference there, but, again, I truly salute your interest on this because I think it is an area that we all need to be doing more. We need to keep our eyes on it very much.

Mr. MCCAUL. And when I talk to the military, they all warn that this is going to be the next battleground, battle space. And so, I agree with you. I look forward to traveling over there with you.

On China, we will be marking up my Championing American Business Interest Through Diplomacy Act. What is USAID doing to counter the growing threat from China, the One Belt, One Road? They are everywhere. They are in Africa. When we were down in El Salvador, the incoming President said that the current President was going to cut a deal with the Chinese to give them two ports and 5G internet access, which means they control, they dominate, they own that space. So, what is your agency doing?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you for the question, timely and important.

So, we have a framework that we are using that we call the Clear Choice Framework. And we do that because we think it is essential that we show our partners and potential partners the difference in the approach that China and other authoritarians take in terms of partnering with countries and that which we put forward.

First, let me say I hear a lot of reference these days to great power competition. That is actually not a term that I favor because it sort of implies that China and the U.S. are on the same playing field heading in the same direction with the same goals, and I just do not think that is the case. What we in the U.S. and our allies seek to do is to help countries move from being assistance recipients to partners, to fellow donors. And so, we work to help these countries with their self-reliance, so they can lead their own bright future.

Chinese financing is predatory financing, and they seek to do the opposite. They seek, instead, to provide long-term obligations to these countries, very often unsustainable, but which give them a

strategic and often militaristic advantage. So, we think the most important thing that we do is to make that choice clear.

Second, and most obvious—and I am sure you hear this in your most recent travels, but elsewhere—we need to be in these places. One of the most important things we need to do is to make sure that we have a presence. Most countries with which I am familiar will tell you the U.S. is their preferred partner. They want to partner with the U.S. and the vibrancy that our system offers. So, we need to be there and engage with them, and link them up with the private sector.

In addition, I think it is important that we not get caught up in a financial arms race with China. I do not believe we should seek to be “China Light”. Instead, what I think we should do is deploy our assets strategically to incentivize the kinds of reforms that help countries help themselves, but also open the doors to the kind of vibrant private sector investment that ultimately they want and they need.

So, I think there is a lot to be done. The most important thing is just what you have done, and that is to point very clearly to the challenge that we face as a Nation, not just us, but our strategic allies who I think see it the same way we do.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you. I see my time has expired.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Keating.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Administrator Green, thank you for your service in such an important function.

The Fiscal Year 1920 budget request highlights that USAID funding, quote, “builds strong partners in the region to reduce vulnerability to Russian aggression,” unquote. And the document further States that USAID funding, quote, “bolsters efforts to resist Russian malign influence by focusing on cybersecurity, good governance, anti-corruption, rule-of-law reforms, supports strong and independent media.” Let me stop there quickly before I go back. Could you tell us the importance of having a strong and independent media, and how the U.S. reflects that value today?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you for the question.

Sure. In fighting malign Kremlin influence, there are a number of things we need to do, but I think one of the most important things we need to do, particularly in Europe and Eurasia, is ensure that citizens in that region are getting an accurate depiction of information and events. And very clearly, that is not happening.

Mr. KEATING. Could I stop you there?

Mr. GREEN. I’m sorry.

Mr. KEATING. I have noticed in this region and throughout the globe a lot of autocratic leaders now are using the term “fake press”. Hear it all the time. It is printed. Do you recognize that is being said quite a bit by these leaders?

Mr. GREEN. Sure, that and other terms, yes.

Mr. KEATING. “Fake news,” “fake press,” you have heard that?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. Clearly, the concerns over a lack of independent media, yes.

Mr. KEATING. Now where do they get the term “fake news,” do you suppose? It is relatively newly used.

Mr. GREEN. Congressman, again, I cannot tell you. What I can tell you is the concern over propaganda and lack of independent media goes back a number of years. And in my previous capacity, that is the work that we used to be involved in.

Mr. KEATING. Do you think that the U.S. Government and its leaders, when they say things that are proven to be factually incorrect and just dispose of it or dismiss it as “fake news,” does not that undercut our efforts in that regard around the world? I think it is hard when you go into countries and trying to advocate for a free press in an area where they are locking up journalists. Yes, I find it harder to do today.

Mr. GREEN. Congressman, you will find me a strong voice for independent media wherever I go. It is important to me. It is important to us. It is part of our programming. We work to support independent journalists in places from Nicaragua to Europe and Eurasia. It is a vitally important part. It is one of the indicators that we take a look at on our roadmaps in building countries’ self-reliance. So, it is very important to us and very important to me.

Mr. KEATING. I believe, as you do in this document, that Russia’s malign influence has to be countered, but the budget request is less than half of what Congress previously appropriated. And I quoted the report as saying this “bolsters” efforts. If it is cutting it in half, how is that bolstering the efforts?

Mr. GREEN. First, Congressman, there is no doubt that this budget reflects difficult choices and tough choices. I think we all see that. We will never have enough resources to seize every opportunity or to take on every challenge.

What I think we are saying there, what I think the document references, that as we unveil the countering Kremlin influence framework, we are prioritizing and pulling together resources to make sure that we focus on this challenge.

Mr. KEATING. Yes, and you mentioned backsliding of democracies, too. I certainly see concerns for that in Hungary and Poland in the European area. I will give you just the opportunity. Maybe you could help us with what your views are with Georgia, a country that has been moving hard, albeit having its own challenges in terms of corruption and other issues as it goes forward, but really working hard to meet democratic standards, so they can move forward. Could you comment on what we could do to further help Georgia?

Mr. GREEN. I had the honor of being an election observer in Georgia just a few years ago, and it was a great experience. But, actually, the best experience was not the day that I observed the elections. It was the following day when I had a chance to meet with young Georgians representing all of the major parties, and they were friends from school and had gotten together. And I saw there more cross-party discussions that gave me tremendous faith in the future of Georgia. Supporting that kind of dialog I think is key and creating the kinds of economic opportunity that give young people a hope in the future.

In that region of the world, we know that the Kremlin goes country by country looking to exploit weaknesses, and the weaknesses are different in each country. And so, I think we have to take a country-by-country approach ourselves. One of the reasons that we

have designed the roadmaps to help guide our discussions is recognizing that not every country is in the same place in its journey to self-reliance. We need to understand where they are. We need to understand where they are coming from and talk with them, work with them, to find ways to provide the tools that they need to rise.

Mr. KEATING. Thank you. Again, thank you for your career service.

And I yield back.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Chris Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator Green, thank you for your tremendous leadership. Having somebody of your caliber and commitment and energy at the helm of USAID is truly important, particularly in this time of great crisis, humanitarian crisis, throughout the world.

I do want to thank you for prioritizing the victims of ISIS genocide in Iraq, including Christians and the Yazidis. You personally led the fact-finding trip last year that I think was very, very instrumental in helping to push forward with additional funding.

Since Fiscal Year 2017, the U.S. had provided more than \$340 million of assistance to support religious and ethnic minorities targeted by ISIS for genocide. So, I, again, want to thank you for that tremendous leadership.

I just want to thank you for your work that you have done on tuberculosis. I know it is a very strong personal commitment that you have. I know the budgets, when they are sent up here by whoever is in the White House, they often call for cuts that are restored by Congress, but this year you are at the 2018 level on TB. I would point out, parenthetically, that when President Obama sent his budgets up, there was a 20 percent cut in TB funding, which, then, again, in a bipartisan way we put back. But you have done a tremendous job in tuberculosis. It is the leading infectious killer around the world, as you know so well.

My question would be concerning TB diagnostics. There have been great advances in recent years with respect to getting rapid results, due, in particular, to the GeneXpert machine. And once people know their status, they can be treated. I wonder if you might want to speak to that and some of the things you are doing personally on this important issue.

And then, third, on the issue of Ebola, thank you for your update. Even your oral presentation had even more numbers of death and sick than the presentation in the written form, showing that it continues to get worse. The good news is that some of the therapeutics that are being used have actually caused people to survive. You might want to speak to that. Also, the idea of vaccinating people against Ebola, a great breakthrough, so that healthcare workers can do their work with less concern about contracting this deadly disease.

And also, if you might want to speak to, how do we protect our deployed health workers and others from other countries, security issues, particularly in the Goma area? I have been there, North Kivu. If it gets to Goma, obviously, a city of a million people, it

puts some more people at risk, obviously, of that terrible disease. But if you could speak to the Ebola crisis further?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman. First, thank you for your kind words on the work that we are doing for displaced religious and ethnic minorities in northern Iraq. But, to be honest, I have to salute you for your leadership. In a lot of ways, we have been standing on your shoulders. And so, I appreciate all that you have done.

As we have discussed, there is a long way to go. Security at the end of the day still will determine whether or not we are successful in helping to rebuild communities and lives there.

Second, on tuberculosis, something I learned a long time ago in the work and the development—actually, in my days of Malaria No More, our chairman, Peter Chernin, used to always talk about taking on challenges that we can actually solve, to build momentum for other work that we need to do. In the case of tuberculosis, we can do this. We absolutely, with the technologies that we have, we can take on and eliminate tuberculosis in many places. It is vitally important.

We have recently unveiled what we call a Tuberculosis Accelerator. What we are trying to do is make sure that we partner with local organizations and health officials to build their capacity and create their investment in results. One of the reasons that I am so keen to tackle tuberculosis is not only can we tackle it, not only is it currently a terrible killer around the world, but, third, it is the stigma that is too often associated with tuberculosis. It attacks the poor and the vulnerable and further marginalizes them from society. And to me, that is an extra tragedy that we need to take on where we can. But these technologies I think create real opportunities.

Third, on Ebola in DRC, we should be very concerned. In the last week, we have seen a number of signs that the outbreak is far from under containment. There is a long way to go. I met with Bob Redfield of the CDC on Friday. And I know that Secretary Azar had had a meeting with the new President of DRC last week. And we are really concerned. In coming days, CDC and USAID together are going to produce a new action plan because some of these new numbers that we are seeing tell us we have a lot of work ahead of us.

What makes Ebola in DRC so different than the challenges that we face with pandemics in other places is the backdrop. So, the outbreak flared up, obviously, last year against the backdrop of elections, which was a complication, shall we say? But, second, there is so much distrust in community leaders and health officials and, quite frankly, outsiders, that it weakens some of the normal approaches that we would take to tackling a pandemic like the Ebola outbreak. This is probably the greatest Ebola challenge in some ways that we have faced. Obviously, currently, knock on wood, it will stay that way. It is not on the scale of West Africa. But, with all the complications of conflict, fragmentation, lack of access to some areas, the security challenges that you point out, that is a daunting challenge.

It is very much worthy of this committee's attention. It has our highest attention. I get briefed on it nearly every day, and we are

working closely with CDC. We would love to provide a further briefing to your staff because it is a challenge that it is worthy of attention.

And just finally, on the security front, that is the big question. Nobody is suggesting that we, the U.S., should deploy security assets in a setting like that. That is not being requested or sought, but we do have to recognize that too often, 20 times since February, if I am correct, we have had security incidents. And we have had, in the last month and a half, several incidents that appeared to target health centers. And that is obviously deeply alarming. Again, without being too alarmist, this is something that requires all of us to pay attention to.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Green.

Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And welcome, Mr. Green, back to the committee.

I am going to try to cover three issues. One you were just talking about, global health security. As noted, the second deadliest Ebola outbreak in history is raging currently in a combat zone in the DRC. We know, confirmed, at least 1100 cases and 629 deaths and rising.

We also know that at least 70 percent of the world's nations are not fully equipped to respond to health emergencies like this. And I just want to inform you that today, on a bipartisan basis, Mr. Chabot and I are reintroducing the Global Health Security Act, with Republicans and Democrats cosponsoring it, which we have got to apply our commitments under the global health security agenda and designate an emergency response coordinator, given the rising threat. We are going to make sure you see that bill and would love to have your support and cooperation. Thank you.

Democracy assistance. According to Freedom House, more countries have been experiencing declines in democracy than gains every year for the last 13 years. And yet, the President's budget would gut democracy promotion funding by more than half. Now I am a member of the House Democracy Project. We have a relationship with 14 or 15 parliaments around the world trying to promote democracy. And I know of your personal commitment. You were with IRI, which is an organization we deal with very closely in these countries. How important is democracy institution-building, from your point of view, Administrator Green, and should not the United States be increasing its support, rather than cutting it in half? And we will stipulate you support the President's budget, but I am asking a policy question and your experience. Surely, you have seen the good that could be done.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman. You and I have had a number of discussions. I share the priority you have placed here.

Among other things, just as a practical matter, the only way that our investments in development are sustainable over the long haul is if we also take a look and bolster citizen-responsive governance. I think it is the key to sustainability.

I am a big supporter of the House Democracy Partnership. It is one of the few programs out there that works on legislative strengthening. I think there is always a risk for us—and I think this is true of almost every country—we deal with executives; it is

easy. That is what we do diplomatically. We tend to reach out to a head of State or a head of government. But we all believe in dispersal of power. We all believe in the checks and balances that come with legislative oversight. HDP I think is a wonderful tool to help address that.

Then, the next point—and this is really what has taken up a lot of my time and thinking recently—I have turned to NDI, IRI, and others to help us think through a framework to tackle the lead-up to elections. I am increasingly concerned, as I laid out in my opening statement; I mean, almost nobody opposes elections anymore, right? What they do is they bend the election, so they can say, “Aha, we’ve had an election.” Maduro has done that.

So, we have to do——

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yes, you can even win an election without winning most of the votes.

Mr. GREEN. We have to take on the challenge of what happens months ahead. What are those indicators? How do we strengthen those institutions?

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Green, because of the interest of time—forgive me——

Mr. GREEN. But I will come back——

Mr. CONNOLLY. I am glad to hear of your commitment. But let me just say, I think we also need to look at the resources necessary for shoring up institutions. We deal with parliament-to-parliament exchanges. They do not have the resources. They do not have the staffing. They do not have the independent analytical capability we can help them with. But we cannot help it by cutting the program in half. And I commend to you a reevaluation of that.

Final point. In the 140 pages of the President’s international affairs budget, he mentions climate change once, and only once. Now in my other committee we are having a hearing on climate change right now. Should we interpret that to mean that USAID is diminishing or retreating from assisting nations in resilience-building and responding to the threats of global warming and rising sea levels, and other kinds of pernicious aspects, including disease and vectors and even agricultural change?

I have asked the witness to be allowed to answer, and then, I, of course, will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you for the question.

So, I noted last week when Secretary Pompeo testified, he was asked the question about climate change, and he said—I am quoting—“The climate is changing.” And so, I think what we try to do, as a development entity, is to help countries deal with consequences. So, in Ethiopia, for example, we have been investing in technologies that help them. So, they have had four consecutive years of drought. We help them with resilience, so they do not fall into famine. We work with land use planning in places like Indonesia to strengthen their resilience against the mudslides that they too often face. Even in places like Bangladesh or on Cox’s Bazar, we are working to strengthen the shelters that are there to deal with the predictable cyclones and monsoons that are coming. So, it continues to be important for us, from food security to humanitarian work, to deal with the consequences of changing climate. It is an important part of our work.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Chabot.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Mr. Green, it is always a pleasure to have you here, having had the distinct advantage and opportunity to serve with you in this body and on a fair number of issues on this committee. We are glad that you have landed well and that you are doing wonderful work for our Nation and the world. So, thank you very much for what you are currently doing and what you did back then.

At the beginning of the year, the Protecting Girls' Access to Education in Vulnerable Settings Act, or conflict zones, we also referred to it, passed the House, passed the Senate, and President Trump signed it into law. This legislation, which I had the honor to author, along with my colleague, Robin Kelly, my Democratic colleague, would allow the State Department and USAID to prioritize education in our foreign assistance programs. I know it has only been a few months, but could you provide some insight on how your organization plans to implement this legislation?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman, for the question.

One of the great things I think about this legislation and the new tools that we have, access to education, particularly for girls, it allows us to prioritize and focus on what I think are the sharpest education challenges that we see right now. And that is access to education for girls in crisis and conflict zones, which I always tell people—"What is it," people always ask me in my line of work, "What is it that gets you up in the middle of night?" What gets me up in the middle of the night are 70 million displaced people, children being born in camps and displacement, growing up in camps and displacement. We have to help create connectivity for the world around them, and education is irreplaceable in that, particularly for girls. If we do not empower girls through education, they are going to be vulnerable to some of the worst forces that are out there. So, it is a very high priority for us, and I really do appreciate your leadership on it.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you. So, we look forward to you all pushing forward with that because, as you indicated, these young girls are vulnerable to horrific things, including human trafficking and a whole range of things that one hates to even think about.

Next question. One of the most horrific crimes against humanity really in recent memory was the attack on the Rohingya by the Burmese military. Essentially, 400,000 or so were driven out. There were villages burned, rapes and murders, and just horrible things happening. What does USAID envision for the Rohingya, given the challenges of ensuring a safe and voluntary return to Burma at this time? Ideally, we would like most, if not all, the folks to go back to their country of origin, but right now they just do not feel safe. We have had the opportunity, myself and some of my colleagues, to meet with them, as well as some Burmese officials and Bangladeshi officials. So, what would you say there?

Mr. GREEN. The challenge of the displaced Rohingya community is obviously a transnational one, Burma and Bangladesh. In the case of Bangladesh, one of our immediate concerns is making sure that the full range of services, if you will, is available to those in

places like Cox's Bazar. So, obviously, emergency medicine and food, but also some semblance of education and working on those things that will allow them to be successful and independent someday. And finally, quite frankly, reinforcing the shelters that are there because Cox's Bazar, in particular, is sometimes referred to as "Cyclone Alley". It is an area that seems to disproportionately get hit by monsoons and cyclones. And so, it is a high priority for us to try to help in that regard.

In Burma, one of the most important things I think we can do is press the government in how it treats the Rohingya who have been left behind, who are in camp settings or other settings in Burma. How you treat your internally displaced persons I think is a pretty good indication as to how you would treat those who might come back.

And I think I have mentioned to you, out of all the things that I have seen as Administrator, what has bothered me the most are the Rohingya who are trapped in places like some of the camps near Sittwe. I was deeply disturbed by the lack of hope and opportunity that those poor families were facing. We have pressed often and will continue to do so. We have made it clear that, while our development portfolio is such that we want to help all in Burma, we need to make sure that we never forget those Rohingya who are in those communities, so that they have some semblance of hope for the future. I have met too many young Rohingya who were born in camps, have never lived outside a camp, and that is as inhumane as I can think of.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you very much.

My time has expired, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Ms. Bass.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Administrator Green. It is good to see you at the committee, and I really appreciate your leadership at USAID.

I wanted to ask you about a couple of countries in Africa. Sudan, 30 years after taking power in a coup, President Bashir now faces an unprecedented challenge to his regime, as protestors continue a peaceful resistance movement, now almost 4 months old. In response, the government has arrested several thousand people and further restricted political space. While U.S. assistance in Sudan is restricted, Congress has long supported USAID's effort to mitigate conflict and promote more inclusive and participatory governance. The administration's Fiscal Year 2020 request proposes a major cut to such programs, eliminating conflict mitigation and stabilization funding and cutting democracy and governance by 30 percent. What impact would these proposed cuts have on the ability of the U.S. to support Sudan's opposition and civil society in their effort to encourage political reforms?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congresswoman. As always, it is great to engage with you on Africa. I am well aware of the love you have for the continent.

What is going on in Sudan is heartbreaking. It just is deeply heartbreaking. As you know, USAID's piece of the five-track approach is humanitarian access for refugees and IDPs as well as some aspects of human rights protection. And what has happened

is obviously a setback in so many ways. And as I said, it is deeply disturbing.

There are things that Sudan needs to do, just straight-up, that the government must take on. And I think it is fair to say that we have constantly impressed upon them the need for creating constructive engagement, as opposed to what they are doing, with transparency. Because if they do not address that, it is very difficult to foresee a better relationship and a brighter path for the country.

Ms. BASS. Well, then, let me just ask, because the funding cuts, as I understand them—and maybe I am misunderstanding—impact our support to Sudan’s opposition and civil society. So, I know if we are going to go in a direction to enter into phase 2, I wasn’t even referring to that. I was really referring to our support for democratic reforms and cutting those resources.

Mr. GREEN. Well, as a general matter, across the continent, very obviously, tough choices are being made. We will do everything we can to make those dollars go as far as we can effectively and efficiently. As to the particular implications for Sudan, quite frankly, I will have to get back to you and make sure that we brief your staff. I am just not familiar enough with the details.

Ms. BASS. OK. And the next was about Power Africa. Power Africa 2.0, which launched last year, is an updated strategy to improve energy access in Africa. And I wanted to know how this version differs from the administration’s work in the past.

Mr. GREEN. Power Africa 2.0 I think is applying the lessons that we have learned in terms of the need for a better enabling environment. So, the greatest thing about Power Africa has been how opportunistic it is—

Ms. BASS. Right.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. In the sense of identifying and closing deals rapidly. In 2.0, as much as anything, we are working more broadly to provide or to push for the kinds of reforms to the enabling environment that open the door for more investment, which will allow us to have a greater impact across the continent. So, it is taking the opportunism that we have seen and applying it more broadly by applying the lessons that we have learned as to what a country needs to have available if American private investment is going to be able to take advantage of the opportunity.

Ms. BASS. And then, maybe in the last few seconds, I know you were addressing the Ebola crisis that is happening in the DRC, and perhaps you can expand on that. What are we doing to get resources there?

Mr. GREEN. In terms of what we are trying to do, again, working closely with CDC in trying to reinforce the Ministry of Health, I have been in constant contact with Dr. Tedros of the World Health Organization, urging a more aggressive vaccination approach, which I think is called for.

In terms of the financial resources, it actually is not a fiscal issue. There is sufficient money for fighting Ebola in DRC. However, with the vaccines that we have available, to produce more takes eight to 10 months. And so, we are urging a more aggressive approach not only in potentially geographic vaccination, but also rebuilding supplies. We have plenty of supplies currently available,

but with this new flare-up that we have seen, we think more aggressive vaccination is called for, and therefore, that we need to see more advanced purchases to rebuild those supplies.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Administrator Green, thank you for being here today. It is always inspiring.

And I remember last year we were discussing how wonderful it would be for the American people to know what the United States Agency for International Development does around the world to help so many people recover. And I have seen firsthand in the Philippines typhoon recovery, but to see the refugee camps across the Middle East and Africa.

One of the most meaningful experiences I ever had in Afghanistan, I was in a very rural area, and there was a sign for a school with the clasped hands, indicating a U.S. flag and an Afghan flag, in a very, very remote area. So, over and over again, the services that you help provide, and then, your promotion of democracy. The democracy programs have been so successful.

I had the opportunity to be an election observer in Bulgaria back in 1990. And now, we see a very positive and democratically developed country, but it did not start that way. And so, IRI and NDI, working together, have made such a difference.

Ambassador Green, you are addressing obstacles in providing assistance. Syria provides a difficult operating environment between the Assad regime and terrorist groups operating throughout the country. How does USAID negotiate the challenges for providing humanitarian response and stabilization assistance in this environment? And can you provide an update on the humanitarian response?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman.

One quick point on a somewhat related subject. In my recent travels, when I was in Jordan, I visited a Catholic center that was helping Syrian refugees with job and skills training for their future. And one of the things they were doing was learning the skills of the tradition of making mosaics. They presented to me a large USAID logo made out of mosaics, the little stones, which is on its way to our headquarters. It will be posted in the lobby. I got to tell you, that was as moving as anything that I have seen because it is a reminder of the role that we play.

With respect to Syria, our stabilization work continues through funding with our coalition partners. So, we are able to do in northeastern Syria additional stabilization work, but it is all dependent upon the security situation on the ground, which we are assessing each and every day to make sure that we are able to work in a safe setting.

On the humanitarian front, we continue to provide humanitarian assistance. It is a vital part of what we do. The challenges in Syria in terms of the suffering are enormous, immense. We are currently funding 19 different organizations to provide food relief and shelter materials and health care and water. But the needs are vast and they will be for quite some time. So, we are doing the best we can with that situation on the ground.

And then, finally, the other challenge that we face is being able to take sufficient precautions against diversion, which has always been a challenge in Syria. From third-party monitoring that we do, to working closely with the Office of the Inspector General, it is a very tough working environment, but one that we obviously all believe we need to engage in.

Mr. WILSON. And another country that is in turmoil is Yemen and access to Yemen. What is being done to provide assistance for persons in Yemen?

Mr. GREEN. Now things keep changing. I note that there was a recent contribution—I think it was from Saudi Arabia—toward cholera, in particular, in Yemen just in the last few days. But we have been the largest bilateral donor in Yemen.

Look, humanitarian assistance is a treatment, not a cure. And we are very, very clear about that. So, humanitarian assistance, I am proud of what we stand for as Americans and what we do. It is not an answer. We need a political answer. We need a political solution to Yemen. And until that happens, we are going to continue to see enormous levels of suffering.

Mr. WILSON. And a final one is the civil war in Libya. What is being done to address issues in Libya?

Mr. GREEN. I will have to have staff followup with you. Quite frankly, it is changing so rapidly; I want to be careful. It is a rapidly changing situation. I got a briefing yesterday, but I fear it may be out-of-date. It is obviously a great—

Mr. WILSON. Your service is greatly appreciated. Thank you very much.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Bera.

Mr. BERA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And it is good to see you again, Ambassador Green.

You and I have chatted in the past about the approach that you have taken in terms of capacity-building. Again, I would like to applaud that as opposed to just straight donations, looking at the assets in regions that we are going into and trying to build on those assets.

In fact, I had the chance to share the stage with one of your deputies celebrating frontline health workers. I have had the chance to see your staff, whether it is in the slums of India, in the refugee camps with Syrian refugees, doing recovery effort in Sierra Leone. I want to applaud the men and women that represent our Nation in aid and development every day, and just make sure they understand that we appreciate the work that they do.

We chatted, and I will not ask this in the form of a question, but I am happy that the administration is taking an interest in women's empowerment. But I think I would be negligent if I did not—as I have raised in private, we cannot do women's empowerment unless we are looking at access to reproductive health, unless we are empowering women to look at appropriate pregnancy spacing. And I am very concerned about what the administration is doing in terms of expanding the global gag rule. I will not ask you to respond to that, but I think it is very important for us from an over-

sight capacity to take a look at that and the impact that it may have on some of our objectives.

I want to thank the chairman for reinstituting the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, which I get the privilege of chairing. One area that we have been hearing quite a bit about is this Congress has authorized and appropriated a lot of aid and development funding. And we are hearing from our partners that are out in the field that some of that funding is being very slow to get to where they were intended. Now I do not want to presuppose what the cause is. It could be understaffing. It could be the regulatory checks and balances that Congress has in place to make sure the funds are getting to the appropriate location. But what I would like to ask, as the Oversight Subcommittee starts to look into this issue, what can we do to get the funds quickly to where they can do the most help? Can I get the commitment from you and your staff to work with us on this?

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Mr. BERA. Thank you. I appreciate that.

A second real success in the last Congress—and I see my colleague, Congressman Yoho, here; Congressman Yoho, Congressman Smith, Senator Coons and Corker—was the BUILD Act, which really attempted to modernize how we did overseas financing and development, and was pretty widely applauded and shared in a bipartisan way.

One thing, as we start to look at the implementation of the BUILD Act, that we have some concerns about is, you know, it really was meant to expand our lending capacity and give us the ability to compete with China in a smart and strategic way. We do have some concerns of how the administration is looking at the BUILD Act, perhaps taking an existing portfolio of loans that USAID has and folding it into the new Development Financing Corporation, which would really undermine the intent and potentially limit our ability to counteract China.

In the minute I have, I would love to have your commitment to work with us on that and to make sure it is being implemented in the most effective way. But, two, what things do you think from an oversight perspective we ought to be thinking about?

Mr. GREEN. Great questions, really important questions.

So, we are at that point in the process where we are working closely with OPIC, which would be obviously——

Mr. BERA. Right.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. The precursor to the DFC, toward that October 1st date when the new DFC will stand up. So, we are having regular communications about that.

To me, the most important things are twofold. No. 1, I think ensuring that we continue to focus on development impact. This is meant to be a development entity that produces real, measurable development outcomes. It is not meant to be a private bank, and it is not. It is meant to do that which could not otherwise be done. And we are very supportive of that. So, I think making sure that we measure development impact.

And second, I think it is really important that we incentivize the kinds of reforms that create the enabling environment for private investment. China does not want to see enabling environment re-

forms. They do not want transparency. They do not want these things. It is up to us to incentivize and bolster the capacity of countries to take it on. Because if countries, often with our help, do reform their enabling environment, private enterprise will take off, and then, I will not say our work is done, but it is a huge step toward that day when a country is fully self-reliant. So, I think those two areas are going to be crucial in coming months to make sure that we do this the right way.

Mr. BERA. Well, Ambassador, I look forward to working with you on that.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Yoho.

Mr. YOHO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Green, thank you for being here.

As you know, I came up here to have a different attack on foreign aid, and we have transformed, over the course of the last 6 years. But, yet, my underlying belief is we have to do a better job of directing this money. And I understand that in the past, and suspect in the future, we will continue to support democracies because we know it leads to better governance, rule of law, increased economies, better human rights, and the story goes on and on.

But, as the world changes, with a rising China offering an alternative to Western forms of democracy, with their form of socialism and Chinese characteristics attached to it, it is just a real obvious divide. You can have Western democracies or you can have Chinese forms of socialism, which basically is communism. And they are offering their 5G network. We know firsthand that they have offered the 5G network to Maduro, so that they can control their citizens, as China is doing. Russia wants that technology. Iran wants it.

And so, we know this is happening throughout the world. Yet, we are in the foreign assistance realm in this committee in a large way, in this country. And so, we want to make sure that money is used effectively. As you said in your opening statement, partners prefer to partner up with countries like us because we are a trusted partner with the rule of law.

And so, when you look at democracies—and I just want to touch on Vietnam. Vietnam is a communist country, but yet they are our 10th largest trading partner, or 16th largest trading partner, 10th largest importer of ag products. How do you look at countries and determine which way do you go as far as where do we develop, how do we develop, and knowing they are communists, lead in this direction? Because I truly believe, if we lead in this direction, over time they will change.

Mr. GREEN. Great question. So, the approach that I have always taken—and this goes back to the day when I was an ambassador in Tanzania, which was for the longest time a non-aligned nation, which meant it was looking more eastward than it was westward—I used to go in and say, look, I am not saying we have got all the answers as Americans. I am saying maybe we have made in our history all the mistakes, and you do not have to make the mistakes that we have made to get ahead. You can learn from our experience. And I find that is a great way to start the conversation and

helping them to understand what we have learned the hard way is needed for sustainable economic growth.

A couple of things I think with respect to China that are really, really important. No. 1, we are the preferred partner, but oftentimes countries are presented with deals that look too good to be true.

Mr. YOHO. Well, and that is where I wanted to get in this.

Mr. GREEN. And they usually are.

Mr. YOHO. I wanted you to bring this up.

Mr. GREEN. So, I think it is very important that we also look at providing them with the objective tools to evaluate that which they are presented, because they are complicated deals. And quite frankly, oftentimes, the fine print is just that, and it is devastating with what it does.

So, in every case in which China presents a deal to a country, to me, the most important single public question is, will you make it transparent?

Mr. YOHO. Right.

Mr. GREEN. Will you release it publicly?

Mr. YOHO. And they run from that.

Mr. GREEN. And again, I think it is really the base, the premise of your question. Again, this is not great power competition. We are not going in the same direction. China does not seek the same end zone that we do.

Mr. YOHO. Right. They are playing a whole different game.

Mr. GREEN. It is a very different thing that they are seeking to achieve, and we have to be very clear about that over and over again.

Mr. YOHO. And that is what we rely on you, and I know you guys do the—you know, we have been around enough State Departments that we realize you guys are the best that there is, and that it is a whole different game. We are offering economic development for the betterment of that country; whereas, China is offering them these loans for the betterment of China.

We were in the DRC with Chairman Royce a couple of years ago, and I asked a rhetorical question to President Kabila's cabinet: "What do you do for social programs?" And the guy says, "What do you mean?" I said, health, education, all those things. And this is what shocked me, the rapidness in his answer. He pointed at us, he goes, "We have you." Those are not sustainable programs.

Right now, our debt is \$61,000 per capita in this country. We are under budget restraints. And so, we rely on people like you to implement this, the foreign aid, especially with the BUILD Act. We were honored to have that pass. And we met with David Bohigian today and Ray Mosbacher, or Mr. Mosbacher, today on the implementation. And we are excited for that, and I hope it is a tool. It is like a piano. It is in front of you; I hope you guys learn to play it well for the implementation, for the betterment of this country, because good foreign policy is good economic policy. It is good trade policy. But, ultimately, it is strong national security.

Thank you.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Espaillat.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator, as the chairman said earlier in this hearing, I had the pleasure of visiting Colombia, the southern border, Cucuta, with Venezuela, El Salvador, and Mexico, as well as the southern border of our Nation. In Venezuela, as Maduro doubles down and begins to crack down on Guaido and some of the opposition to his tyranny, we also see the potential of the situation spiraling out of control. The bridges leading to Venezuela and the southern border have containers filled with sand and bolted down to the actual bridge. To move them, you are probably going to have to blow up the bridges.

So, do you see—my first question is—as this takes another level of need, do you see the potential of us airlifting aid to Venezuelans, particularly those in the interior that would not have access to the border anyway, assisting perhaps humanitarian organizations with the task of airlifting aid to needy Venezuelans in the interior and all over the country?

Mr. GREEN. Great, great question. So, what has been a watershed moment, a game-changer for us in terms of trying to help ease suffering in Venezuela, was the recognition of Juan Guaido as Interim President by the U.S. and 50 other countries, because it has given us someone with whom we can work in terms of the prepositioning of assistance and a more trusted network. As you know, Nicolas Maduro has used humanitarian assistance as a weapon, and he has used food to reward his friends and punish his enemies. We simply will not be part of that, very obviously.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Yes, but excuse me on this.

Mr. GREEN. Uh-hum.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. But that is not happening. He is doubling down on Guaido. So, are we going to allow the Venezuelan people to starve to death? Can we airlift aid to towns where perhaps people can have direct access to food and medicine, and just drop down that aid? I think we have got to save lives. This is spiraling out of control, and it could be a major, major humanitarian crisis, if it is not already. Can we do that?

Mr. GREEN. So, first off, it is a major humanitarian crisis already. Second, as you may have seen, in the last week an arrangement was reached with the International Federation of the Red Cross/Red Crescent—

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Can we work with them?

Mr. GREEN. Potentially. One of the things that we need to make sure of is that the agreement will be abided with, so that we do not allow Nicolas Maduro to once again use assistance as a weapon. But that is a hopeful step.

Also, the prepositioning of supplies in places like Curacao—and as you know, a shipment just reached Curacao—will allow us, knock on wood, when that day comes, to mobilize assistance under the interim, Guaido's leadership, into some of those areas.

We are working with other allies. We are working with the Brazilians. We are working with the Colombians. So, the good news is that there is a broad network of aligned countries looking for ways to be able to speed up relief into parts of the country.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you.

My second question is, we also visited El Salvador, and we were very encouraged to see this new 38-year-old President who ran

against corruption and violence, has got the aspirations and the support of the young people in that country, a country that has seen a drop in homicides of 50 percent. We saw programs supported by your agency to recruit young people away from gangs. And really, what they need right now is a shot in the arm with economic development to see if we can get that economy going again and creating jobs.

Yet, the President threatened to cut El Salvador's aid, which is probably the model that we ought to follow in Honduras and in Guatemala. The folks showing up at the border are primarily from Honduras and Guatemala, and not even Mexico. Less than 12 percent of the folks being sent back are of Mexican descent.

So, what do you feel about this threat to shut down aid to El Salvador, a country that is seeing some progress in fighting the violence and the corruption, and everything else there? And by the way, the Chinese are there. If we do not do it, they will step up and fill the vacuum of leadership.

Mr. GREEN. Congressman, I am long overdue to get down there myself. I was last there, actually, right before I became Administrator.

We have seen some programs that are doing good things. Obviously, none of us are entirely satisfied with the broad results in terms of displaced communities and migrant flows. We all recognize that, as you know—

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Is it a mistake for the President to threaten to shut down aid?

Mr. GREEN. Well, the Secretary is reviewing all the existing grants and contracts that use Fiscal Year 1917 dollars to make sure that they are aligned and achieving outcomes, and I look forward to that review.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. But is it a mistake? Is it a mistake?

Mr. GREEN. Look, the President is the President. He is expressing frustration. We share the frustration. It is as—

Mr. ESPAILLAT. So, you are frustrated with that decision, as I am, right?

Mr. GREEN. I am sorry?

Mr. ESPAILLAT. You are frustrated with that decision, as we are?

Mr. GREEN. I am frustrated with the situation of the rising numbers on our southern border. As former Secretary Jeh Johnson said, "It is a crisis by anyone's determination." And so, clearly, we all have to do more, and we are looking at new approaches. We look forward to the review and look forward to the day when the White House is satisfied that our host country partners are making the necessary commitments that we can take on some of these issues again.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ENGEL. Thank you.

Mrs. Wagner.

Mrs. WAGNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for organizing this hearing.

Thank you, Administrator Green, for your time and your service.

The high rates of child marriage remain a serious concern in refugee camps. In fact, I introduced a bill yesterday that would prompt the United States to take the lead on this issue at the

United Nations. How is USAID working to provide alternatives to child marriage among refugees and other vulnerable populations?

Mr. GREEN. A great question. I have not seen the legislation. I have heard of the legislation.

Mrs. WAGNER. We will send it to you.

Mr. GREEN. I very much appreciate your interest and leadership on the issue.

So, there are a number of things that we have been doing and need to be doing. One of the biggest things we need to do is to empower young women, girls and young women, better educational access, providing the kinds of economic opportunities in communities that give families more independence and more choices. I think those are among the things that we need to be doing. But it is—

Mrs. WAGNER. We also want to stop children from being married off in these refugee camps.

Mr. GREEN. And the other piece to it is protection of vulnerable girls.

Mrs. WAGNER. Right.

Mr. GREEN. So, in some cases it is removal; in other cases, it is counseling and health response. There are a number of things that we need to do. There is no one thing. It is the full range of services from the more punitive side in terms of removal and prosecution—

Mrs. WAGNER. Right.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. To looking at these young, vulnerable girls and women and providing counseling and relief and caring. So, it is the full range.

Mrs. WAGNER. Tens of thousands of Rohingya have been trafficked by criminals promising employment and citizenship. A ship carrying 47 trafficked Rohingya arrived in Malaysia just yesterday. And Malaysian authorities fear that trafficking operations are on the rise. What measures does USAID employ to prevent Rohingya refugees from falling prey to human traffickers?

Mr. GREEN. Our work in trafficking is global. Obviously, Rohingya are particularly vulnerable for the obvious reasons. So, it is, again, the full range. It is from protection, counseling. Prosecution is a big piece of it that we need to be doing, investigation and prosecution. But it is providing some economic independence and opportunity as much as anything.

So, you have the Rohingya who are in Bangladesh and Rohingya who are in Burma. In the case of Burma, we continue to, and need to continue, pressing with the government to allow some semblance of dignity and opportunity for these targeted—

Mrs. WAGNER. Well, they have got to have stability first. I mean, we have to go after the perpetrators. I mean, 47 just arrived there in Malaysia yesterday—

Mr. GREEN. Yes, absolutely.

Mrs. WAGNER [continuing]. And they say they are seeing it daily. The demand side has got to be shut down, and these people that are selling these poor refugees into sex slavery need to be stopped and prosecuted.

Mr. GREEN. Congresswoman, the even greater tragedy, these are just the ones that are caught. It is an even greater problem.

Mrs. WAGNER. I am sure of that.

I want to thank you for highlighting the work USAID is doing to advance the Indo-Pacific Strategy, reassuring our allies and partners. However, Southeast Asia countries on the frontlines of escalating competition between the United States and China worry that a strategy focused on the Indo-Pacific will diminish their role in regional affairs. How will USAID promote Southeast Asian countries' centrality in achieving a free and open Indo-Pacific?

Mr. GREEN. All the ASEAN countries are part of the Indo-Pacific Strategy—

Mrs. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. That has been laid out. So, the piece that we have at USAID is focused on energy independence, in particular, which is one of the greatest constraints to economic growth. So, that is perhaps the biggest focus of what we are doing. But it is engaging, it is being there, it is bolstering our presence there. It is being opportunistic in terms of American investment, which they seek, and it is providing the means to allow their communities a vibrant economic future. So, it is all of those things, but very much ASEAN is at the center of the Indo-Pacific Strategy.

Mrs. WAGNER. As the co-chair of the ASEAN Caucus, I could not agree more in terms of security and safety, in security issues, in terms of trade issues, energy issues. We have great opportunity there to be a counterbalance to China. So, I thank you for whatever USAID can do to bolster the region.

And my time has expired and I yield back.

Ms. HOULAHAN [presiding]. Thank you.

I now recognize Representative Levin from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Mr. Green, thank you so much for coming. I am very excited to see you here.

I first studied USAID as a 19-year-old college student when I went to Haiti to look at the impact of USAID programs during the Duvalier dictatorship. And I have got a lot of questions for you. So, I will try to zoom along.

Do you believe that humanitarian assistance should be guided by internationally recognized humanitarian principles?

Mr. GREEN. I am sorry. Could you repeat? I did not hear.

Mr. LEVIN. Yes. That humanitarian assistance should be guided by internationally recognized humanitarian principles, humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and the like?

Mr. GREEN. Sure, but we deploy our humanitarian assistance according to not only—I mean, as you know, we are the largest donor by far in humanitarian assistance.

Mr. LEVIN. Although not proportional to our budget. Other countries do much more—

Mr. GREEN. No, but, by far, we are—

Mr. LEVIN. I know we are by far, but we are a lot bigger country than many European countries. So, we are not the most generous by our ability to pay.

But, anyway, go ahead. I know we give a lot.

Mr. GREEN. I mean, we are, again, No. 1, and 2, 3, and 4 added together do not equal us. So, we are, by far, the largest donor. And

I do not mean it as an excuse; I mean it as a point of pride. It is obviously something that we all think is important.

So, in terms of international standards, sure, I think we help to shape those international standards as much as anything, but we deploy our humanitarian assistance in most places, like what is taking place now from Cyclone Idai, based upon what our teams see on the ground as the most immediate needs and what we can do to provide relief and stabilization in an economic future.

So, I am not sure I dodged the question, but—

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, well, I guess I have been having trouble understanding some of the actions the administration has taken. It feels like our humanitarian assistance is unduly influenced by politics.

For example, we have effectively ended assistance to the West Bank in Gaza. I do not think there can be any doubt that humanitarian aid is needed there. For example, in Gaza, just 10 percent of households have direct access to safe drinking water. Yet, the President's budget request merely says that any economic assistance to Palestinians will be available through a new Diplomatic Progress Fund, "should advances be made," quote/unquote, "in support of U.S. objectives in the peace process." Isn't that saying that humanitarian assistance should be subject to political outcomes? Isn't that effectively what we are pretty much doing in—I say this as a huge backer of Israel my whole life, but I do not see how this helps us.

Mr. GREEN. So, the Diplomatic Access Fund, as I understand it, is an effort to create, to sort of allocate or set aside resources, so we can be opportunistic when situations open up.

Mr. LEVIN. Well, I mean, do you have evidence that indicates that the loss of aid for Palestinians will aid the prospects for peace?

Mr. GREEN. In the case of—

Mr. LEVIN. We are cutting aid, sir, conditional on them doing evidently what we want. We do not have a peace proposal.

Mr. GREEN. So, there are a couple of things, though. Just it is important to clarify because there are two different things that have happened here. So, with respect to West Bank Gaza, there was the review that was directed in 2018 that led to the reallocation of resources, redirection of resources away from West Bank Gaza. And then, second, near the end of last year was the passage of ATCA, which, then, led to the Palestinian Authority formally notifying the U.S. Government that it would not accept any assistance that was covered by or specified in the legislation. And so, I just wanted to be clear, those are the two—

Mr. LEVIN. Yes, but my time is super-limited. I am trying to get to a broader point. So, let me just mention the cutting of aid to the Northern Triangle. In 2017, Vice President Pence, at the Northern Triangle Conference for Prosperity and Security, said, and I quote, "To further stem the flow of illegal immigration and illegal drugs into the U.S., President Trump knows, as do all of you, that we must confront these problems at their source. We must meet them and we must solve them in Central and South America." How does cutting off assistance to these countries help achieve the administration's stated goal of addressing the key factors driving families to flee to the U.S.?

Mr. GREEN. Just to be clear, I think this is where perhaps I think we had some confusion before. That is not humanitarian assistance. That is development assistance. Just because we have an important——

Mr. LEVIN. No, right, I am talking about USAID's overall mission and the politicization of it.

Mr. GREEN. Fair enough.

Mr. LEVIN. But I totally agree with what you are saying.

Mr. GREEN. With respect to the Northern Triangle, as we began with, with respect to the Fiscal Year 1917 moneys, the Secretary will be leading a review over the next couple of weeks. Again, I think we are frustrated that we are not where we would like to be in terms of illegal immigration along the southern border. We have been working on some new tools, and we are hopeful that we get to a point in the future where we are able to have effective partners on the other side to work on some of these measures.

Ms. HOULAHAN. The gentleman's time has expired. I now recognize Representative Wright from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

And, Administrator Green, thank you for being here, and thank you for your many years of service to our country.

I want to focus just a moment on energy and the threat Russia poses. It continues to weaponize its energy resources, as you know, against Europe and Eurasian countries. And that makes it increasingly risky for EU and NATO to be reliant on Russian oil and gas.

What is USAID currently doing to assist European countries in diversifying their energy resources, and how can we use public-private partnerships to connect American energy companies with European countries?

Mr. GREEN. A great question. Earlier when we were talking about the countering Kremlin influence framework, some of it is messaging and democratization, but a big piece of it, to go country by country, is taking a look at that increasing dependency on Russian sources of energy, which Russia certainly fosters and pushes. So, it is helping these countries undertake reforms in the enabling environment such that American private investment has an opportunity.

Second, it is working to, again, help them evaluate what dependence on Russian sources of energy does for other portions of the economy. It is diversifying sources in terms of bringing to bear private sector technologies. It is all the above, but it is, as you are suggesting, it should be a very high priority because country by country that is what the Russians are often exploiting, is that energy dependence.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it your observation that some of our allies in NATO are stumbling blocks to that effort?

Mr. GREEN. To be honest, I am not sure I am qualified to answer that.

Mr. WRIGHT. In terms of our ability to help them diversify their energy resources, do we have allies that are stumbling blocks to that effort?

Mr. GREEN. We can followup with you, but we have a lot of, I think, key allies in Europe and Eurasia for whom we are the pre-

ferred partner. And I think there are great opportunities there. Country by country, we will followup with you.

Mr. WRIGHT. I want to shift to Africa for just a moment. In December, the administration's new Prosper Africa Initiative, as part of its Africa strategy, the administration requested \$50 million in funding to launch Prosper Africa, which in National Security Advisor Bolton's words, "will support U.S. investment across the continent, grow Africa's middle class, and improve the overall business climate in the region." Presumably, this will allow the U.S. to better compete with great power investment on the continent. Can you give me a better idea of what types of programs will be supported by the initiative, and will there be any emphasis on increasing investment in broadband infrastructure? We know what China is doing in Africa with its broadband, and that is a potential danger for everybody.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman.

Prosper Africa we will be formally unveiling very soon in the near future. It is an initiative that is aimed at doubling two-way trade between Africa and the U.S. by 2025, and it is going country by country to look at commercial opportunities and ties. I think broadband has to be a big piece of it because, when it comes to what authoritarians are doing on broadband, it is not only what they are seeking to do in terms of economic opportunity; very often, it is about data harvesting. It is about closed-loop systems in which they are seeking to advance their data harvesting for strategic purposes. So, we have two reasons to be taking it on.

Mr. WRIGHT. Thank you.

And I yield back.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

I now recognize the gentlewoman from Virginia, Representative Abigail Spanberger.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Thank you so much for your time today.

I am a former CIA case officer, and in my counterterrorism experience, when there is a void, someone will fill it. And so, the work of your agency is so tremendously important to making sure that we are the ones filling that void. From Hezbollah in southern Lebanon to the transnational criminal organizations and drug cartels of Central America, we see what happens when there are voids and communities in need. So, I thank you for your work in that arena.

And my question today is specific to the Indo-Pacific budget proposal put out by the administration. The State Department and USAID have said that support for the Indo-Pacific region is a top priority for the Trump administration. And in a tweet on March 12th, the @usforeignassistance account stated that the budget request for the Indo-Pacific efforts, quote, "nearly doubles foreign assistance resources we will invest in the Indo-Pacific to promote a free, open, and secure region." End quote. Is this accurate, that this budget request doubles our State and USAID investments over current levels?

Mr. GREEN. I will have to respond to you more formally, but for the Indo-Pacific, presumably, yes. It is \$1.2 billion, and the Indo-Pacific Strategy was just launched in 2018. So, in terms of specific accounts, I will be happy to respond to you formally.

Ms. SPANBERGER. And I would appreciate that formal response.

I do not think that we should be legislating or communicating solely on Twitter. But, in the case where this is out there in the public sphere, I have to call attention to the fact that this tweet is, in fact, rather deceptive and inaccurate, because, in fact, the budget request would, if it were honored as it is requested by the administration, would effectively be \$161 million cut over Fiscal Year numbers, based on budgeting. We only have the Fiscal Year numbers available for our Indo-Pacific efforts. That is an 11 percent decrease, and that is a substantial—substantial—decrease.

The details there would be the administration did not request at high levels in Fiscal Year 8. Congress saw fit to fund programs that are incredibly vital, again, to fill in these holes. So, I am very concerned by the fact that this is the message that is being put out; that, in fact, it looks as though we are increasing our efforts, when, indeed, the proposal would be cutting them.

And my concern relates specifically to the Philippines. The Philippines is one of our largest foreign assistance recipients in Asia through the Partnership for Growth, and we have seen a troubling erosion of democratic institutions in this country, from erosions of the media, the judiciary, I mean the well-reported extrajudicial killings that exist across the country. And having spent time studying and recognizing the challenges, the counterterrorism challenges, in Mindanao, my question for you is, what do you think we can be doing to address the root causes of the conflict in Mindanao, and how do you feel that those efforts are going?

Mr. GREEN. Thanks for the question.

So, on the Indo-Pacific, we will get back to you formally.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Thank you.

Mr. GREEN. With respect to the Philippines, there are clear challenges to be taken on. I was just trying to get to the page in our self-reliance roadmap because it is one of the areas that we want to prioritize in terms of civil society and responsive governance, not only because it is an expression of American values, but we all believe it is key to a sustainable economic future.

In terms of specific evaluation on the Philippines, I will get back to you formally. I have not been there, quite frankly, in a couple of years. But the Philippines is a very important—first off, it is not only a very important partner for us, but, second, the conflict that we have seen in the southern Philippines is deeply disturbing. And in terms of our battle against violent extremism, you know, the good guys have to win. I will put it that way.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Thank you. Well, thank you for your continued service and thank you for your time today.

I yield back.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

I now recognize Representative Pence from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Chairman Engel, Ranking Member McCaul, thank you for convening this hearing.

Administrator Green, thank you for being here. I know you have got a lot of challenges around the world, and I appreciate your time.

In your prepared testimony, you said, and I quote, “Nowhere is America’s leadership in humanitarian assistance more important or more timely than our continued response to the manmade, regime-

driven crisis in Venezuela.” So, it was with great interest that I read of the continuing power outages in Venezuela. After several weeks of power outages, tens of thousands of Venezuelans protested the Maduro regime in the streets. We are talking about an energy-rich country that cannot keep the lights on.

I note that, on April 3d, USAID announced it had prepositioned emergency health kits to help Venezuelans in need. This is important and necessary assistance, but I imagine in a country that is used to having the lights on, those lights being off presents challenges, especially in medical attention. If hospitals and clinics go without power, that probably necessitates more health kits.

Venezuela certainly has the capacity to supply power to its people, but my concern is what their infrastructure looks like after so many years of mismanagement by the socialist Maduro regime. My question: assuming we experience a successful transition to legitimate and Interim President Guaido, how quickly and will USAID be able to provide—and I read from your literature—“energy sector reconstruction in countries recovering from conflict and national disasters”? In Venezuela, as you note, how is USAID’s Office of Energy and Infrastructure Programs planning for this challenge?

Mr. GREEN. Congressman, great question and an important challenge and opportunity, one of the most important in the world for us right now.

First, on the challenge side, you put your finger on it, and I think a lot of people do not really realize this: how great the suffering is in terms of the medical challenges as a result of a grid that, shall we say, is at best extraordinarily fragile. When I met with a number of Venezuelan refugees in Cucuta in Columbia, I often heard that they were driven by that, the lack of insulin, the lack of medical supplies because of the lack of refrigeration, quite frankly, and storage. So, it is a profound humanitarian challenge that we see.

Second, in terms of when we get to that day, when we all look and say, OK, we have the open door, we have the opportunity, it is going to take years and it is not going to be simply a U.S. Government effort; it is going to be a broad-based effort by the private sector, the public sector, and a wide range of our allies.

Now let me give you the most hopeful piece of this. I have had a couple of trips in which I have gone through Florida, Miami, and met with a number of the Venezuelan diaspora. There are few places for which I have seen a more dedicated and prepared and nimble diaspora than the Venezuelan diaspora. Doctors, professionals, a wide range who I have met with who are already going back to Venezuela to do charity care and such on a fairly regular basis. But, second, they are helping us all think through the scenario planning to mobilize those networks. It is going to take a lot. It is going to be a long-term challenge. It is going to take public sector, private sector, but I am very optimistic about how this will go and, also, what it will mean to the entire hemisphere. The departure of the authoritarian regime which has brought about immense suffering, its benefit to the world, especially the Western Hemisphere, is immense, worth our attention.

Mr. PENCE. Thank you, Administrator Green.

I yield my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes.

Thank you so much for your testimony, sir.

I have two separate kinds of questions, and I am going to try to use my 5 minutes appropriately for that. I had the opportunity—I also serve on Armed Services—to meet with the head of DARPA, and I asked him what keeps him up at night. And his answer was the same thing that keeps me up at night, which is biology. A couple of us here have asked questions about the Ebola outbreak. But, as recently as this week, there were two articles in *The New York Times*. The first one was titled, “In Poor Kenyan Communities, Cheap Antibiotics Fuel Deadly Drug-Resistant Infections”. In Kenya, 90 percent of people use drugs, antibiotics, in the last year. And that compares in the U.S. to about 17 percent. We have lost about 700,000 people to drug-resistant antibiotics in the last year alone.

There was a second article that also talked about this same concern, but in the case of anti-fungal disease, resistant treatments. This one was called, “A Mysterious Infection, Spanning the Global in a Climate of Secrecy”. It was also about the *Candida auris* virus. Again, half the people who get this particular fungal infection end up dying within 90 days.

And so, my question to you is similar to the questions about Ebola. What are we doing to address these issues? Because, largely, the issue is not necessarily resistant treatments to antibiotics, but also the disease and—I am sorry—the dirt and the fact that we are not taking care of communities, and that is where they are getting infections from.

Mr. GREEN. I can see why it keeps you up at night in terms of the way that you have laid it out, absolutely. So, a few things. One aspect of this that I thought you were going to focus on, which is also a legitimate and real concern, is fraudulent medicine. And when I served as Ambassador in Tanzania, one of the things we saw far too often were drugs that were nothing but water. And we saw a lot of fraudulent manufacturing and distribution, particularly coming from the East, but not exclusively, and it is a real problem.

Second, as we work country by country, we look to build the capacity to detect and respond to disease from infectious disease to non-infectious disease, because not only is it the right thing to do, but it can lead to the kinds of despair that creates stabilization threats and concerns as well. So, it is also a focus for us in that area as well.

And we have in some of our overseas platforms, we have particular capacities to help us detect and address outbreaks and recognized health challenges before, hopefully, they spread and become an even greater challenge. So, all of those things.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. And I would love to get a little bit more detail on the things that you think we are doing in places like Kenya to make sure that we are taking care of the cause of these kinds of infections, as opposed to the treatment of them.

Mr. GREEN. And education, I think—I used to live in Kenya—so, I think, in particular, education; making sure that fairly basic,

sound health is put into the curriculum in countries with which we partner. That also helps to head a lot of this off.

Ms. HOULAHAN. And thank you.

And with the last minute and a half of my time, that is the second thing that I wanted to ask you about. I appreciated comments from both sides of the aisle about the importance of education, particularly for women and girls, which is another passion of mine. And I wanted to ask you to comment a little bit about the global gag rule and to ask you, how you are evaluating the impact of that rule on your service, the delivery of services you provide? And what are you putting into place to understand and measure the impact of that rule?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congresswoman.

So, in I think it will be May, as we are working on it, we will be working with State producing a report that we have discussed with a number of Members of Congress, or which has been requested by a number of Members of Congress, that takes a look at the data regarding PLGHA, its application in terms of those organizations which have participated and those which have turned down funding. So, that is a report that we will be happy to bring to you and brief you on.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I appreciate that.

What criteria will you use to determine any exemptions, if any at all, to the gag rule?

Mr. GREEN. Exemptions in what sense?

Ms. HOULAHAN. Is there any circumstance under which you think that the administration's gag rule will be waived for some particular reason? And I am sorry, I only have 5 more seconds.

Mr. GREEN. Sure. Sure. I turn to the announcement the Secretary made just a couple of days ago, which was pretty clear and stands on its own. So, I am not aware of exemptions that are being looked at.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you so much. I appreciate your time.

And I now will recognize Representative Reschenthaler from the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Thank you, Chairwoman.

And thank you, Administrator Green. Thanks for all you do for the country as well.

As you know, last year the President signed the Taylor Force Act into law. This measure prohibits direct assistance or funding projects to the Palestinian Authority until they stop paying convicted terrorists and their family members. USAID has operated many projects in the West Bank. Some of the projects have directly benefited the Palestinian Authority and others may not have. Administrator Green, although the aid is currently suspended, has the agency developed objective guidelines to make determinations for future aid disbursements on what assistance directly benefits the Palestinian Authority?

Mr. GREEN. We absolutely comply with the Taylor Force Act and have drawn up implementation guidelines. I would be happy to brief you on it further.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. And thank you.

I just want to shift gears briefly here. In a recent fact sheet on partnering and procurement reform, you indicated a desire to di-

versify USAID's partner base. I just wanted to see what steps you are taking to incentive USAID to make new awards to small, U.S.-based nonprofits, such as those with less than \$50 million in gross proceeds a year.

Mr. GREEN. Great question, a topic for which I am passionate, but rarely gets any attention outside of a small number of people.

So, one of the things that I discovered when I arrived at USAID—and it has been a trend for years—quite frankly, was the shrinking number of partners. It was a smaller and smaller number of partners. None of them are bad partners, but we are not getting the competition, obviously, that we all believe is important.

So, what we have been doing is utilizing some of the procurement mechanisms that we already had on the books and, quite frankly, did not utilize often enough, which, essentially, if you will, lower the cost of participation, so smaller businesses find it easier to bring forward their ideas. No guarantee that they are going to get the contract or agreement, but at least make it easier for us to engage with them.

Second, and one of the areas that I think is really important, we are utilizing some of the tools that I think have been best pioneered by the Global Development Lab that allow for more collaboration, where we set out an area of interest and objectives and funding, and actually bring in businesses, including smaller businesses, for-profit and nonprofit, to explore ways of drawing up approaches together. I think it creates better tailored responses to challenges that we see, but will broaden our partner base. And we are already starting to see that partner base expand.

Perhaps the best example is in the area of TB, tuberculosis. So, in the TB Accelerator Initiative that we unveiled at the end of last year, we did a call for participation by local, smaller businesses. And we had something like 300 expressions of interest, which surprised a lot of our team and, quite frankly, made me very happy because it means that we are getting that greater level of competition. So, it is an area in which I think everyone agrees competition is good, new ideas are good, and new partners are good.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Thank you, Administrator Green.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

I now recognize Mr. Ted Lieu from California.

Mr. LIEU. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Administrator Green, for your public service.

I listened to your entire opening statement earlier today. As you know, Yemen has been of intense interest to U.S. Congress on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. I am curious why in your opening statement you did not mention Yemen. So, my first question to you is, did anyone in the administration suggest or direct you not to mention Yemen in your opening statement?

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely not. It was for time.

Mr. LIEU. OK. Would you agree that Yemen is the world's worst humanitarian catastrophe right now?

Mr. GREEN. It is certainly right up there. If it is not first, it is first, second, or third. We face—

Mr. LIEU. What would be a worse humanitarian catastrophe than Yemen right now?

Mr. GREEN. I mean, you could point to the Ebola crisis. You could point to what is happening in Mozambique, in Zimbabwe, in Malawi, which is the worst humanitarian crisis in two decades. So, I do not mean to be argumentative, but we have a lot right now.

Mr. LIEU. Right, but reports are from various places maybe up to 14 million people are at risk of famine. That is pretty bad, right?

Mr. GREEN. Oh, absolutely, yes.

Mr. LIEU. So, how much is USAID trying to help out in Yemen?

Mr. GREEN. A ton. We are the largest bilateral—again, I cannot speak with the recent contribution that was made by, I think, Saudi Arabia—we have been the largest bilateral humanitarian donor in Yemen.

Mr. LIEU. How much money is that?

Mr. GREEN. Seven hundred and twenty-one million dollars since October 2017. And just a matter of weeks ago, we announced an additional \$24 million in humanitarian assistance. I meet monthly with the NGO's that are working in Yemen to talk with them about the challenges that they are seeing on the ground. So, we are very heavily engaged in Yemen, and I agree that it is a top priority.

Mr. LIEU. Thank you. I just want to make sure that Yemen is, in fact, your top priority—

Mr. GREEN. Very much so.

Mr. LIEU [continuing]. Because I could not tell that from your opening statement.

Mr. GREEN. Again, not intentional.

Mr. LIEU. OK. Thank you.

So, if the UN-brokered deal on Hodeidah collapses and the port city is cutoff by fighting, what contingency plans, if any, are in place within USAID to deal with the humanitarian fallout?

Mr. GREEN. Again, the Deputy Secretary of State and I meet monthly with all the NGO's working, representatives of the NGO's working in Yemen, always drawing up contingency plans. To be very clear, the work that we do, the humanitarian assistance is not an answer. A political solution is the answer. Ours is treatment of suffering. And so, we are constantly looking at ways for the most effective, efficient delivery that we can do. We partner—

Mr. LIEU. Thank you. Would you be OK if we, in written questions, if you provided us—

Mr. GREEN. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. LIEU. Yes, I thank you.

Now are there any countries or parties in Yemen right now trying to block humanitarian assistance?

Mr. GREEN. I will have to get back to you in writing. Conflict itself is what blocking humanitarian assistance.

Mr. LIEU. So, if could get back to us of what—

Mr. GREEN. It is a security situation is what is making it difficult for us and our partners to be able to provide the relief we all want to provide.

Mr. LIEU. Thank you.

Now there are other parts of the world where you do have either organizations or countries specifically trying to block humanitarian aid. And so, my question is, what unilateral and multilateral tools does the U.S. Government have to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance and to hold accountable those who obstruct it?

Mr. GREEN. So, first off, the obvious answer is diplomatic and economic pressure. A classic example is Venezuela and Nicolas Maduro's efforts to block the delivery of humanitarian assistance. We apply diplomatic pressure, political, economic sanctions. In other parts of the world, it is constantly looking for innovative delivery mechanisms to do our best to try to get humanitarian assistance in.

Mr. LIEU. You would support using targeted economic sanctions for those who try to obstruct humanitarian assistance?

Mr. GREEN. Again, that is a question for the State Department and Treasury. Our piece is the delivery of humanitarian and development assistance. We are the operational part of that. So, I would refer you to the Secretary of State or Secretary Mnuchin.

Mr. LIEU. Thank you. I appreciate your time.

And I yield back.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I now recognize Congressman Guest from Mississippi.

Mr. GUEST. Thank you.

Mr. Green, you say on page 7 of your written statement, you refer to Russia and China. You say in that statement, "Many parts of the world have seen exponential growth of predatory financing dressed up as development assistance. China and Russia have been by far the greatest, though not the sole, sources of such financing. This form of financing often leads to unsustainable debt, eroding national sovereignty, and even the forfeiture of strategic resources and assets." Could you just expand on that just a little bit, please, sir?

Mr. GREEN. Sure. I will put it this way: a few months ago, I had a chance to meet with some American business leaders, men and women who were doing some investments in countries where China is a player in terms of its financing. And they said that in the business community they refer to Chinese finance as "loan to own" because the terms are set up basically never to be repaid and, as a result, forfeiture of assets. We have certainly seen it in places like Djibouti and in Sri Lanka, the unsustainable debt, quite frankly, that has emerged from this. So, it is predatory financing.

Obviously, it is not the assistance that we do. We do true development assistance. We want to help countries help themselves and rise. And I would guess you would agree, I do not believe that that is what China, in particular, but others, seeks to do.

Mr. GUEST. And, Mr. Green, you also stated and you talk a great deal about the value of partnerships with the private sector, engaging the private sector in foreign assistance. Recently, H.R. 2067, which is the Trade Act, which would use the roadmaps created by your Department, seeks to identify countries that are currently receiving foreign aid and turning these countries into trade partners with the United States. Do you believe that, if we were able to use that public-private partnership, and we were able to turn countries that are currently receiving aid into trade partners, that this would help combat some of the influence that we are seeing coming out of Russia and China?

Mr. GREEN. In our model of assistance, what we call the journey to self-reliance, we want to help countries progress to the point where they can be trading partners. So, where they have good pro-

tection of rule of law, regulatory capacity, they have those attributes that are necessary for effective investment in trade, that is always the goal.

Countries want private investment. That is their ultimate goal. Many countries simply are not there yet in terms of their capacity. We seek to try to bolster that capacity, so that that is where they can get to, those sustainable investments that help them to lead their own future.

Mr. GUEST. And is one of the goals of the aid that you provide and the plans that you put in place to make these countries to where they do reach the level where they can be trading partners with the United States?

Mr. GREEN. Our goal is to help countries go from being recipients to partners, to fellow donors. And also, to be clear, we provide almost no money directly to governments. We work through NGO's and we work through civil society partners, often that which can most effectively create these conditions. But, as a general matter, it is getting to that point where they can be fellow donors, the South Korea miracle, what we have seen—India is now one of the largest donors to Afghanistan work. That is obviously the ideal.

Mr. GUEST. Thank you.

I yield back.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

With sincere apologies, I now recognize Mr. Ted Deutch from the great State of Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Madam Chair. There is no need to apologize.

Mr. GREEN. Well, there is an introduction.

[Laughter.]

Mr. DEUTCH. But it is a great State and I appreciate that.

Madam Chair and Mr. Ranking Member, thanks for holding this hearing.

And thank you, Administrator Green, for being here today.

I would like to begin by commending USAID and your incredible work force of civil and Foreign Service Officers. The work that you do has tremendous value to our country and to partners around the world. And all of us on this committee, and all of us in our country, frankly, should and must value the contribution that you make to global stability and to the United States national security. We are most grateful.

That, Administrator Green, is why I am so concerned that, for the third straight year, the Trump administration has proposed drastic cuts to the international affairs budget. This year's request includes a 24 percent cut to the overall foreign affairs budget, 28 percent reduction to global health, and a 34 percent decrease to humanitarian assistance. Again, it is more than a quarter of the whole cut in the programs for global health and over a third in the programs that are focused on humanitarian assistance.

Foreign assistance is not charity. We invest in people and countries around the world because it is in our own national interest. Investing in diplomacy and development prevents the outbreak of conflict. It saves U.S. taxpayer dollars. Most importantly, it saves American lives by preventing the deployment of U.S. service members to dangerous parts of the world.

And while we have got to maintain the world's most powerful military, many contemporary crises from deadly pandemics to climate change, to a record number of displaced persons worldwide, lack military solutions. You cannot fix them by sending in troops.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reverse these misguided cuts and to pass a budget that actually advances U.S. interests and values and enhances our national security. And, yes, that includes increased funding for programs like yours.

I serve as chair of our Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa. And as the Syrian conflict continues and the situation in Yemen deteriorates, where in Syria over half a million dead, more than 6 million internally displaced persons, 5 million refugees, and Yemen, where 24 million people are in need of aid. Economic development, education, and good governance programs are critical to stabilize just all the region. That is what we ought to be investing in.

But the Fiscal Year budget request for the Middle East is 12 percent less than the Fiscal Year actual level. And while ISIS's caliphate might be defeated, its fighters remain active, could launch strikes and further destabilize Iraq and Syria. And the Fiscal Year economic assistance request for Iraq is less than a quarter of what we spent in Iraq in 2017. The request also zeroes out economic assistance for Syria, which follows the administration's decision last August to freeze stabilization assistance for Syria. We have learned the hard way that, if we do not support people immediately after conflict, we run the risk of malign forces intervening to make the situation even worse.

Administrator Green, with such a reduced budget, how do you plan to support the Syrian and Iraqi people? How do we prevent the return of ISIS?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Congressman.

Obviously, first off, it is a budget that will not seize every opportunity or address every challenge; we recognize that. No budget in recent memory has or could, and it is a budget with tough choices in it. We will ask others to do more, and in many places we will ask host country partners to mobilize their own resources. And we will also engage with the private sector more and more. But my commitment, also, in the work that we do is to be as effective as we know how to be and as efficient as we know how to be, and that is our commitment, to make these dollars go as far as they can. But it clearly is, at the end of the day, if we have less resources, inevitably, we cannot do as much.

Mr. DEUTCH. Which is why we are committed to ensuring that you do not. As my time winds down, I appreciate the desire to ask others to do more, and certainly the private sector should play a role. But, as with everything else that we do in this committee, the concern that I have, that so many of us have, is that on this issue of the greatest way to display our commitment to American values, when we say we are going to leave it up to others, when we say we are going to leave it up to the private sector, we miss out on the opportunity to lead. And when we are not leading, we are sending a message to the rest of the world that these types of interventions, which are meant to help the development of these societies

and provide assistance and keep people alive, that they are just not as important as they once were. But they are to me and they are to this committee, and we are going to do everything we can to make sure that you have the necessary resources to show the leadership that America needs to show.

And I yield back.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you.

I now recognize Representative Burchett from the State of Tennessee.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Chairlady, and it is a pleasure having you at the helm.

I am going to forego the usual praise of my own party and distaste for the other party. I am just going to ask you a question, if that is all right, brother.

And it is something I dealt with when I was a State legislator and made statements on and passed legislation, or attempted to. It deals with religious freedoms, with religious minorities that are being targeted for violence and intimidation all over the world. Can you explain how these funds will be used and how they can help keep religious minorities protected?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you for the question.

With respect to northern Iraq, which is the highest profile work we have been doing in this regard, we have people in the field who meet with representatives of the religious and ethnic communities, from Chaldean Catholics to Yazidis, and look for ways to restore essential services, so they can find their future there. It is very challenging work. We want to create an environment in which these communities can return home, and that we can roll back some of what ISIS stole from them, which is the ability to live securely and express their faith, whether they be Yazidi or Christian. Obviously, it is not faith-or religion-specific, nor should it be.

Mr. BURCHETT. Chairlady—or, Chairman, excuse me, sir. Quite a metamorphosis up there.

[Laughter.]

That is a big word.

I yield the remainder of my time. Thank you, sir.

And thank you, brother. I appreciate you being here.

Mr. ALLRED [presiding]. The gentleman yields. We now recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Malinowski.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Thank you.

And, Administrator Green, thanks for your testimony. Thank you for your commitment to democracy and to development.

I do want to go back to the Central America discussion for a bit. In response to a question from Chairman Engel, you said something along the lines of that you are confident that when partner countries in Central America are doing all they can, we can resume or continue our assistance programs. What do you mean by “doing all they can”? Are you referring to the President’s demand that they stop people from leaving their countries?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you for the question.

So, very clearly, the President is frustrated. I think everyone is frustrated. We hope to see more, we want to see more in terms of stemming the flow of illegal migration, immigration, on the south-

ern border. That is what has led to where we are in terms of what the Secretary announced and the review that is being undertaken.

What we are doing during this process is not only participating in the review in terms of talking about our programs, but looking inward and trying to sharpen our tools, so that they are focused on geographically the areas from which migrants are coming, those that are coming illegally, but also sharpening our tools in terms of the metrics that we apply to our programs with implementing partners. So, that is what we are undertaking.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. But it is our policy that these countries should stop people from leaving? Is that a fair statement of our policy right now?

Mr. GREEN. Well, in terms—

Mr. MALINOWSKI. It is what the President has said.

Mr. GREEN. In terms of the overall policy, I will leave that to the State Department, as the lead institution here. But, very clearly, trying to address the drivers of migration is what our programs are about.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. There is a huge distinction between addressing the drivers, which is what USAID was doing by funding development, security assistance programs, and urging countries to stop people from leaving. And can you think of any precedent, historical precedent, in which the United States has urged another country to stop people from leaving? I mean, we urged the Soviet Union to allow Soviet Jews to leave. We have condemned North Korea for stopping people from leaving its country. We would be outraged if the Maduro regime were to stop people from leaving. How would this even work? Are we advising the Honduran police to arrest or shoot people if they try to leave their country?

Mr. GREEN. Again, these are not things in which USAID is participating. So, quite frankly, I would refer you to the State Department.

Again, on the piece that is in our lane, as I mentioned, we are looking at tools that we can sharpen and present.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Right. Well, OK. It does seem that your ability to use those tools rests on these countries meeting that demand, and I find it completely and utterly unprecedented in our history that we would be asking a country to do that.

On Syria, a number of members have asked about this, about the ending of our stabilization program there. And I think you have referred to other countries meeting a greater share of the burden. And, of course, one of those countries that has been providing, and we have been urging to provide, a lot of money for Syria programs is Saudi Arabia. And I have to say that raises more concerns in my mind than any gratification.

Can I ask you, can Saudi money in Syria be used to support women's rights organizations or schools that allow boys and girls?

Mr. GREEN. In Syria or?

Mr. MALINOWSKI. In Syria. They wrote us a check, and we are urging them to take on more of the burden.

Mr. GREEN. First off, we have not discontinued our stabilization work. It is simply being funded—I think that is your reference—by, in this case, Saudi Arabia and other partners. In terms of what those dollars can be used for, I will have to get back to you.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Is there an MOU that you could share with us?

Mr. GREEN. Presumably, yes, but we will get back to you formally and brief you and get you something.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. That is good. Because, I mean, in my mind, stabilization involves a lot more than just bulldozers fixing infrastructure——

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. MALINOWSKI [continuing]. Although that is important. It is also training local police that can respect human rights, supporting NGO's, supporting local councils that can provide effective governance. Would you agree that those are important aspects of stabilization?

Mr. GREEN. Sure. I mean, it is part of stabilization. Obviously, in the case of Syria, there is so much to be done on so many fronts, but your points are taken.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Right. These are things we were doing. So, I would hope that they would continue.

Mr. GREEN. Yes, and we will formally get something back to you.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Thank you so much.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLRED. Thank you.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes.

Mr. Administrator, thank you for being here today and for your patience. I know it has been a long hearing. And I want to thank you for your career of work and the body of work that you have put together. I am a big believer in the work that you have done and in the work that you are doing now. I think that our soft power and our aid, and our use of that aid, is one of the best ways we can engage with the world.

As many of my colleagues have said, I do not envy you being here today, having to defend a budget that I do not think reflects your values or reflects the career that you have put forward. To me, this budget request is a series of shortsighted decisions that would cost us more in mitigation efforts down the road, if they are enacted, than the savings, I guess you could call them, that we might get in the short term. Whether we are talking about opening the door to increase, as you have said, often predatory Chinese influence or withdrawing critical funding for democracy assistance at a time when democratic institutions across the world are increasingly in danger, these decisions, if enacted, would reduce our soft power, make the world less safe and fair, and be counter to our national security interests, in my opinion.

And so, I just want to have a conversation with you. Several members have discussed the President's threats to cutoff funding to Central America. And several weeks ago, you testified before the House Appropriations Committee about the effectiveness of USAID programs in Central America. And I just want to ask you, how would cutting this funding negatively impact the progress that USAID has made?

Mr. GREEN. In the Northern Triangle, some of the programs—well, the programs that we have been focusing on the drivers of migration, some of these have shown real results. Clearly, more needs to be done. I think we all recognize that. As I mentioned, we are taking a look, everything we can, to find ways to improve these

tools, both in how they are targeted and how they are applied, and look forward to participating in the review of the State Department and the interagency discussing these and seeing how we might be able to be helpful.

Mr. ALLRED. What programs would you say have been most successful in Central America that USAID has administered?

Mr. GREEN. Oh, there is a wide range. I am, again, a big believer in our food security tools, but it something that, quite frankly, did not exist when I was an ambassador overseas. I look back on it now and I think of all the things that we missed that we could not take on. So, I think food security investments, done the right way, are a way of accelerating economic opportunity. So, I am a big believer in those.

I also think the citizen security work, where we create work to try to create safe places for families, for kids to be able to go to school, for families to be able to gather, but, again, clearly, there is so much to be done, and we all recognize that.

Mr. ALLRED. Yes. Well, thank you.

I would just note that, in this budget request for Fiscal Year 0, there has been a 50 percent cut to the food security program—50 percent. And for education funding, there has been a 60 percent cut requested. So, directly counter to the programs that are most effective in Central America, and I just do not think that is in our interests.

So, you did speak movingly earlier about the need to educate and protect girls and women across the world, especially those who have been displaced. As you know, last year there were over 25 million refugees worldwide. This budget calls for a \$3 billion cut to migration and refugee assistance. And I just want to ask you, how will USAID be able to ensure that programs to help deal with and protect women and girls who are displaced, how will you be able to protect them if these proposed cuts are enacted?

Mr. GREEN. Well, we will have to make sure that we prioritize in our allocations these challenges as much as we possibly can. We seek to garner support from others as well. We need other countries to step up and help contribute. The need outpaces, obviously, the supply of resources, not simply under this budget request, but, quite frankly, under budget enacted. There are 70 million displaced people in the world. I worry about children growing up in displaced communities, and it is important work to be done. We either do it now or, quite frankly, I think we end up dealing with it later.

Mr. ALLRED. I could not agree with you more, Mr. Administrator, and I want to, again, thank you for your hard work. And I know USAID's staff is one of the best agencies that we have, and I want to thank your staff as well.

Mr. GREEN. I am a lucky guy. It is a great organization——

Mr. ALLRED. Yes, sir.

Mr. GREEN [continuing]. Great professionals.

Mr. ALLRED. Yes, sir.

And with that, I will recognize the gentleman from California, Mr. Sherman, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you.

It would, indeed, be a change in American policy if we were to say that countries should keep people in. We never said that in

East Berlin. We did not say that with regard to Cuba. The idea of punishing a country for not building a wall around its own borders with the barbed wire facing in is absurd. We should call upon Central American countries to provide the better governance that would cause most Central Americans to live in Central America.

And toward that end, there is nothing more ironic and sad and counterproductive than for us to spend not only billions on a wall, as is proposed, but many tens of billions of dollars of dislocation in our society, ripping apart America, all because we will not spend hundreds of millions, and perhaps a few billion, making life in Central America more tolerable.

We have seen a dramatic decline in illegal immigration from Mexico because things are better in Mexico than they were 20 years ago. It should not be beyond our capacity to achieve a similar life for the people of northern Central America.

As to your budget, we in Congress will ultimately determine that. It would be good to have the Trump administration on our side, but we will be doing everything possible to give you a budget that we will count upon you to spend according to law.

I have so many questions. I will start with, since fiscal 1998, our assistance program for the Republic of Artsakh, formerly known as the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, has supported life-giving maternal health, provided clean drinking water, cleared mines. And, of course, the HALO Trust, which is leading the mining efforts, reports that it has completed about 88 percent of the mission, but needs American support. Is USAID committed to completing the clearance of landmines and unexploded ordnances within the traditional boundaries of the Republic of Artsakh?

Mr. GREEN. Yes. In fact, I just received something. We actually expect to complete this work in, I think it is calendar year 2020. So, absolutely, and thanks for bringing it forward.

Mr. SHERMAN. Thank you. I had a followup question, but I think your answer to that question was so good, I am going to move on.

Let's talk about Pakistan for a second. USAID has played an important role in Pakistan, particularly with its education system. Are there ways that charitable organizations can partner with USAID to support that work?

Mr. GREEN. As you know, we are undergoing—"we" being the administration is undergoing—a review of our assistance in Pakistan that we hope will be finalized soon. And we will then report to you in terms of what will be going forward.

Mr. SHERMAN. In spite of our aid to Pakistan, conditions in the Sindh province of south Pakistan continue to deteriorate in many areas. Schools and hospitals are getting worse in many areas, as is water availability. Of course, we see the Hindu minority subject to persecution to force conversions and force marriages. What is USAID doing to ensure that assistance to Pakistan is improving the lives of ordinary people in Sindh?

Mr. GREEN. As with all of our programs, we have the program metrics that we use. One thing we are trying to do more of is to shift from outputs to outcomes. So, we have our roadmap with 17 objective metrics that help us measure capacity and commitment in each country where we work or want to work, like Pakistan. So, more and more, we are trying to make sure that we are able to

make a difference on the outcome side, hastening the capacity of our host country partners to take on these challenges themselves, although I think Pakistan is daunting.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank you for that, and I hope that when you focus on Pakistan, you will focus on the women and children, and especially the minority religions in Sindh.

As to Sri Lanka, perhaps for the record, you could provide me with a progress report on U.S. assistance to Sri Lanka, particularly in the former war zones, and let me know what USAID is planning to do to help that country recover from its ethnic conflict. Can I count on you for that written report?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. SHERMAN. I believe my time has expired.

Mr. ALLRED. Thank you.

That concludes today's hearing. I again thank our witness and all of our members for their participation today.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

Eliot L. Engel (D-NY), Chairman

April 9, 2019

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to be held in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live on the Committee website at <https://foreignaffairs.house.gov/>):

DATE: Tuesday, April 9, 2019

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

SUBJECT: FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities

WITNESS: The Honorable Mark Green
Administrator
United States Agency for International Development

By Direction of the Chairman

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

Day Tuesday Date 04/09/19 Room 2172 RHOB

Starting Time 9:41 a.m. Ending Time 12:15 p.m.

Recesses 0 (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Chairman Eliot L. Engel, Rep. Chrissy Houlahan, Rep. Colin Allred

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session ☒

Electronically Recorded (taped) ☒

Executive (closed) Session ☐

Stenographic Record ☒

Televised ☒

TITLE OF HEARING:

FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

See attached.

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

N/A

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes ☒ No ☐

(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

SFR - Connolly

QFR - Engel, Smith, Sherman, Sires, Titus, Lieu, Houlahan, Malinowski

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____

or **TIME ADJOURNED** 12:15 p.m.

Evan Bursey
 Full Committee Hearing Coordinator

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

<i>PRESENT</i>	<i>MEMBER</i>
X	Eliot L. Engel, NY
X	Brad Sherman, CA
	Gregory W. Meeks, NY
X	Albio Sires, NJ
X	Gerald E. Connolly, VA
X	Theodore E. Deutch, FL
X	Karen Bass, CA
X	William Keating, MA
	David Cicilline, RI
X	Ami Bera, CA
X	Joaquin Castro, TX
	Dina Titus, NV
X	Adriano Espaillat, NY
X	Ted Lieu, CA
X	Susan Wild, PA
X	Dean Phillips, MN
X	Ilhan Omar, MN
X	Colin Allred, TX
X	Andy Levin, MI
X	Abigail Spanberger, VA
X	Chrissy Houlahan, PA
X	Tom Malinowski, NJ
X	David Trone, MD
X	Jim Costa, CA
X	Juan Vargas, CA
	Vicente Gonzalez, TX

<i>PRESENT</i>	<i>MEMBER</i>
X	Michael T. McCaul, TX
X	Christopher H. Smith, NJ
X	Steve Chabot, OH
X	Joe Wilson, SC
X	Scott Perry, PA
X	Ted Yoho, FL
X	Adam Kinzinger, IL
X	Lee Zeldin, NY
X	James Sensenbrenner, Jr., WI
X	Ann Wagner, MO
X	Brian J. Mast, FL
	Francis Rooney, FL
X	Brian K. Fitzpatrick, PA
	John Curtis, UT
X	Ken Buck, CO
X	Ron Wright, TX
X	Guy Reschenthaler, PA
X	Tim Burchett, TN
X	Greg Pence, IN
X	Steve Watkins, KS
X	Michael Guest, MS

STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED FROM A COMMITTEE MEMBER

Statement for the Record from Representative Gerry Connolly

FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities

April 9, 2019

President Trump's FY 2020 international affairs budget continues the Trump Administration's unilateral retreat from U.S. global leadership through a reckless disinvestment in U.S. foreign assistance. As threats to U.S. national security grow around the world, the Trump Administration's response is to retreat from our international commitments, eviscerate assistance to vulnerable populations, and cut the financial and human resources that support U.S. foreign aid. Today, I would like to highlight three issues that are critical to U.S. national security, but that Trump's budget undermines: global health security, refugee protection and humanitarian assistance, and democracy promotion.

At present, the second deadliest Ebola outbreak in history is raging within an active armed conflict zone in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). Already there have been more than 1,100 cases and 629 deaths. Public health emergencies such as this one will continue to occur, often in fragile settings. USAID, as a core implementing partner of the Global Health Security Agenda, helps to strengthen partner countries' capacities to prevent, detect, and respond to infectious disease outbreaks. Yet, the President's FY 2020 budget would cut funding for global health security by 35 percent.

The United States needs to promote global health security as a core national security interest and be prepared to respond to these crises as they arise. That is why, today, I am reintroducing the bipartisan Global Health Security Act, which codifies our commitments under the Global Health Security Agenda and designates a senior National Security Council official responsible for coordinating the interagency response to a global health security emergency.

As Venezuela continues to struggle with constant food and medical shortages, more than three million Venezuelans have sought refuge in neighboring countries. The generosity of Venezuela's neighbors in the region stands in stark contrast to the Trump Administration, which despite a record high number of refugees worldwide, announced a record low refugee admissions goal for FY 2019. That is why I will be reintroducing the Lady Liberty Act (H.R. 6909 in the 115th Congress) to require the President to set the refugee admissions ceiling at a minimum of 110,000 refugees annually. Trump's FY 2020 request also collapses four humanitarian accounts into one account and slashes it by nearly 50 percent. At a time when humanitarian crises from Venezuela to Syria to Yemen are driving massive refugee flows, the United States should exercise its global leadership by supporting refugees. This Administration's budget and policies send the opposite message.

The global rise of authoritarianism and extremism presents the most formidable challenge to liberal democracy in a generation. According to Freedom House, more countries have been experiencing democratic declines than gains every year since 2006. In the face of this democratic backsliding, the Trump Administration's response is to disinvest in democracy promotion and disparage our allies while cozying up to dictators. President Trump's FY 2020 international affairs budget proposes to gut democracy promotion funding by more than half. This approach neglects the core values of freedom and democracy upon which our nation was founded and endangers U.S. interests by allowing our adversaries to flourish unchecked. That is why I recently led a bipartisan

appropriations letter in support of robust funding for democracy assistance that garnered a record 77 signers.

Under Administrator Green's leadership, USAID has launched an internal redesign effort that seeks to end the need for foreign assistance. One of the pillars of this reform effort is moving partner countries toward "strategic transitions," or self-reliance. Working with a partner country to reduce and eventually eliminate reliance on U.S. foreign assistance should always be the goal of development programs. However, it is clear this Administration has already concluded that our investments abroad need to be gutted. Congress must ensure that Administrator Green's redesign effort is not coopted to serve this Administration's slash and burn approach to the international affairs budget. I encourage Administrator Green to consult with Members of Congress and other stakeholders to ensure that his reform efforts advance development goals and do not help justify further cuts to our foreign assistance programs.

We need an empowered, premier development agency safeguarding U.S. interests abroad. Unprecedented humanitarian crises, democratic backsliding, and other threats to global stability require dedicated American leadership and engagement. Rather than demonstrating the U.S. commitment to face these issues head on, this Administration's international affairs budget says we're going to take a back seat.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Questions for the Record from Chairman Eliot L. Engel
 FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
 April 9, 2019

Question:

Ethiopia. After years of low levels of U.S. funding for democracy and good governance programs in Ethiopia, support for such programs increased in FY2017 and FY2018. The DG requests for FY2019 and FY2020, however, propose significant reductions during a period of remarkable political opening in the country under a new reform-minded prime minister. With critical changes underway and highly anticipated elections expected in 2020, how is the United States positioned to support the democratic reforms that Congress and successive Administrations have long called for?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Ethiopia. Although the Ethiopian government's trajectory in recent months has been mostly positive, over 2.4 million Ethiopians are internally displaced, primarily due to a recent surge in intercommunal violence. In late 2018, Refugees International reported that the Government of Ethiopia was only distributing humanitarian assistance to individuals who returned to their areas of origin – even though these areas continue to be affected by conflict. What is the status of Ethiopian and international efforts to address domestic displacement and related food insecurity? What is the Administration doing to ensure the Ethiopian Government does not carry out additional premature, non-voluntary returns, and enables aid organizations to provide assistance in both areas of displacement and areas of return? What is the Administration doing to work with the Government of Ethiopia to increase resiliency to both conflict and food insecurity?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

DRC. The Administration has pledged to work with President Tshisekedi to counter corruption, protect human rights, and promote economic growth. In what ways will this agenda, and the inauguration of a new president more broadly, shape U.S. aid to DRC? In what ways has the Administration's application and interpretation of legal restrictions under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) constrained the types of aid that the U.S. government is able to offer to help reform and strengthen state institutions in DRC?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

South Sudan. Over half the population of South Sudan is experiencing food insecurity with over 1.1 million children under the age of five suffering from severe and moderate acute malnutrition. How is the Administration working with South Sudanese actors to address the threat of famine and ensure that humanitarian actors have the access they need to provide lifesaving aid? What is the United States doing to press the Government of South Sudan to cease the bureaucratic impediments and operational interference of relief operations by state agents, or to hold state security force actors responsible for violence against aid workers? What is the status of the Administration's aid review – are there any preliminary findings that can be shared? How has the Administration's application and interpretation of legal restrictions under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) impacted USAID programs in South Sudan?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Tanzania. The erosion of democracy in Tanzania in recent years has been swift, with the government enacting a number of new laws aimed at criminalizing speech online and in the media, preventing journalists from being able to obtain licenses to do their work, and threats by government officials to round up and arrest anyone suspected of being gay. As a result, some LGBTQ activists have fled or gone into hiding. What is the Administration doing to push back against President Magufuli's increasingly authoritarian and undemocratic behavior? What is the Administration doing to ensure that U.S. assistance, including health and education programs, is not being affected by government restrictions on civic and political space? Finally, what is the Administration doing to ensure that our approach to development in Tanzania is inclusive of persecuted LGBTQ communities?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Prosper Africa. The Administration's FY2020 budget request includes \$50 million for Prosper Africa to strengthen bilateral investment and trade between the United States and African countries. As that initiative continues to take shape, can you provide any information on which African states might be among its initial beneficiaries?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Power Africa. Power Africa 2.0, which launched last year, is an updated strategy to improve energy access in Africa. How does this version differ from the Administration's work in the past? Is the Administration reaching its targets for increased energy generation? What kinds of gains is the Administration making the areas of distribution and transmission to effectively deliver the new power capacity to citizens and businesses? Is Power Africa exploring the potential of microgrids? What kind of outreach, if any, is the Administration making to U.S. companies to encourage them to explore energy-related opportunities that exist in Africa?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Youth. African youth populations hold significant socioeconomic promise but realizing their potential presents governments with profound challenges related to the provision of education, job creation, and socio-political enfranchisement. What is your assessment of the promise and peril associated with investing in—or failing to invest in—the socioeconomic development of Africa's large youth population? What U.S. interests are at stake with respect to this challenge? How important are leadership promotion and exchange-based programs—such as the Young African Leaders Initiative (YALI)—to U.S. development efforts in Africa?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Food Security. What is the current food security outlook for sub-Saharan Africa? Which countries is the Administration most concerned about? And in which countries has the Administration assessed that USAID's resilience programming has mitigated an even worse food security situation for the coming months?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Democratic backsliding in central Europe. In your testimony, you said, “Democratic backsliding is a significant challenge that we’re hard at work trying to address. In modern times, authoritarian leaders rarely oppose elections outright. Instead, as we’ve seen in capitals from Caracas to Phnom Penh, they use sophisticated tools and methods, often with outside help, to bend elections long before the votes are ever cast.” You also identified Europe and Eurasia as an area where you support independent media programming. Can you confirm whether Hungary, Poland, and other countries in central Europe are a concern for USAID in terms of democratic backsliding? Should Hungary and Poland be priorities for assistance focused on democracy, rule of law, and independent media?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Framework for countering malign Kremlin influence. Can you please describe how USAID’s soon-to-be-unveiled framework for countering malign Kremlin influence fits within the Administration’s broader efforts to counter Russian malign influence? How does the funding for that framework relate to that for the Countering Russian Influence Fund?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Ukraine. It is critical that we continue to help Ukraine pursue pro-Western reforms and combat corruption, in the face of severe Russian pressure. How would you characterize the effectiveness of USAID’s rule of law and civil society programs in Ukraine? What can be done to enhance them? Do you have sufficient funding to do so?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Georgia. Though Georgia has made substantial strides since the days of the Soviet Union, there is much more work to do in order to reduce corruption, cement democratic practices, and modernize its economy. How can USAID do more to help Georgia solidify its transition to a liberal democracy and help ensure that it remains a beacon of hope and

refuge to pressured civil society groups in neighboring countries? Are you concerned with Russian efforts to undermine Georgian democracy and encroach on Georgian territory? How can USAID help counter these efforts?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Budget Cuts / “Northern Triangle” Countries. Chairman Engel asked about the cost impact of termination for convenience of current USAID contracts and termination of grants for provision of such assistance. You responded that the Secretary of State would be completing a review of all implications of the President’s decision within weeks. *What cost impacts has the Secretary found? Please answer regarding all fiscal year funds currently obligated into contracts and grants for assistance in these countries. What is the full amount of USAID assistance that is implicated, by account and fiscal year?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Humanitarian Assistance. The FY 20 budget request refers to a dual-hatting of roles for the head of humanitarian assistance (HA), a position that would now report to both you and the Secretary of State. Given that HA is the second largest pot of funding at USAID--

- *Wouldn’t this change reduce the agency’s independence, and ability to maximize its strengths as an operational entity? Is the Administration seeking legislative authority to achieve this change, which would be required based on the current statute?*
- *Given that Congress has rejected similar proposals to consolidate humanitarian programs over the past two years, has the Administration consulted with Congress on alternative reform proposals that could garner bipartisan support? What, if any, alternative proposals does USAID have?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Last year, there were over 25 million refugees worldwide (in addition to 40 million internally displaced people (IDPs)). 85% of these refugees are hosted in developing countries, and most rely on support from the international community to respond to the crisis.

- *What impact will the \$3 billion proposed cut to migration and refugee assistance would have on domestic, regional, and global stability? What impact do you think it will have on the effectiveness of USAID humanitarian assistance?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

When asked about specific foreign policy tools used in response to restrictions to humanitarian access, you deferred to the Department of State and the Treasury Department regarding potential sanctions. What, if any, tools would you seek, suggest, or support to facilitate humanitarian access into certain countries where access is blocked or restricted (e.g., Yemen) for any reason? Please respond regarding all restrictions perceived by implementers.

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Foreign Assistance Review. We have heard multiple and at times contradictory messages from this Administration on its development policy. One of these threads has been the Foreign Assistance Review, which has largely been kept under wraps. Congress has not been consulted on the process, and Members remain without a clear understanding of the purpose and content of the review.

- *Are you familiar with the review?*
- *Will you provide a copy to the Committee, as the oversight body for foreign assistance?*
- *What has been your input?*
- *What do you say in response to those who see the review as a roadmap to further budget cuts?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

USAID Redesign. One area that has lacked clarity over time is the appropriate relationship between the lead diplomatic agency – the State Department – and the lead development agency - USAID. A number of think tanks and NGOs have called for the alignment of agency mission with budget resources. Specifically, these proposals call for

USAID to control its own budget and programming – thereby establishing clear accountability for development results and ending duplication with the State Department’s Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources (F).

- *What would having greater policy and budget authorities mean for USAID as our nation’s lead development agency? What options are under consideration?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Proposed DDI Bureau. I appreciate your efforts to make positive changes within USAID’s structure, and tackle long-term issues like procurement and the fragmentation of humanitarian assistance in your Redesign efforts. However, I remain concerned about the treatment of democracy, human rights, and governance in the proposal, which have been lumped into a much larger, catch-all bureau. DG has too often been pushed aside in favor of the immediate humanitarian assistance, but your proposed solution does nothing to elevate or strengthen DG’s place in the Agency, but rather puts it into an even bigger bureau than before.

- *How will you ensure democracy and governance is appropriately prioritized?*
- *Can you commit to including DG in the conflict and stabilization bureau, as it focuses on some of the root causes of governance, squarely in the DRG wheelhouse?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Democracy Assistance. In our hearing, you mentioned that USAID is working on a framework “to tackle the lead-up to elections.” You noted that “nobody opposes elections; what they do is, they bend the elections.” Please provide more detail on that framework: What does it entail? What practices does it recommend or discourage? What recommendations, if any, have you received and how does USAID plan to implement them? Have they been incorporated into the budget request? What additional funds would you seek to implement this framework?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Food Security/Feed the Future. With the proposed elimination of the Title II food assistance account, the US would lose \$365 million of non-emergency food assistance,

helping low income farmers and communities. Additionally, the budget is proposing a nearly 50 percent cut in nutrition and doesn't even come close to the directive for food security Congress provided in the FY19 appropriations.

- *Is food security no longer a priority?*
- *Since the proposed International Humanitarian Assistance (IHA) account would not allow for any nonemergency activities, where will that funding now be found, particularly given the cuts in other development funding?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Global Health. In his State of the Union address, the President represented to the American people that this administration is committed to “defeat AIDS in America and beyond.” His actual actions, which are not televised in prime-time, include this request to cut PEPFAR funding by 25%.

- *How are increasing budget cuts part of the commitment to defeat AIDS promised by the President? How is this good for America's national security?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Trafficking Victims Protection Act. The State Department issues the annual Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Report, but USAID programs are most affected when assistance is suspended under the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. These impacted programs include conservation, vaccinations, education, and support for free and fair elections – many of which arguably support a country's ability to combat trafficking and provide positive alternatives. For example, the Administration's suspension of election assistance to the DRC – designated as a “Tier 3” country-- on the eve of critical elections that the U.S. had encouraged and supported. How is that helpful to either the US or to DRC? Delays in providing waivers, inconsistent messaging, and lack of guidance to the field and implementing partners are endangering successful development programming.

- *How are you determining which activities in Tier 3 countries will go forward, and which will be halted?*
- *What legal guidance are you relying on in making this determination? Please answer with particular respect to the exceptions for humanitarian assistance and for assistance to entities other than governments.*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Oversight/Branding. More and more, USAID and its partners are working in dangerous, nonpermissive environments, from northern Nigeria to Yemen.

- *What are the challenges in the provision of assistance in conflict areas? What oversight mechanisms are in place for the distribution of humanitarian and emergency food assistance, particularly in insecure and hard-to-reach areas?*
- *We are always proud to see the U.S. “flag on the bag” branding whenever we travel to see foreign assistance at work overseas. However, how do we ensure that this branding doesn’t place aid workers or aid recipients targets in danger?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Women in conflict. Sexual violence, domestic violence, human trafficking, and early childhood marriage are all exacerbated during times of conflict. Particularly when people have been displaced from their homes, women are more likely to be victims of gender-based violence due to a lack of security in surrounding areas where markets, firewood, water, and fields are located.

- *How can we better protect women in conflict areas? How will USAID be able to ensure that programs to help deal with this problem will continue if the proposed cuts to humanitarian assistance are enacted?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Staffing. In your February 27 testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairwoman Lowey asked you about your intentions regarding staffing. She noted the pattern of this Administration significantly reducing staffing. You responded by referring to a hiring freeze imposed in the first year of this Administration. That is no longer in place. In these first years of your administration, USAID has experienced significant staff reductions. When asked if you think USAID should be expanding, you responded that you are subject to constraints of available Operating Expenses budget, but “beyond that, we will continue to hire staff and power up since the freeze was lifted.” You assured the chairwoman that you “will be expanding staff, in line with the available budget.”

- *Administrator Green, your Operating Expenses budget request for FY 2020, released after your testimony to the Appropriations committee, is less than the amounts*

appropriated for FYs 2019 and 2018. Please clarify: Is your intent to continue to downsize USAID or do you intend to rebuild USAID to recover from the consequences of the hiring freeze, at least?

- *You have referred to Operating Expenses account “constraints.” Please elaborate on practical impacts of the “OE” account. Does USAID have suggestions or recommendations for alternative approaches to funding for staff?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Development Finance Corporation. With last year’s passage of the BUILD Act, Members of our committee have been very engaged in the creation of the new Development Finance Corporation (DFC). As the Administration moves to implement the law, I’m curious how you will ensure that the different development efforts complement rather than duplicate each other – and how we can avoid a loss of capabilities, either by neglect or cuts.

- *What capabilities will USAID retain in this change, and what will be handed over to DFC, and why?*
- *The proposed plan calls for transferring 40 positions from USAID to the DFC -- will those positions be permanently reduced, or will they be used elsewhere within the Agency?*

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Chris Smith
FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
April 9, 2019

Question:

- 1) Further to our exchange regarding prioritizing the victims of ISIS genocide in Iraq, including Yazidis, Christians and Shabak Muslims:
 - A. With respect to Christians, according to the State Department's annual International Religious Freedom Reports, there were up to 1.4 million Christians in Iraq in 2002, 500,000 by 2013 just before the rise of ISIS, and less than 250,000 by the end of 2017, which covers the latest reporting year.
 - i. What do indigenous Christian communities on-the-ground tell USAID is the current number of Christians remaining Iraq?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

- B. Since Fiscal Year 2017, the United States has provided more than \$340 million of assistance to support religious and ethnic minorities targeted by ISIS for genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes. Much of this has laudably been directed toward the Nineveh Plains, the historic home of three targeted communities: Christians, Yazidis, and Shabak. But many members of these communities remain displaced in other parts of Iraq, including Erbil and Baghdad, and are at-risk of being forced to leave Iraq as refugees.
 - i. What is USAID's strategy to address the humanitarian, stabilization, and recovery needs of these communities wherever they are now displaced in Iraq, thereby enabling them to survive and have the possibility of eventually returning home?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

- ii. Commendably, USAID has been helping restore infrastructure to the Nineveh Plains. Do our contracting partners hire indigenous workers to

work on construction projects, and if so, do we prioritize jobs for workers from the genocide-affected communities?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

- 2) In the last congress, this Committee conducted vigorous due diligence in addressing deficiencies in the antiretroviral supply chain and the procurement process, including a hearing that I chaired along with Rep Bass in our Africa and Global Health subcommittee. One of the problems we noted, which had major downstream impact, was in the bid review process.

Among problems with the bid review process was the failure to have vendors appear in person before the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) and demonstrate that what they were proposing on paper – such as IT systems – actually worked. Another was the obstacles to having USAID field personnel with on-the-ground experience participate on the TEC – they would be effectively penalized economically by forgoing their in-country hardship pay differential.

- i. What steps has USAID taken to address these concerns raised by Congress?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Brad Sherman
FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
April 9, 2019

Question:

The United States, including USAID, has given Pakistan billions of dollars in assistance. Despite this, the situation in Sindh Province continues to deteriorate. Schools and hospitals are getting worse and people are protesting over water issues in Badine District every day. Hindu minorities are unsafe, with forced marriages and forced conversions to Islam increasingly common. Enforced disappearances in Sindh Province continue to terrorize the population. What is USAID doing to ensure that assistance to Pakistan is improving the lives of ordinary people in Sindh Province, especially women, children and Sindhi Hindus?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Since fiscal year 1998, our assistance program for the Republic of Artsakh (formerly Nagorno Karabakh) has supported life-saving maternal health care, provided clean drinking water for families, and cleared mines and unexploded ordnance from farms and villages. HALO Trust, which is leading the demining effort, reports that it has completed approximately 88% of its mission, but needs continued U.S. support to finish its life-saving work. Is USAID committed to continue funding to complete the clearance landmines and unexploded ordnance (UXO) within the traditional boundaries of The Republic of Artsakh, a territory with one of the highest per capita mine and UXO accident rates in the world?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

USAID has played a significant role in assisting Pakistan develop its education system. According to USAID's own numbers, we have built or repaired 1,580 schools since 2009, and we have helped train over 42,000 teachers and school administrators. How can we improve USAID's partnerships with charities operating in Pakistan that work to improve education there?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

The Philippines is a strategic, treaty ally of United States, and yet the international community continues to see very troubling and unacceptable human rights violations from the Duterte government. What can USAID do to strengthen democracy and protect fundamental human rights in the Philippines?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Can you provide an update on the impact U.S. assistance has made in Sri Lanka in terms of economic development and democracy programs? There are concerns that current efforts have been insufficient to strengthen the country's democratic institutions, including an independent judiciary, while rebuilding communities, businesses and academic institutions in the former war zones. What additional steps will USAID take to support Sri Lanka's ongoing recovery from past ethnic and religious conflict?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

What role is USAID playing in interagency efforts to strengthen US cooperation with India, including coordinating responses to natural disasters and the delivery of humanitarian assistance?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

USAID has recently negotiated two important agreements with Israel—one on Power Africa and the other an MOU on broader cooperation. Can you provide an update on how the implementation of those agreements is proceeding and how you see the U.S. taking advantage of Israel's specific expertise to help advance the goals both countries share?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Albio Sires
FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
April 9, 2019

Question:

The Administration has requested authority in FY2020 to transfer up to \$500 million to support a democratic transition in Venezuela. Recognizing that the Secretary of State would determine when to disburse this assistance, have you conferred with Secretary Pompeo about what accounts this aid would be transferred from and what type of support this assistance would entail?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

In your estimation, how important have USAID-funded democracy assistance programs in Venezuela been in pushing back against the erosion of human rights protections in Venezuela? Given that these programs have enabled civil society to support Venezuela's National Assembly, the only remaining democratic institution in the country, should we be providing more than \$9 million for democracy assistance to civil society organizations in Venezuela?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Northern Triangle countries have committed \$8.6 billion of their own funds toward the Alliance for Prosperity, which the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America supports. Do you still believe that the U.S. should work alongside willing partners to advance security and prosperity in the region? What message would it send for the U.S. government cut off aid to these countries?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

The Administration has proposed significant cuts in assistance for the Caribbean, including cuts of 98% for Barbados and Eastern Caribbean countries from \$24 million in FY2018 to \$600,000 in FY2020. What is the rationale for these proposed cuts? How would you ensure they do not undermine U.S. economic and security interests in the region?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

How is USAID assisting Caribbean countries with disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation assistance? Please explain how these efforts are reflected in the FY2020 budget request.

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Recognizing the importance of supporting the people of Cuba and Nicaragua as they fight against repressive dictatorships and seek to achieve freedom and democracy, what is the rationale for cutting U.S. democracy assistance to Cuba in this year's request? And why has the administration requested just \$6 million for Nicaragua, given that a majority of U.S. assistance has supported civil society and independent media?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Dina Titus
FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
April 9, 2019

Question:

USAID's disability policy has not been updated since 1997, nearly ten years before the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. When can we expect the policy to be updated, and how will it be updated?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

How do you intend to prioritize inclusion of people with disabilities across USAID's policy, programming, and funding agendas?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Would you agree that positive women's health outcomes lead to better economic outcomes for women?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

If so, how can you explain the cuts to women's health initiatives in the request? This request cuts maternal and child health funding by nearly a quarter, slashes family planning by more than 60 percent, and nutrition by 46 percent. How can this Administration tout economic empowerment while depriving women of the key interventions they need to be healthy mothers, entrepreneurs, wives, farmers, girls, and students?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Won't the funds and work of the Women's Global Development and Prosperity Initiative be less fruitful if we don't fund these initiatives?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

The Administration said another review would be conducted in December 2018. Has that assessment been conducted? If not, when will it be done and the findings published?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

If it has been conducted, was the recent expansion of the policy announced by Secretary Pompeo informed by these findings?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

What effects has the policy had on access to care, particularly in remote areas where all health services are provided in one facility?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

There is a strong push within PEPFAR to fund faith-based organizations, which have been critical partners in the fight against HIV but may not be best positioned to deliver comprehensive HIV prevention, care, and treatment services to everyone who needs it in all settings. With scarce resources, are you still committed to evaluating which partners are best able to achieve programmatic goals, or is there an earmark and special treatment for certain types of faith-based partners?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Ted Lieu
FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
April 9, 2019

Yemen. Administrator Green, thank you for being here. USAID plays a critical role in promoting U.S. interests around the world by helping people in dire need and promoting sustainable growth.

For that very reason, I was surprised that in your opening remarks, you neglected to mention what is today the world's worst humanitarian crisis in Yemen. Over 22 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance and huge populations are on the brink of famine.

I appreciate what you said to my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. Wilson, that humanitarian aid in a conflict is a band-aid, not a cure. This conflict is a man-made catastrophe that requires a political solution. But I would like you to speak more specifically to where this ranks on USAID's priorities and what specific challenges we face there.

Question:

What is USAID's assessment of how effectively the UN has responded to access challenges in Yemen, including at Red Sea Mills?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

I understand that in some areas, humanitarian organizations on the ground hear complaints that they are empowering their own preferred actors rather than working with local authorities. Can you evaluate Saudi humanitarian and relief efforts, which USAID is advising? What safeguards are in place to ensure that aid and aid projects are not being used for political advantage in certain areas or with certain groups?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Does USAID believe humanitarian access is being tied to the wider political process? What can be done to decouple the issues?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

If the UN-brokered deal on Hodeida collapses and the port is cut off by fighting, what contingency plans are in place within USAID and the UN to deal with the humanitarian fallout, for example, by diverting ships to places like Aden?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

As you know, the airport in Sana'a is critical to providing aid to the populations under Houthi control. The coalition has long promised a so-called humanitarian air bridge for serious medical cases, which was to be operated by the World Health Organization. But the air bridge has never come into existence. Can you speak to access challenges we have with the airport and what USAID has done to address them with both the coalition and the Houthis?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

We also hear reports of access challenges to the Port of Aden. Humanitarian groups hear from merchants that it is actually cheaper for them to move goods over land from Dubai and Omani ports into Yemen then it is to go through Aden port because of corruption and inefficiency in the port. How do you assess the feasibility of the Port of Aden serving as a replacement for the flow of goods from Hodeidah in the event that that port is shut down due to fighting?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Humanitarian Assistance Access Challenges. Humanitarians face a multitude of access challenges – most man made as warring parties play politics with humanitarian relief. Some conflict-affected areas are too dangerous for humanitarian responders to deliver assistance – to do so would risk the lives of both aid workers and those whom they seek to exist. But insecurity is only the tip of the iceberg.

From Syria to Yemen to South Sudan to Nigeria, both governments and armed actors are trying and succeeding to slow, manipulate, or outright block access to humanitarian relief. These impediments range from cumbersome bureaucratic requirements, overburdensome taxes and fees, restrictions on movement of aid workers or those in need of assistance.

At the same time, barbaric war tactics like siege are being employed with impunity – using starvation as a weapon of war and indiscriminate or even deliberate targeting that damages or destroys hospitals, clinics, water treatment and other humanitarian infrastructure leaves millions with access to health care and clean water – exacerbating need and making delivery of assistance more difficult or even impossible.

Question:

In an era of growing political and security constraints to access to those most in need, what unilateral and multilateral tools does the US Government have at its disposal to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance and to hold accountable those who seek to obstruct it?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Are there ways the US could be more effective in addressing these humanitarian access challenges we experience?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

How is USAID working to ensure that discussions about and demands for humanitarian access are a top diplomatic priority?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

In addition to deliberate constraints on access imposed by parties to conflict, a host of counter-terror regulations and restrictions promulgated by donors and the UNSC also threaten humanitarian access and programming. What consideration is USAID and the entire USG giving to the unintended consequences of CT measures? What steps are being taken to mitigate these consequences for humanitarians in particular? How is USAID working with Treasury and other agencies to ensure legal protection for humanitarians to continue their life saving work?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Chrissy Houlahan
 FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
 April 9, 2019

Question:

The Secretary of State recently announced a further, unprecedented expansion of the Global Gag Rule, which would further endanger women's and reproductive health services around the world, even activities that have no US funding or organizational governance. NGOs have already reported that compliance with the Global Gag Rule has increased their administrative costs due to adding complicated compliance mechanisms.

- a) How much will this broad interpretation increase this burden for these NGOs?
- b) How much will this new compliance burden affect the amount and quality of health services this funding is intended for?
- c) Has USAID looked into how this broad interpretation will impact programs across the development sector?
- d) As a development professional, don't you think that would be the responsible course of action before announcing such a dramatic shift in policy?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

In 2017 and 2018, the Administration made negative Kemp-Kasten determinations against the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) without a single visit to its programs or a face-to-face meeting with staff prior to this decision, which strips all funding from their lifesaving work - including in humanitarian settings.

- a) Have you met with UNFPA staff since these determinations have been made?
- b) If so, did you raise your concerns with them?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

The United States is a member of UNFPA's Executive Board, which monitors all UNFPA programming.

- a) Do fellow Board Members share the concern of the United States?
- b) Have you worked with other Board Members to correct the perceived wrongdoing of UNFPA?
- c) Does the Administration plan to conduct a more thorough Kemp-Kasten determination this time around, including visiting UNFPA programs and speaking to their staff?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Questions for the Record from Representative Tom Malinowski
FY 2020 Foreign Assistance Budget and Policy Priorities
April 9, 2019

Syria

Question:

What foreign countries are funding USG-implemented stabilization, development, and technical assistance programs in Syria? Please include the total amount of funding and the timeline constraints on when these funds must be disbursed.

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

What are the specific programmatic constraints imposed on USG-implemented programming through MOUs or other formal or informal arrangements reached with these foreign funders? Are USG implementers able to execute women's programs, educational programs, democracy & governance programs, and civil society empowerment programs through these funding arrangements?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

What are the specific geographic constraints imposed on USG-implemented programming through MOUs or other formal or informal arrangements reached with these foreign funders?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

Has the withdrawal of US troops affected the medevac and force protection considerations of USAID personnel in Syria? How specifically have USAID implementers on the ground had to adjust to the decreased presence of US forces?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Gaza / West Bank

Question:

Is there an ongoing USG review of funding for programming with Palestinian populations of Gaza and the West Bank? Is USAID involved in this review? If so, what are the criteria for this review, what is the timeline, and which offices of the USG are involved in the review?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

What is the impact on children living in Gaza of cuts to US-funded humanitarian assistance? Are you concerned about the potential for a humanitarian disaster in Gaza?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Libya

Question:

What is the status of USAID programs in Libya? How have these been affected by recent armed hostilities? Have specific militias or armed groups made it difficult for USAID to conduct assessments, engagements, and programs in Libya?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Yemen

Question:

What is the status of USAID provision of emergency assistance to the population of Yemen? Please describe USG ability to access port facilities and which parties are constraining the ability of US and its international partners to distribute emergency aid.

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Question:

What is your current assessment of access through the ports of Aden and Hudaydah for USG and partner-managed humanitarian assistance? What constraints and challenges have you faced in the past six months? Please list the total tonnage of humanitarian aid that has transited these ports for each of the last six months.

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.

Central America

Question:

Please describe the guidance that USAID has provided in the past two months to the missions in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador regarding funding to these countries for FY17, FY18, FY19. When was new guidance transmitted to the missions? Has all FY18 funding been cut off to these countries? On what date was this guidance transmitted to the USAID missions? What were USAID missions in these countries directed to provide to Central American partners as the reason for the aid cut-off?

Answer:

Administrator Green did not submit a response in time for printing.