



# COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL REPORT ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ACTIVITIES

Public diplomacy is a vital dimension of American diplomacy. Given the rapid proliferation of non-state actors who are shaping the international system this century and the increasing flow of information across borders, effective public diplomacy has never been more pertinent to our national security strategy. Yet public diplomacy, like traditional diplomacy, is a long game. It requires commitment and patience, and the strategic investment of limited resources to inform, engage and influence critical foreign audiences over the very long term.

This report looks at the main activities and budget for the Public Diplomacy (PD) and Public Affairs (PA) Bureaus at the U.S. Department of State as well as the activities and budget for the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG). The PD family of bureaus at the State Department was created in 1999 after the merger between the U.S. Information Agency and the State Department. Its mission is to “support the achievement of U.S. foreign policy goals and objectives, advance national interests, and enhance national security by informing and influencing foreign publics and by expanding and strengthening the relationship between the people and Government of the United States and citizens of the rest of the world.” The mission of the BBG is distinct from the State Department’s public diplomacy activities. The BBG’s primary objective is not to persuade attitudes regarding the United States or its policies, but to “inform, engage and connect people around the world in support of freedom and democracy.” It is, however, strategically aligned with broader U.S. foreign policy goals. This 2014 report is the

result of the Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy’s (ACPD) congressional reauthorization in 2013, which called for a “comprehensive report on public diplomacy and international broadcasting activities to Congress, the President, and the Secretary of State” that includes “a detailed list of all public diplomacy activities funded by the United States Government; a description of—the purpose, means, and geographic scope of each activity; when each activity was started; the amount of Federal funding expended on each activity; any significant outside sources of funding; and the Federal department or agency to which the activity belongs; the international broadcasting activities under the direction of the Broadcasting Board of Governors.” This report provides the requested information for Washington and field-directed State Department public diplomacy activities, itemizing the various exchange and cultural programs in the Educational and Cultural Exchange (ECE) budget, in addition to a break down of spending per country for roughly 180 U.S. missions worldwide. It also explains the purpose and cost of all of the Broadcasting Board of Governors news media services.

The report is 250-pages long and available at <http://www.state.gov/pdcommission>. The report’s key findings and recommendations are listed below, as are the cost rankings for the top 100 U.S. public diplomacy missions; State Department’s 89 academic, professional, youth, cultural and sports programs; in addition to BBG’s 74 Services.

## OVERALL KEY FINDINGS

- In FY13 public diplomacy spending at the State Department in both the Diplomatic and Consular Programs (D&CP) budget and the Educational and Cultural Exchange (ECE) budget combined amounted to **\$602.369 million, which was 1.7 percent of the total \$54.844 billion International Affairs (IA) Budget.** In FY14, that percentage rose to 1.8 percent with \$562.649 million of the total \$52.080 IA budget—\$40 million less, but a minimally higher amount percentage wise. **The Broadcasting Board of Governors spent \$713.3 million in FY13 and \$733.5 million in FY14.**

- **Research and Evaluation is greatly underfunded at the BBG and the State Department.** As public diplomacy scholar Nicholas Cull once wrote, evaluating progress on long-term public diplomacy goals “can seem like a forester running out every morning to see how far his trees have grown overnight.” It takes time. Yet at the State Department, databases and tools are not setup for users to connect their resources with public diplomacy strategy and systems are not in place to mark long-term progress, making studies for Congress on the efficiency and impact of public diplomacy difficult to produce in timely manners. Reforms are underway to remedy this at the State Department and the Bureau of International Information Programs (IIP) has been a leader in creating front-end research for program and campaign evaluation. At the Broadcasting Board of Governors, strong teams are in place for this work, but they could use more funding.

- **The cost for practicing public diplomacy varies country by country and the numbers should not be seen in a vacuum.** Priority countries Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq have especially high amounts because public diplomacy activities are supported by Economic Support Funds to help with democratic transitions. Other countries have higher cost of operations given the markets they

work within or because they serve as vital partners for the U.S. on third-country crises.

- Washington-directed activities need to **remain responsive to needs in the field** and take into consideration the goals in the Integrated Country Strategy and Public Diplomacy Implementation Plans in addition to the already heavy administrative burden placed on Public Affairs Sections to execute a wide variety of tasks.

- The Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) Bureau’s **Fulbright Student Program, International Visitor Leadership Program, EducationUSA, and English-language instruction, in addition to the International Information Program’s (IIP) American Spaces are foundational to long-term relationship-building,** widely in-demand by U.S. embassies, and relatively cost-efficient.

- The move to **digital-first public diplomacy** is reflected in new initiatives in IIP, PA, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) and the Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (CSCC). For example, Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCS), ShareAmerica, Live@State, and efforts to combat violent extremism online all contribute to educating and informing foreign publics. It is important that these tools and platforms consistently adapt and measure their performances so that they augment in-person relationship-building.

- The **Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications (CSCC)** has taken on new challenges in countering violent extremism (CVE), especially with the new threat from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). It’s imperative that they **increase their metrics expertise and capability** to learn and adapt to this fast-moving issue.

- With the exception of the U.S.-Timor-Leste Scholarship Program (\$145,000 per participant for four years), the U.S.-South Pacific Scholarship Program (\$108,750 per participant for four years), and the Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program (\$151,800), all of which were authorized by Congress, the majority of ECA programs cost well below \$67,000 per participant. **Programs that target youth cost below \$25,000 per participant. (See ranking of ECA programs by cost.)**

- In the last 10 years, **nine programs have been created under the Fulbright brand** (i.e. Fulbright mtvU Fellowship, Fulbright-National Geographic Digital Storytelling Fellowship). The programs have small cohorts of participants, yet we are concerned about the **possible dilution of the Fulbright brand**.

- The **International Information Program Bureau is on a very promising course** after the 2013 Inspector General report. The FY15 re-organization, described in this report, creates an iterative digital-first approach that focuses on consistent improvements to its programs, products and platforms.

- Communication between the Public Affairs Bureau and International Information Programs Bureau have greatly improved in the last year.

Concerns remain that given the transnational media landscape, there is **overlap in its digital activity** as foreign audiences do not distinguish between where media messages from the United States originate. ACPD will look into this in 2015.

- **American spaces are being increasingly isolated and fortified** due to the effects of the New Embassy Security Act of 1998. We're encouraged that IIP has reached out to the Overseas Building Office and Diplomatic Security to push to maintain open access principles to ensure that these spaces, even when relocated to New Embassy Compounds (NECs), are open to the members of the public without appointments, allow for unescorted access within the space, a separate security screening from the main embassy, allow people to maintain use of their electronic devices, and use wireless Internet within the space.

- **BBG has announced its intent to hire a Chief Executive Officer**. This should bring more organizational efficiency and data-driven programming to the Agency. Should BBG reform legislation pass in Congress in 2015, ACPD will closely monitor changes while recognizing that there will be a new opportunity to rethink operations, including measurement and evaluation capacity at both institutions.

## STATE DEPARTMENT OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Continue to connect Public Diplomacy with Policy Decision-Making at Washington and Field Levels:** there has been significant movement the last decade to connect public diplomacy with foreign policy decision-making. With the State Department, public diplomacy is seen as having a more pervasive role in diplomacy and it is imperative that public diplomacy strategies and tactics continue to be aligned with greater foreign policy and mission-specific goals. The new Public Diplomacy Implementation Plan (PDIP) should help to do so, but PAOs should also be a substantive part

of the country team meetings to ensure that public diplomacy considerations are a daily, systematic part of the mission at a local level. The use of a concept paper to tie public diplomacy tactics into the mission objective in the Integrated Country Strategy at the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City is a best practice. At the Washington level, the integration of PD officers in the regional bureaus has been encouraging, and we support further integration into policy development and implementation discussions.

- **Tolerate Mistakes, Embrace Risk:** As is the case with almost all bureaucracies, suggestions of limited or negative outcomes may inhibit future funding and administrative support. This creates a climate that inhibits risk-taking and realistic evaluations, in addition to evaluations in general. State Department and BBG leadership should encourage the admission of setbacks for stronger programming and reward and encourage honest and balanced appraisals.

- **Public Diplomacy Training Reform:** There is great opportunity to rethink how PD officers—and other officers within State—are trained to engage effectively with foreign publics at post and not just learn the many administrative tasks they are required to do. This training should also require courses on how to read and interpret research; officers should also be encouraged to seek out previous or complementary research and use actionable information to change programs. New courses at Foreign Service Institute (FSI) on how to identify and integrate basic research and evaluation into A-100 classes for new foreign services officers, not just public diplomacy officers, would help significantly. ACPD will be looking deeper into this issue in 2015.

## STATE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS BY BUREAU/OFFICE

### OFFICE OF POLICY, PLANNING AND RESOURCES

- **Continue Course on Strategic Planning:** Moving into its second decade, R/PPR has a great opportunity to become more of a support hub for public diplomacy offices in Washington and the field. ACPD looks forward to seeing how the new Public Diplomacy Implementation Plan (PDIP) can support more strategic public diplomacy, including by better connecting Mission Activity Tracker (MAT) data to local and regional priorities. We are also supportive of a redesign of MAT that is underway, but would encourage R/PPR to

further integrate its tools such as PDIP, the PD Resource Plan (PDRP), and MAT. By further integrating systems, officers may have less of a data entry burden and may be able to quantify more of their impact. The same design firm reforming MAT is currently working with ECA to streamline its various databases and alumni information to ensure consistency and compatibility with the tools mentioned earlier. For example, by linking alumni databases to MAT, data could show how individuals interact with PD programs over time. Also, linking PDIP and MAT may also forward integrate program development into the MAT process making it a first thought as opposed to an afterthought.

- **Eliminate Advancing Public Diplomacy Impact Report, Add Director of Research Position:** We recommend that the third iteration of the Advancing Public Diplomacy Impact (APDI) report be its final and resources be reallocated for other research. A new Director of Research and Evaluation Position within R/PPR would provide more strategic leadership throughout the R cone for audience research and understanding program impact. This position should regularly design and advise on standardized research questions, methodologies, and procedures that directly link practice to strategy and foreign policy objectives. This office would give more organizational legitimacy and authority to research, advocate for researchers' needs, and prioritize research activities in ways that reflect strategic short-, middle-, and long-term objectives.

- **Indonesia: Maintain Funding to @america:** In spring 2014, the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs cut direct funding for @america by 30 percent to \$2 million per year, which reduced programming to only five days per week, meaning that the center is open two days without programs. Despite the reduced hours of operation @america remains one of the busiest American Spaces in the world. While the cut in financial support from the Under Secretary

is understandable, especially given the need to support other critical American spaces worldwide, increased cuts to @america would reduce operations significantly and could force the center to close down altogether. Since programming and operations at @america also affect the 11 American corners throughout the country, it is in U.S. interests to maintain the space.

## **BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

**- Maintain, if not Increase, Fulbright Funding Levels:** The State Department's Fulbright Budget request was \$25 million less in FY15 than years prior to meet NSC budget guidelines for shorter programs that respond to pressing foreign policy priorities. The Fulbright brand is one of the United States' most valuable and respected institutions. Cutting the Fulbright budget sent a negative message to global publics about the seriousness of U.S. public diplomacy programs, even though the money was largely re-allocated to short-term exchanges. ACPD is skeptical that the short-term exchanges have the same effect as longer ones; the longer programs allow students, scholars and professionals to develop personal connections and networks within their designated countries. Given that foreign governments' contributions cover 40 percent of the cost, Fulbright students cost the U.S. roughly \$23,000 a person. This is roughly on par with the \$24,500 a person cost of Young African Leaders Initiative (YALI) Washington Mandela Fellows in FY14 for their six week to two month stay in the U.S. ACPD will further review the question of short-term versus long-term exchange effects in 2015.

**- Focus on U.S. Mission Needs:** U.S. embassies ask for more funding for English teaching and teacher training, youth exchanges, alumni engagement, culture and sports while keeping core programs such as Fulbright and the International Visitor Leadership Program strong. ACPD recommends that ECA continue to serve posts' various needs depending on their local environments.

This includes more undergraduate and masters programs and fewer Ph.D. and post-doctorate programs as posts requested in a recent survey. It is also important that Washington-directed ECA activities remain responsive to the field and take into consideration the goals in the U.S. embassy's Integrated Country Strategy, Public Diplomacy Implementation Plans, as well as the already heavy administrative burden placed on Public Affairs Sections to execute a wide variety of tasks.

**- Germany: Restore Funding for Congress-Bundestag Exchange Program in FY16:** Given the negative political signal that cutting U.S. funding for the Congress-Bundestag exchange sends, we strongly recommend that funding be restored in the FY16 budget. It would also be ideal if a U.S. Legislator would adopt and promote the program so that the Germans coming to the U.S. would experience an equivalent level of engagement as the Americans traveling to Germany encounter.

**- Vietnam: Continue Investment in the Fulbright program and Fulbright University:** Fulbright Vietnam is highly prestigious, has built an impressive alumni network, and has been a critical currency for the U.S. in the country. The U.S. spending for Fulbright exchange programs, Fulbright Economic Teachers Program, and Fulbright University Vietnam are reasonable, empower Vietnam's next generation of leaders, and produce significant goodwill. ACPD recommends continued investment in both the fellowship and the university.

**- Link Alumni Affairs Closely to Program Evaluation:** We support the 119 percent increase in funding for the Alumni Affairs Division in FY15 given that it is linked and reinforces the work of the Evaluation Unit and maintains an alumni network that is used to measure and augment the long-term effects of exchange programs.

**- Increase ECA Evaluation Budget & Add Specialists:** The industry standard for research

and evaluation in philanthropies and foundations is 5 percent of the budget; in FY13-15 it has been less than one quarter of one percent. The under-resourcing of constraint limits the amount of short and long-term evaluations undertaken and the depth and quality of these reports. Increased funding for expanded field research, including cases studies, would provide valuable data on the impact of public diplomacy programming over the long term. Comparative studies also would enhance understanding of the impact of context on public diplomacy outcomes. Incorporating such methodologies in ECA measurement activities would help to develop a narrative showing how opinion has changed toward the U.S. and toward U.S. foreign policy over time among key publics.

## **BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION PROGRAMS**

**- Raise Congressional Cap for an IIP Assistant Secretary:** Due to the congressional cap on the number of assistant secretaries, a coordinator leads IIP. The lack of an assistant secretary rank in IIP limits the coordinator's effectiveness and the State Department's perceptions and inclusion of the bureau, which is especially inopportune given that the State Department as a whole is increasingly focusing on digital strategies to reach foreign publics and counter violent extremism. The ACPD agrees with multiple Office of Inspector General reports and strongly supports raising the legislative cap to allow for an Assistant Secretary for International Information Programs. We encourage the Under Secretary for Management, the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, and the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, to actively push for raising the cap in the 114th session.

**- Increase Capacity for Analytics Office:** IIP's Analytics Office focuses its evaluations of digital activities mainly on campaigns and explores how content disperses among social media networks. The past emphasis of these evaluations was on analyzing the diffusion of messages, and less so on how social media content contributes to foreign

policy strategy. Its team size fluctuates between three-five people. Moving into FY15 and FY16, ACPD encourages movement toward analytics staffers helping to inform program and product design and set the appropriate metrics for success at the front end. We also support an increase in staff support and funding to expand the amount of analytics that can realistically be done.

**- [For Diplomatic Security] Implement Open Access Principles at American Centers moving to New Embassy Compounds:** ACPD is concerned about the increasing effects of the New Embassy Security Act of 1998 on the accessibility of American Centers. We're encouraged that IIP works with the Overseas Building Office and Diplomatic Security to maintain open access principles to ensure that these spaces, even when relocated to New Embassy Compounds (NEC), are open to the members of the public without appointments and that visitors have unescorted access within the space, a separate security screening from the main embassy, can maintain use of their electronic devices, and use wireless Internet within the space. U.S. government officials must also have work spaces within the Centers. ACPD's August 2014 visit to the Benjamin Franklin Library in Mexico City, which plans to relocate to a NEC in 2020, underscored this importance for us.

**- [For Overseas Building Office] Create Permanent Budget Line in OBO for American Centers Construction and Rehabilitation:** ACPD is concerned about the lack of a permanent line in the Overseas Building Office's budget for American Centers' construction and rehabilitation. In FY15 and FY16, OBO's budget should include a line specifying funds that will support our American spaces' maintenance since .7 funds can no longer be transferred to support them and the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs cannot transfer money for that purpose.

**- Where American Centers are Being Relocated into Embassies, Consider Conversion of Facilities to BNC Model:** Binational Centers (BNCs)

are a successful and cost-effective implementation of the American spaces at-large initiative. On ACPD's travel to Monterrey, Mexico, we visited a BNC that was well-run with a robust array of English-language programming to meet different needs, an inviting facility, in addition to a space for education advising to recruit students to U.S. universities. Because it was not an official American Center, it was not subject to tight security restrictions and is open and accessible to the Mexican public. Given the different security protocols, IIP may consider conversion of American Centers into BNCs where the environment permits.

## BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

- **Develop Metrics Capacity:** Presently, the PA Bureau does not systematically collect metrics on its programs. We recommend that the Bureau, with support from R, develop its own capacity to begin to collect data on the reach of and reaction to PA messaging activities.

- **Condense Media Monitoring Activities:** PA's RRU produces very quick turnaround reports with narratives that enable officials to confirm and enhance their effectiveness in responding to foreign audiences. IIP and Open Source Center (OSC) both produce longer term, but deeper, analytic documents, often on similar topics. The Department needs to better coordinate media monitoring and analysis across-bureaus and between Washington and the field. This includes coordination with IIP in the area of social media and strengthening its relations with OSC to look for ways to increase capacity for media analysis, make more efficient use of resources, and avoid duplication of effort.

## CENTER FOR STRATEGIC COUNTERTERRORISM COMMUNICATIONS

- **Embrace New Technologies & Mobile Platforms:** As digital environments and mobile platforms proliferate, ACPD encourages CSCC in its efforts to establish a presence on mobile-based

interactive environments and to distribute audio files over mobile devices to reach less literate audiences.

- **Expand Research & Analytics Operations to Understand Impact:** CSCC requires more funding and specialists for research and evaluation to fully measure the impact of CSCC videos and digital outreach beyond just outputs and numbers. The Center currently has only one person focused on program evaluation; more evaluation specialists and data scientists would help to more systematically and rigorously measure the outcomes of its work. Disrupting the extremist space and eliciting angry responses from leaders in the digital realm is not the best measure of activities' impact. Based on ACPD's other appraisals of public diplomacy audience research and program evaluation, we recommend that research and analysis inform every digital outreach engagement and program from the outset; provide proper context; set meaningful benchmarks, i.e. by comparing CSCC activities to those of adversarial actors; and acknowledge limitations whenever possible. In CSCC's own appraisal reviewed for this report, CSCC has been honest about its setbacks, something we encourage. We also support the Integrated Analysis team working with other digital public diplomacy research units in the International Information Programs (IIP) and the Public Affairs (PA) Bureaus, in addition to the interagency, to track propagation of extremist messages and to course-correct and fine tune narratives in digital engagement.

- **Work with Posts to Understand Local Audiences and Priorities:** ACPD is encouraged by the role that CSCC plays within the U.S. government interagency to work transparently to counter violent extremism in concert with the intelligence community. We encourage CSCC to continue to develop programming that resonates with local audiences by working with the Public Affairs Officers and their local staff working in target regions in Near East Asia, South Central Asia and Africa.

## AFRICA BUREAU-SPECIFIC

- **[With DGHR] Review Appropriate Staffing for PAO Positions in Africa Bureau:** Public Affairs Sections in Africa are notoriously understaffed and Public Affairs Officer positions are normally given to entry-level officers. As long as this remains necessary due to human resource constraints, we recommend that these officers receive extended training before starting their assignments to prepare them not just for the administrative burdens of managing a budget and a staff of Locally Employed Staff, but also be prepared to do the network-building and engagement work necessary for public diplomacy in the region and have time to identify young leaders who are becoming increasingly important to the White House through the Young African Leaders Initiative (YALI).

## CZECH REPUBLIC-SPECIFIC

- **Continue Use of the American Center:** ACPD encourages the American Center to continue to be used for strategic purposes to advance U.S. foreign policy goals in the region and to highlight Czech-American shared values.

- **Increase Attention to Social Media:** ACPD recommends that the Public Affairs Section right size the importance of social media to view it as another vehicle for the dissemination of American ideals and for the development of support for U.S. foreign policy support rather than as an end in itself. Reorientation that social media usage is in support of the larger U.S. mission in the country.

## GERMANY-SPECIFIC

- **Investment in German Relations Still Necessary:** ACPD understands that FY15 will see budget cuts in U.S. public diplomacy funding in Germany. We believe that it is against our interest to invest less in our relations with the German public at a critical time when facing dual threats

from Russia and countering violent extremism in Europe, while also trying to secure the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) agreement with the EU. As seen already, the FY15 stated cutbacks to Fulbright and the cutback of U.S. investment in the Congress-Bundestag exchange also sends a strong message to the German public and government that the U.S. does not value the relationship with a critical ally whose public is increasingly skeptical of the United States.

- **Maintain Programs to Connect with German Youth:** Germany's youth has no memory of U.S. contributions towards Germany's democratic and economic advancement in the 20th century and has cultivated negative impressions of the U.S. due to the Iraq War, drone strikes, and the most recent spying scandals. Developing and sustaining relationships with German youth is critical, as the mission has realized. We encourage full commitment to the exchange programs which are supported 2-1 with German dollars.

- **Continue Work to Counter Russian Propaganda:** ACPD recommends the mission continue to work to develop a coordinated counter-response to Russia's efforts in the region, incorporating the expertise of U.S. Consulate Leipzig in eastern Germany. This includes pushing back against Russian propaganda efforts, which is prevalent in Germany, particularly with the launch of the German language version of Russia Today website and YouTube channel in November 2014.

## MEXICO-SPECIFIC

- **Continue to Develop Youth Councils and Jóvenes en Acción as a Model for Youth Engagement:** The Youth Council and Jóvenes en Acción programs are innovative ways to empower Mexican youth and get them involved early in their communities and governments so they can work toward their country's prosperity and stability, both of which are in U.S. interests. ACPD recommends further development of these programs

and that they be a model for other youth programs worldwide.

### UKRAINE-SPECIFIC

- **Continue to Resource Embassy Kyiv to Meet the Crisis:** ACPD supports the increases in funding to Kyiv, especially as it supports the Ukrainian Government's communications capacity development through the Ukraine Crisis Media Center. We also believe that the U.S. Embassy Public Affairs Section needs additional personnel, with the appropriate experience and training, to focus on social media outreach and capacity development

for government communicators and journalists.

### VIETNAM-SPECIFIC

- **Supplement Funding for 20th Anniversary of Normalized Relations:** 20 years of normalized relations between the U.S. and Vietnam is a remarkable moment and we encourage additional financial support to recognize the people to people ties that are advancing U.S.–Vietnam relations. The Government of Vietnam is already planning celebrations in the summer of 2015, and the U.S. government's contribution will require supplemental public diplomacy spending.

## BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Continue to Expand Evaluation to Measure Impact, Not Just Reach:** While reach—the number of people who accessed BBG content in the past week—is the first thing that outside observers ask about and is a helpful starting point for analyzing the potential significance of BBG programming, it is insufficient for measuring “impact.” Illustrating impact would include how much programming people actually consume, what they remember, what they think about the programs they watched, or how what they consume, remember, or think influences attitudes toward freedom of expression or democracy. The BBG's new Impact Framework includes other indices and factors.

- **Maintain OCB Funding at Requested Amount:** In FY13, the OMB request for the Office of Cuba Broadcasting (OCB) was \$23.594 million, but Congress allocated \$26.881 million for it. In FY14, OCB's funding increased to \$27.043 million, which was also above the request. Simultaneously, the research and evaluation budget for IBB consistently falls below one percent of the total BBG budget when the industry standard for research and evaluation at foundations is 5 percent of the total budget. ACPD recommends that FY16 and future budgets

fund OCB, at the requested levels. Should Congress want to appropriate an additional millions to broadcasting, we recommend it be directed to the Office of Research and Assessment in the IBB budget so that the BBG can more systematically measure the impact of its various services, including OCB.

- **Continue to Expand RFE/RL and VOA Coverage in Response to the Crisis in Ukraine:** ACPD understands that the RFE/RL staff in the region face numerous constraints to produce daily content. Despite this, there have been rapid expansions to RFE/RL coverage in response to the crisis. The Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs has made countering Russian disinformation a priority and given seed money to RFE/RL and Voice of America for expanded programming. To maximize the impact of their work, we strongly recommend that RFE/RL and VOA continue to work to increase their reach to Ukrainian audiences and to ensure that their content is shown in other European markets, especially the Russian periphery. In particular, RFE/RL should also research the best practices on how to get their content to the impacted zones. We are encouraged by RFE/RL's discussions with

local television and radio stations to distribute their content. We recommend that both agencies continue to increase viewership of their content by looking for new platforms and channels to distribute their material.

**- Expand Digital Media Content in Vietnam:**  
Radio Free Asia and VOA should continue to grow their in-country digital content projects

that highlight original video and social media outreach. Social media is becoming increasingly pervasive in Vietnam, and it is slowly creating the conditions for increased freedom of speech. Some Vietnamese journalists feel as if they can engage their audiences more freely on social media than they can via traditional means.

## PUBLIC DIPLOMACY & INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING SPENDING WORLDWIDE

### ACTUAL FY13 EXPENDITURES

#### TOP 100 COUNTRIES\*

**\* This is based on the allocation of “.7,” or public diplomacy funds in the Diplomatic and Consular Affairs (D&CP) budget. While it does not include money from the Educational and Cultural Exchange (ECE) Budget, .7 funds can also be spent on implementing ECA programs.**

1. Afghanistan .....	\$65.13 million**
2. Pakistan .....	\$49.23 million**
3. Iraq .....	\$10.71 million**
4. Japan .....	\$8.47 million
5. Brazil .....	\$7.66 million
6. India .....	\$6.55 million
7. Germany .....	\$6.55 million
8. China .....	\$6.38 million
9. Mexico .....	\$4.91 million
10. Russia .....	\$4.86 million
11. Indonesia .....	\$4.33 million
12. Israel .....	\$4.16 million
13. South Korea .....	\$3.75 million
14. France .....	\$3.70 million
15. Turkey .....	\$3.53 million
16. Nigeria .....	\$3.50 million
17. Palestinian Territories .....	\$3.45 million
18. South Africa .....	\$3.21 million
19. Spain .....	\$2.82 million

20. Colombia .....	\$2.81 million
21. Argentina .....	\$2.58 million
22. Canada .....	\$2.58 million
23. Egypt .....	\$2.57 million
24. Australia .....	\$2.52 million
25. Venezuela .....	\$2.51 million
26. United Kingdom .....	\$2.27 million
27. Chile .....	\$2.24 million
28. Peru .....	\$2.20 million
29. Poland .....	\$2.09 million
30. Morocco .....	\$1.995 million
31. Saudi Arabia .....	\$1.993 million
32. Ukraine .....	\$1.92 million
33. Greece .....	\$1.88 million
34. Kenya .....	\$1.82 million
35. Belgium .....	\$1.78 million
36. Kazakhstan .....	\$1.73 million
37. Austria .....	\$1.71 million
38. Thailand .....	\$1.69 million
39. Bolivia .....	\$1.66 million
40. United Arab Emirates.....	\$1.63 million
41. Ecuador .....	\$1.60 million
42. Czech Republic .....	\$1.57 million
43. Philippines .....	\$1.54 million
44. Vietnam .....	\$1.53 million
45. Malaysia .....	\$1.48 million
46. Austria .....	\$1.44 million
47. Zimbabwe .....	\$1.44 million

48. Romania .....	\$1.42 million	75. Ethiopia .....	\$926,938
49. Yemen .....	\$1.39 million	76. Mozambique .....	\$920,946
50. Jordan .....	\$1.34 million	77. Azerbaijan .....	\$918,499
51. Lebanon .....	\$1.34 million	78. Sri Lanka (and Maldives) .....	\$906,556
52. Kyrgyzstan .....	\$1.34 million	79. Georgia .....	\$898,468
53. Nepal (and Bhutan) .....	\$1.34 million	80. Uganda .....	\$877,124
54. Serbia .....	\$ 1.31 million	81. Bulgaria .....	\$875,043
55. Bangladesh .....	\$1.30 million	82. Qatar .....	\$855,095
56. Slovakia .....	\$1.26 million	83. Denmark .....	\$850,355
57. Netherlands .....	\$1.26 million	84. Cameroon .....	\$833,807
58. Norway .....	\$1.26 million	85. Tanzania .....	\$812,275
59. Haiti .....	\$1.21 million	86. Singapore .....	\$781,508
60. Croatia .....	\$1.18 million	87. Burkino Faso .....	\$777,039
61. Uruguay .....	\$1.18 million	88. Honduras .....	\$771,258
62. Hungary .....	\$1.16 million	89. Turkmenistan .....	\$764,074
63. Dominican Republic .....	\$1.1 million	90. Ghana .....	\$736,701
64. Sweden .....	\$1.09 million	91. Niger .....	\$717,253
65. Tajikistan .....	\$1.05 million	92. Estonia .....	\$716,846
66. New Zealand .....	\$1.05 million	93. Nicaragua .....	\$715,438
67. Panama .....	\$1.05 million	94. Paraguay .....	\$702,834
68. Cote d'Ivoire .....	\$1.03 million	95. Macedonia .....	\$ 698,994
69. Democratic Republic of Congo .....	\$1.01 million	96. Cyprus .....	\$698,863
70. Costa Rica .....	\$948,500	97. Slovenia .....	\$698,609
71. Finland .....	\$946,753	98. Uzbekistan .....	\$659,339
72. Burma .....	\$939,910	99. Kuwait .....	\$655,090
73. Portugal .....	\$939,382	100. Bahrain .....	\$654,170
74. Tunisia .....	\$930,808		

**\*\* Includes Economic Support Funds, which are programs that aid U.S. countries in transition by developing and strengthening institutions necessary for sustainable democracy.**

## EDUCATIONAL & CULTURAL EXCHANGE BUDGET—AVERAGE FY13 U.S. COST PER PARTICIPANT\*

\*All costs are approximate

\*\*U.S. financial contributions were phased out in FY13 or FY14

### ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

1. U.S.-Timor-Leste Scholarship Program - \$145,000 (for four years)
2. U.S.-South Pacific Scholarship Program - \$108,750 (for four years)
3. Cyprus-America Scholarship Program (CASP) - \$91,666\*\*
4. Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program - \$67,543
5. Teachers of Critical Languages Program - \$62,494
6. Fulbright Classroom Teacher Exchange Program - \$59,375
7. Fulbright Distinguished Awards in Teaching Program - \$53,773
8. Fulbright Regional Network for Applied Research (NEXUS) Program - \$50,000
9. English Language Fellows and Specialists - \$45,555
10. J. William Fulbright-Hillary Rodham Clinton Fellowship - \$45,000
11. Tunisia Community College Scholarship Program - \$43,224
12. Community College Initiative Program - \$40,710
13. Fulbright U.S. Scholar Program - \$40,000 (FY14)
14. George Mitchell Scholarship Program - \$36,250\*\*
15. Tibetan Scholarship Program - \$35,875
16. International Leaders in Education Program (ILEP) - \$33,162
17. Fulbright-National Geographic Digital Storytelling Fellowship - \$30,000 (FY14)
18. Global Undergraduate Exchange Program (UGRAD) - \$31,923
19. Fulbright Visiting Scholar Program - \$29,000
20. Fulbright Short-Term Visiting Scholar Program for Iraq - \$28,571
21. Fulbright Short-Term Visiting Scholar Program for Libya - \$27,128
22. Community College Administrator Program - \$25,000
23. Afghanistan Junior Faculty Development Program (AJFDP) - \$25,000
24. Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders (YALI) - \$24,740 (FY14)
25. Youth South-East Asian Leaders Initiative (YSEALI) - \$24,740
26. Fulbright U.S. Student Program - \$23,000
27. Fulbright Foreign Student Program - \$23,000
28. Fulbright-Fogarty Fellowships in Public Health - \$23,000
29. Fulbright mtvU Fellowship - \$23,000
30. Teachers for Global Classrooms Program - \$22,099
31. Teaching Excellence and Achievement Program (TEA) - \$21,960
32. Fulbright English Teaching Assistant Program (ETA) - \$21,000
33. Fulbright Foreign Language Teaching Assistant (FLTA) Program - \$20,000
34. Vietnam Economics Teaching Program - \$19,000
35. American Overseas Research Centers (ORCs) - \$17,241

36. Critical Language Scholarship (CLS) Program - \$15,912
37. Summer Institutes for European Student Leaders - \$12,500
38. Study of the U.S. Institutes for Student Leaders and Scholars - \$12,285
39. Fulbright Specialists Program - \$7,371
40. Center for Cultural & Technical Interchange (East-West Center) - \$4,909
41. Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program - \$4,481
42. English Access Microscholarship Program - \$1,488
43. E-Teacher Scholarship Program - \$1,333

### YOUTH EXCHANGES

1. Kennedy-Lugar Youth Exchange & Study (YES)—Foreign Students ..... \$26,702
1. Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX) ..... \$23,000
1. American-Serbia & Montenegro Youth Leadership Exchange (A-SMYLE)..... \$17,700
2. National Security Language Initiative for Youth (NSLI-Y)..... \$14,331
3. Kennedy-Lugar Youth Exchange & Study (YES) Abroad—American Students..... \$14,073
4. TechGirls..... \$12,200
5. Youth Leadership Programs (YLP) ..... \$10,000
6. American Youth Leadership Program..... \$8,620
7. Youth Leadership On Demand..... \$8,028
8. Youth Ambassadors ..... \$7,097
9. Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange (CBYX)—Germany ..... \$5,633 (U.S.)
10. Benjamin Franklin Summer Institutes..... \$4,825
11. Global Connections & Exchange Program (GCE)..... \$2,788
12. German-American Partnership Program (GAPP)—Germany . \$58

### PROFESSIONAL EXCHANGES

1. Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program ..... \$151,800
2. TechWomen ..... \$31,000
3. Community Solutions ..... \$25,000
4. U.S. Congress-Korea National Assembly Youth Exchange..... \$15,500
5. Professional Fellows “On Demand” Program ..... \$15,000
6. Institute for Representative Government ..... \$14,188
7. Professional Fellows Program..... \$13,000
8. Ngwang Choephel Fellows Program..... \$12,325
9. American Center for International Labor Solidarity ..... \$10,929
10. Fortune/U.S. State Department Global Women’s Mentoring Partnership ..... \$7,000-\$10,000
11. National Youth Science Foundation/ National Youth Science Camp ..... \$8,125
12. Partners of the Americas ..... \$6,118
13. American Council of Young Political Leaders (ACYPL) ... \$5,915

## CULTURAL PROGRAMS

1. Arts in Collaboration: Next Level.....	\$36,923
2. Center Stage.....	\$32,051
3. American Music Abroad (AMA).....	\$30,000
4. DanceMotion USA.....	\$29,000
5. American Arts Incubator.....	\$29,700
6. Museums Connect.....	\$21,000
7. OneBeat.....	\$21,000
8. American Film Showcase (AFS).....	~\$18,000
9. Community Engagement Through Mural Arts.....	\$17,200
10. Cultural Visitors.....	\$12,916
11. Arts Envoy Program.....	\$7,000
12. IWP Between The Lines.....	\$6,327
13. International Writing Program (IWP).....	\$4,448

## SPORTS

1. Sports Envoy Program.....	\$21,305
2. Sports Visitor Program.....	\$10,695
3. International Sports Programming Initiative.....	\$7,340
4. Empowering Women and Girls through Sports Initiative.....	\$7,119

## IVLP

1. IVLP Gold Star Projects -	\$22,500
2. IVLP -	\$21,500
3. IVLP On Demand (formerly the Voluntary Visitors Division) -	\$8,000
4. Congress-Bundestag Staff Exchange—Germany -	\$8,000

## INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING SPENDING WORLDWIDE - 74 SERVICES (61 LANGUAGES)\*

**\*Total Cost in FY13, including program delivery. Program delivery costs include: direct transmission via satellite; shortwave, medium wave, or FM radio; and lease payments to affiliate stations. These are attributed to the appropriate language service to the extent possible, though streams shared by multiple BBG services and/or networks mean that some costs cannot be attributed to a particular language service.**

**^ VOA Greek programming was terminated in 2014.**

1. MBN's Alhurra TV.....	\$47.745 million
2. VOA's Persian Service.....	\$21.459 million
3. MBN's Radio Sawa (Arabic).....	\$19.309 million
4. Office of Cuba Broadcasting's Radio/Television Marti. \$15.957 million (\$26.881 million for all of OCB)	
5. VOA's Mandarin Service.....	\$13.060 million
6. VOA's Global English Service.....	\$12.955 million
7. RFE/RL's Radio Farda (Persian).....	\$11.242 million
8. RFE/RL's Radio Svoboda (Russian).....	\$8.529 million
9. VOA's Urdu Service.....	\$8.001 million
10. VOA's Radio and TV Ashna (Dari and Pashto to Afghanistan).....	\$7.398 million
11. RFE/RL's Radio Azadi (Dari and Pashto to Afghanistan).....	\$6.272 million
12. RFA's Mandarin Service.....	\$6.241 million
13. MBN's Alhurra Iraq (Arabic).....	\$6.054 million
14. RFA's Tibetan Service.....	\$5.518 million
15. VOA's Indonesian Service.....	\$5.486 million
16. VOA's English to Africa Service.....	\$5.136 million
17. RFE/RL Balkans (Albanian, Bosnian, Croatian, Macedonian, Montenegrin, Serbian).....	\$4.616 million+
18. RFA's Korean Service.....	\$4.044 million

19. VOA's Korean Service.....	\$3.956 million
20. RFE/RL's Radio Mashaal (Pashto to FATA).....	\$3.672 million
21. VOA's Radio Deewa (Pashto to FATA).....	\$3.641 million
22. VOA's Tibetan Service.....	\$3.507 million
23. VOA's French to Africa (French, Songhai).....	\$3.096 million
24. VOA's Russian Service.....	\$3.040 million
25. VOA's Spanish Service.....	\$2.757 million
26. RFE/RL's Radio Svoboda (Belarusian).....	\$2.724 million
27. RFE/RL's Radio Svoboda (Ukrainian).....	\$2.663 million
28. RFE/RL's Radio Tavisupleba (Georgian).....	\$2.537 million*
29. VOA's Burmese Service.....	\$2.501 million
30. VOA's Horn of Africa Service (Amharic, Afraan Oromo, Tigrigna).....	\$2.388 million
31. RFA's Burmese Service.....	\$2.318 million
32. RFE/RL's Radio Free Iraq (Arabic).....	\$2.225 million
33. RFA's Vietnamese Service.....	\$2.033 million
34. RFE/RL's Radio Azattyk (Kyrgyz).....	\$2.020 million
35. VOA's Khmer Service.....	\$2.006 million
36. RFE/RL's Radio Azatutyun (Armenian).....	\$1.926 million
37. RFE/RL's Radio Azadliq (Azerbaijani).....	\$1.886 million*
38. VOA's Albanian Service.....	\$1.799 million
39. VOA's Hausa Service.....	\$1.752 million
40. VOA's Ukrainian Service.....	\$1.709 million
41. RFA's Uyghur Service.....	\$1.706 million
42. VOA's Kurdish Service.....	\$1.635 million
43. VOA's Vietnamese Service.....	\$1.612 million
44. RFE/RL's Radio Azattyq (Kazakh).....	\$1.602 million

45. RFE/RL's Radio Ozodi (Tajik) .....	\$1.599 million	59. VOA's Cantonese Service .....	\$1.053 million
46. VOA's Somali Service .....	\$1.560 million	60. VOA's Turkish Service .....	\$1.024 million
47. VOA's Serbian Service .....	\$1.537 million	61. VOA's Zimbabwe Service/Studio7 (Shona, Ndebele, English) .....	\$873,000
48. RFE/RL's Radio Ozodlik (Uzbek) .....	\$1.516 million	62. RFE/RL's Tatar Bashkir Service .....	\$885,000
49. RFA's Lao Service .....	\$1.508 million	63. RFE/RL's Radio Azatlyk (Turkmen) .....	\$836,000
50. RFE/RL's North Caucasus Service (Avar, Chechen, Circassian) .....	\$1.342 million	64. VOA's Bosnian Service .....	\$810,000
51. VOA's Creole Service .....	\$1.204 million	65. VOA's Georgian Service .....	\$722,000*
52. RFA's Khmer Service .....	\$1.202 million	66. VOA's Lao Service .....	\$707,000
53. VOA's Portuguese to Africa Service .....	\$1.196 million	67. VOA's Uzbek Service .....	\$700,000*
54. VOA's Swahili Service .....	\$1.193 million	68. VOA's Thai Service .....	\$639,000
55. RFE/RL's Radio Europa Libera (Romanian to Moldova) .....	\$1.172 million	69. VOA's Azerbaijani Service .....	\$569,000*
56. VOA's Bangla Service .....	\$1.104 million	70. MBN's Afia Darfur .....	\$495,000
57. VOA's Central Africa Service (Kinyarwanda, Kirundi) .....	\$1.104 million	71. VOA's Macedonian Service .....	\$480,000
58. RFA's Cantonese Service .....	\$1.063 million	72. VOA's Greek Service .....	\$458,000 ^
		73. VOA's Armenian Service .....	\$400,000
		74. VOA's Bambara Service .....	\$198,000

**+ RFE/RL's programming to the Balkans is budgeted as a single service, while VOA's is budgeted and organized as multiple services. The total figure for VOA's Albanian, Bosnian, Macedonian, and Serbian services combined would be \$4.626 million.**

