AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 419

112TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 112–173

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 3254]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 4, 2012.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

Calendar No. 419

112TH CONGRESS, 2nd Session | SENATE | REPORT 112–173

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 3254]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 4, 2012.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
74–387 WASHINGTON : 2012

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office,
http://bookstore.gpo.gov. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center,
U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-mail, gpo@custhelp.com.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

CARL LEVIN, Michigan, *Chairman*

JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
JACK REED, Rhode Island
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
E. BENJAMIN NELSON, Nebraska
JIM WEBB, Virginia
CLAIRE McCASKILL, Missouri
MARK UDALL, Colorado
KAY R. HAGAN, North Carolina
MARK BEGICH, Alaska
JOE MANCHIN III, West Virginia
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, Connecticut

JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi
SCOTT P. BROWN, Massachusetts
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
KELLY AYOTTE, New Hampshire
SUSAN M. COLLINS, Maine
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
JOHN CORNYN, Texas
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana

RICHARD D. DEBOBES, *Staff Director*
ANN E. SAUER, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Bill	1
Committee overview	2
Scoring of budgetary effects (sec. 4)	3
Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget implication	3
Summary of National Defense Authorizations For Fiscal Year 2013 Table	4
National Defense Budget Authority Implication Table	9
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations	11
Title I—Procurement	11
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	11
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)	11
Subtitle B—Army Programs	11
Multiyear procurement authority for Army CH–47F helicopters (sec. 111)	11
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	11
Refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln (sec. 121)	11
Ford Class Aircraft Carriers (sec. 122)	11
Limitation on availability of amounts for second Ford class aircraft carrier (sec. 123)	12
Multiyear procurement authority for Virginia class submarine program (sec. 124)	12
Multiyear procurement authority for Arleigh Burke class destroyers and associated systems (sec. 125)	13
Authority for relocation of certain Aegis weapon system assets between and within the DDG–51 class destroyer and Aegis Ashore Programs in order to meet mission requirements (sec. 126)	14
Designation of mission modules of the littoral combat ship as a major defense acquisition program (sec. 127)	15
Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps funds (sec. 128)	16
Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Procurement, Marine Corps funds for procurement of weapons and combat vehicles (sec. 129)	16
Sense of Congress on Marine Corps amphibious lift and presence requirements (sec. 130)	16
Sense of Senate on Department of Navy fiscal year 2014 budget request for tactical aviation aircraft (sec. 131)	17
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	17
Reduction in number of aircraft required to be maintained in strategic airlift aircraft inventory (sec. 141)	17
Treatment of certain programs for the F–22A Raptor aircraft as major defense acquisition program (sec. 142)	17
Avionics systems for C–130 aircraft (sec. 143)	19
Procurement of space-based infrared system satellites (sec. 144)	19
Transfer of certain fiscal year 2011 and 2012 funds for aircraft procurement for the Air Force (sec. 145)	20
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters	20
Multiyear procurement authority for V–22 Joint Aircraft Program (sec. 151)	20
Limitation on availability of funds for full-rate production of Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form/Fit radios under the Joint Tactical Radio System program (sec. 152)	20
Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program (sec. 153)	21
Budget Items	22

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Army 22
Joint tactical radio systems integration 22
M88A2 improved recovery vehicle 22
Advanced procurement for M1 Abrams tank upgrade program 22
Lightweight .50 caliber machine gun 24
30mm and 40mm ammunition reductions for excess 24
Excalibur 1–b round schedule delay 25
Spider network munitions reduction 25
Family of medium tactical vehicles 25
Joint tactical radio system airborne and maritime/fixed radios 25
Spider remote control unit 25
Sense-through-the-wall sensor program 25
Small unmanned ground vehicle 26
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 26
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 26
Navy 26
F/A–18E/F 26
Close-in weapon system modifications 27
81mm, grenade, and demolition munitions reductions for excess 27
Air Force 27
Joint surveillance/target attack radar system 27
Defense-wide 29
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense 29
Special operations aviation 30
High definition full motion video 30
Items of Special Interest 31
Common remotely operated weapon station 31
Impact of Global Hawk Block 30 termination 31
Integrated base defense 31
Joint strike fighter program 32
Paladin integrated management program 34
Rotary-wing planning tools 34
Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget implication 34
Use of advance procurement for major systems 35
U.S. Special Operations Command Budget line items 36
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 37
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 37
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201) 37
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 37
Next Generation Foundry for the Defense Microelectronics Activity (sec. 211) 37
Advanced rotorcraft initiative (sec. 212) 37
Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Navy research, development, test, and evaluation funds (sec. 213) 40
Authority for Department of Defense laboratories to enter into education partnerships with educational institutions in United States territories and possessions (sec. 214) 41
Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation funds (sec. 215) 41
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Matters 41
Homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 231) 41
Regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 232) 42
Missile defense cooperation with Russia (sec. 233) 42
Next-generation Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (sec. 234) 43
Modernization of the Patriot air and missile defense system (sec. 235) 44
Medium Extended Air Defense System (sec. 236) 44
Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program (sec. 237) 45
Subtitle D—Reports 45
Mission packages for the littoral combat ship (sec. 251) 45
Comptroller General of the United States annual reports on the acquisition program for the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (sec. 252) 46
Conditional requirement for report on amphibious assault vehicles for the Marine Corps (sec. 253) 46
Subtitle E—Other Matters 47

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Subtitle E—Other Matters—Continued
Transfer of administration of Ocean Research and Resources Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (sec. 271) 47
Budget Items 47
Army 47
Medium Extended Air Defense System 47
Improved turbine engine program 48
Air Force 48
Next generation aerial refueling aircraft 48
Defense-wide 49
Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict Advanced Development and Combatting Terrorism Technology Support 49
Industrial base innovation fund 50
Defense microelectronics strategy and Next Generation Foundry 50
Advanced sensor applications program 52
U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs 52
Department of Defense Corrosion Program shortfall 53
Defense research and development Rapid Innovation Program science and technology thrust areas 53
General fund enterprise business systems realignment 55
Developmental test and evaluation 56
Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program 56
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs 56
Items of Special Interest 58
Adaptive engine technology development program 58
Air Force cyber and information technology research 58
Air Force space developmental test and evaluation 59
Applied mathematics and computational science 59
Army manned airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms 60
Army robotics 61
Ballistic missile defense overview 62
Cyber research, development, test, and evaluation, and training infrastructure 67
Department of Defense labs workforce and infrastructure 69
Dry Combat Submersible 70
Energy efficiency research and development coordination and transition 70
Hexavalent chromium 71
Human bone collections for Department of Defense research 71
Hypersonics ground test and evaluation capabilities and workforce 71
Internet cartography 73
Massachusetts Institute of Technology—Lincoln Laboratory improvement project 74
Medical Countermeasures Initiative 74
Naval electromagnetic railgun projectiles 75
Naval Engineering Education Center 75
Support for the Minerva Research Initiative 76
Title III—Operation and Maintenance 79
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 79
Operation and maintenance funding (sec. 301) 79
Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions 79
Department of Defense guidance on environmental exposures at military installations (sec. 311) 79
Funding of agreements under the Sikes Act (sec. 312) 80
Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of alternative fuel (sec. 313) 80
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment 81
Repeal of certain provisions relating to depot-level maintenance (sec. 321) 81
Subtitle D—Reports 82
Annual report on Department of Defense long-term corrosion strategy (sec. 331) 82
Modified deadline for Comptroller General review of annual report on prepositioned materiel and equipment (sec. 332) 82
Subtitle E—Other Matters 82

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance —Continued
Subtitle E—Other Matters —Continued
Savings to be achieved in civilian workforce and contractor employee workforce of the Department of Defense (sec. 341) 82
NATO Special Operations Headquarters (sec. 342) 83
Repeal of redundant authority to ensure interoperability of law enforcement and emergency responder training (sec. 343) 84
Budget Items 84
General Fund Enterprise Business System realignment 84
Museum funding decrease for ahead of need request 84
Unobligated Operation and Maintenance balances 85
U.S. Special Operations Command Operation and Maintenance 85
Defense Security Cooperation Agency 85
Defense-wide funding decrease for ahead of need request 86
Enhanced intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to Operation Observant Compass 86
Operation and Maintenance funding for impact aid 87
Items of Special Interest 87
Advanced predictive modeling and simulation methodologies 87
Air Force strategic basing process 88
Canines in support of members of the armed forces 88
Comptroller General of the United States assessment of Department of Defense security cooperation activities 88
Consideration of fuel cell systems 89
Corrosion prevention 89
Corrosion projects return on investment and funding for corrosion-related activities 90
Critical manufacturing capabilities and capacities 91
Department of Defense inventory management 91
Energy performance savings contracts 92
Essential role of rare earth materials 92
Funding shortfalls for minimum capital investment program, facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization, and base operations support 92
Ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms 93
Lack of competition in Air Force C–17 engine maintenance contracting 94
Marine Corps depot maintenance activity group 95
Modernizing the aging fleet 95
Rapid equipping and fielding initiatives 95
Readiness support for unfunded requirements 96
Report on Defense Science Board climate change recommendations ... 96
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations 99
Subtitle A—Active Forces 99
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 99
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 100
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 100
End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412) 100
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 101
Fiscal year 2013 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) 101
Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415) 101
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 102
Military personnel (sec. 421) 102
Budget Item 102
Military personnel funding changes 102
Title V—Military Personnel Policy 103
Subtitle A—Officer Policy 103
Extension of relaxation of limitation on selective early discharges (sec. 501) 103
Exception to 30-year retirement for regular Navy warrant officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–5 (sec. 502) 103
Modification of definition of joint duty assignment to include all instructor assignments for joint training and education (sec. 503) ... 103
Sense of Senate on inclusion of assignments as academic instructor at the military service academies as joint duty assignments (sec. 504) 104

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy —Continued
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 104
Authority for appointment of persons who are lawful permanent residents as officers of the National Guard (sec. 511) 104
Reserve component suicide prevention and resilience program (sec. 512) 104
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 104
Diversity in the armed forces and related reporting requirements (sec. 521) 104
Modification of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the armed forces (sec. 522) 105
Authority for additional behavioral health professionals to conduct pre-separation medical examinations for post-traumatic stress disorder (sec. 523) 105
Quarterly reports on involuntary separation of members of the armed forces (sec. 524) 105
Review of eligibility of victims of domestic terrorism for award of the Purple Heart and the Defense Medal of Freedom (sec. 525) 105
Subtitle D—Military Justice and legal Matters Generally 106
Clarification and enhancement of the role of the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (sec. 531) 106
Additional information in reports on annual surveys of the committee on the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 532) 106
Subtitle E—Sexual Assault, Hazing, and Related Matters 107
Authority to retain or recall to active duty reserve component members who are victims of sexual assault while on active duty (sec. 541) 107
Additional elements in comprehensive Department of Defense policy on sexual assault prevention and response (sec. 542) 107
Hazing in the armed forces (sec. 543) 108
Subtitle F—Education and Training 108
Inclusion of the School of Advanced Military Studies Senior Level Course as a senior level service school (sec. 551) 108
Modification of eligibility for associate degree programs under the Community College of the Air Force (sec. 552) 108
Support of Naval Academy Athletic Programs (sec. 553) 108
Grade of commissioned officers in uniformed medical accession programs (sec. 554) 109
Authority for service commitment for Reservists who accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants to be performed in the Selected Reserve (sec. 555) 109
Repeal of requirement for eligibility for in-state tuition of at least 50 percent of participants in Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program (sec. 556) 110
Modification of requirements on plan to increase the number of units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (sec. 557) 110
Consolidation of military department authority to issue arms, tentage, and equipment to educational institutions not maintaining units of the Junior ROTC (sec. 558) 111
Modification of requirement for reports in Federal Register on institutions of higher education ineligible for contracts and grants for denial of ROTC or military recruiter access to campus (sec. 559) 111
Comptroller General of the United States report on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (sec. 560) 111
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military 112
Family Readiness Matters 112
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 571) 112
Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 572) 112
Amendments to the impact aid program (sec. 573) 112
Military spouses (sec. 574) 112
Modification of authority to allow Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools to enroll certain students (sec. 575) 112
Sense of Congress regarding support for Yellow Ribbon Day (sec. 576) 113
Subtitle H—Other Matters 113

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy —Continued
Subtitle H—Other Matters—Continued
Family briefings concerning accountings for members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 581) 113
Enhancement of authority to accept gifts and services (sec. 582) 113
Clarification of authorized Fisher House residents at the Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware (sec. 583) 113
Report on accuracy of data in the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (sec. 584) 113
Items of Special Interest 114
American Bar Association Military Pro Bono Project 114
Army's sexual assault and special investigation training 115
Assessment of skills and abilities to enhance transition from military service 115
Crime Victims' Rights Act 115
Department of Defense Inspector General oversight of investigations of sexual assault 116
Inclusion of synthetic drug compounds in the Uniform Code of Military Justice 116
Joint Professional Military Education special areas of emphasis 116
Recruiting for cyber-related career fields 117
Report on assignment policies concerning women in the armed forces and the characterization of certain combat-related service 117
Report on specialized graduate programs 118
Requirement for Council of Governors views on legislative proposals addressing child custody litigation involving members of the armed forces 118
Social media and operational security 119
Special Operations Force Generation 120
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 121
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 121
Rates of basic allowance for housing for Army National Guard and Air National Guard members on full-time National Guard duty (sec. 601) 121
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 121
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611) 121
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612) 121
One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613) 122
One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614) 122
One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615) 122
Increase in amount of officer affiliation bonus for officers in the Selected Reserve (sec. 616) 122
Increase in maximum amount of incentive bonus for reserve component members who convert military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortages (sec. 617) 122
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances .....
Permanent change of station allowances for members of Selected Reserve units filling a vacancy in another unit after being involuntarily separated (sec. 631) 122
Authority for comprehensive program for space-available travel on Department of Defense aircraft (sec. 632) 123
Subtitle D—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits 124
Repeal of requirement for payment of Survivor Benefit Plan premiums when participant waives retired pay to provide a survivor annuity under Federal Employees Retirement System and termination of payment of Survivor Benefit Plan annuity (sec. 641) 124
Repeal of automatic enrollment in Family Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance for members of the armed forces married to other members (sec. 642) 124
Subtitle E—Military Lending Matters 124
Enhancement of protections on consumer credit for members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 651) 124

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy —Continued
Subtitle E—Military Lending Matters—Continued
Additional enhancements of protections on consumer credit for members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 652) 124
Relief in civil actions for violations of protections on consumer credit extended to members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 653) 125
Modification of definition of dependent for purposes of limitations on terms of consumer credit extended to members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 654) 125
Subtitle F—Other Matters 125
Transitional compensation for dependent children who are carried during pregnancy at time of dependent-abuse offense (sec. 661) 125
Title VII—Health Care Provisions 127
Subtitle A—TRICARE Program 127
Extension of TRICARE Standard coverage and TRICARE dental program for members of the Selected Reserve who are involuntarily separated (sec. 701) 127
Inclusion of certain over-the-counter drugs in TRICARE uniform formulary (sec. 702) 127
Expansion of evaluation of the effectiveness of the TRICARE program (sec. 703) 127
Subtitle B—Other Health Care Benefits 128
Use of Department of Defense funds for abortions in cases of rape and incest (sec. 711) 128
Availability of certain fertility preservation treatments for members of the armed forces on active duty (sec. 712) 128
Modification of requirements on mental health assessments for members of the armed forces deployed in connection with a contingency operation (sec. 713) 128
Subtitle C—Health Care Administration 128
Clarification of applicability of certain authority and requirements to subcontractors employed to provide health care services to the Department of Defense (sec. 721) 128
Research program to enhance Department of Defense efforts on mental health in the National Guard and reserves through community partnerships (sec. 722) 129
Subtitle D—Reports and Other Matters 129
Reports on performance data on Warriors in Transition programs (sec. 731) 129
Report on Department of Defense support of members of the armed forces who experience traumatic injury as a result of vaccinations required by the Department (sec. 732) 129
Plan to eliminate gaps and redundancies in programs of the Department of Defense on psychological health and traumatic brain injury among members of the armed forces (sec. 733) 130
Report on implementation of recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States on prevention of hearing loss among members of the armed forces (sec. 734) 130
Items of Special Interest 131
Comptroller General study on Department of Defense health care contracting 131
Cooperative health care agreements 132
Health care provider appointment and compensation authorities 132
Medication therapy management 133
Standards for production and performance of prostheses and prosthetic sockets for military amputees 134
TRICARE efficiencies 135
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters 137
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ... 137
Limitation on use of cost-type contracts (sec. 801) 137
Acquisition strategies for major subsystems and subassemblies on major defense acquisition programs (sec. 802) 137
Management structure for developmental test and evaluation (sec. 803) 138
Assessments of potential termination liability of contracts for the development or production of major defense acquisition programs (sec. 804) 139

Page

Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters—Continued
Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs—Continued
Technical change regarding programs experiencing critical cost growth due to change in quantity purchased (sec. 805) 139
Repeal of requirement to review ongoing programs initiated before enactment of Milestone B certification and approval process (sec. 806) 140
Subtitle B—Acquisition Policy and Management 140
One-year extension of temporary limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services (sec. 821) 140
Prohibition of excessive pass-through contracts and charges in the acquisition of services (sec. 822) 141
Availability of amounts in Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund for temporary members of workforce (sec. 823) 141
Department of Defense policy on contractor profits (sec. 824) 142
Modification of authorities on internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 825) 142
Extension of pilot program on management of supply-chain risk (sec. 826) 143
Subtitle C—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 143
Applicability of Truth in Negotiations Act to major systems and related subsystems, components, and support services (sec. 841) 143
Maximum amount of allowable costs of compensation of contractor employees (sec. 842) 144
Department of Defense access to and use of contractor internal audit reports (sec. 843) 144
Enhancement of whistleblower protections for contractor employees (sec. 844) 145
Extension of contractor conflict of interest limitations (sec. 845) 146
Repeal of sunset for certain protests of task and delivery order contracts (sec. 846) 146
Subtitle D—Provisions Relating to Wartime Contracting 147
Responsibility within Department of Defense for contract support for overseas contingency operations (sec. 861) 147
Annual reports on contract support for overseas contingency operations involving combat operations (sec. 862) 147
Inclusion of contract support in certain requirements for Department of Defense planning, joint professional military education, and management structure (sec. 863) 147
Risk assessment and mitigation for contractor performance of critical functions in support of overseas contingency operations (sec. 864) ... 148
Extension and modification of reports on contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 865) 149
Extension of temporary authority to acquire products and services in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan (sec. 866) 149
Compliance with Berry amendment required for uniform components supplied to Afghanistan military or Afghanistan National Police (sec. 867) 149
Sense of the Senate on the contributions of Latvia and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations to the success of the Northern Distribution Network (sec. 868) 149
Subtitle E—Other Matters 150
Requirements and limitations for suspension and debarment officials of the Department of Defense (sec. 881) 150
Uniform contract writing system requirements for the Department of Defense (sec. 882) 150
Comptroller General of the United States review of use by the Department of Defense of urgent and compelling exception to competition (sec. 883) 150
Authority to provide fee-for-service inspection and testing by Defense Contract Management Agency for certain critical equipment in the absence of a procurement contract (sec. 884) 151
Disestablishment of Defense Materiel Readiness Board (sec. 885) 151

Page

Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters—Continued
Subtitle E—Other Matters—Continued
Modification of period of wait following notice to Congress of intent to contract for leases of certain vessels and vehicles (sec. 886) 151
Extension of other transaction authority (sec. 887) 151
Items of Special Interest 151
Competition in the development and procurement of training systems for major ground and airborne vehicle programs 151
Engagement with independent experts and interested parties in implementation of counterfeit parts legislation 152
Implementation of section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 152
Inventories and reviews of contracts for services 153
Joint Urgent Operational Needs and Joint Emergent Operational Needs 154
Recommendations by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the involvement by the service chiefs in the acquisition of major weapon systems 156
Reverse auctions 157
Strategic sourcing and spend analyses 157
Treatment of procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense in accordance with the interagency agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy 158
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management 159
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 159
Definition and report on terms "preparation of the environment" and "operational preparation of the environment" for joint doctrine purposes (sec. 901) 159
Expansion of duties and responsibilities of the Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 902) 159
Subtitle B—Space Activities 160
Operationally Responsive Space Program Office (sec. 911) 160
Commercial space launch cooperation (sec. 912) 161
Reports on integration of acquisition and capability delivery schedules for components for major satellite acquisition programs and funding for such programs (sec. 913) 161
Department of Defense representation in dispute resolution regarding surrender of Department of Defense bands of electromagnetic frequencies (sec. 914) 161
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related and Cyber Matters 161
Authority to provide geospatial intelligence support to security alliances and international and regional organizations (sec. 921) 161
Army Distributed Common Ground System (sec. 922) 162
Rationalization of cyber networks and cyber personnel of the Department of Defense (sec. 923) 163
Next-generation host-based cyber security system for the Department of Defense (sec. 924) 164
Improvements of security, quality, and competition in computer software procured by the Department of Defense (sec. 925) 165
Competition in connection with Department of Defense data link systems (sec. 926) 168
Integration of critical signals intelligence capabilities (sec. 927) 168
Collection and analysis of network flow data (sec. 928) 169
Department of Defense use of National Security Agency cloud computing database and intelligence community cloud computing infrastructure and services (sec. 929) 170
Electro-optical imagery (sec. 930) 172
Software licenses of the Department of Defense (sec. 931) 175
Defense Clandestine Service (sec. 932) 176
Authority for short-term extension of lease for aircraft supporting the Blue Devil intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance program (sec. 933) 177
Sense of the Senate on potential security risks to Department of Defense networks (sec. 934) 177
Subtitle D—Other Matters 178
National Language Service Corps (sec. 941) 178
Report on education and training and promotion rates for pilots of remotely piloted aircraft (sec. 942) 178

Page

Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management—Continued
Budget Items 178
Operationally Responsive Space Funding 178
Space Test Program 179
Items of Special Interest 179
Determination of accuracy of spectrum auction proceeds 179
Development of cyber security expertise and partnerships 180
Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program 180
Navigation location and tracking in GPS-denied environments 182
Reports on airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements and investment strategy 182
Report on cost savings in the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System Program 183
Title X—General Provisions 185
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 185
General transfer authority (sec. 1001) 185
Authority to transfer of funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to sustain nuclear weapons modernization (sec. 1002) . 185
Audit readiness of Department of Defense statements of budgetary resources (sec. 1003) 185
Report on effects of budget sequestration on the Department of Defense (sec. 1004) 185
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 186
Extension of authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1011) 186
Requirement for biennial certification on provision of support for counter-drug activities to certain foreign governments (sec. 1012) ... 186
Authority to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1013) 186
Quarterly reports on use of funds in the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide account (sec. 1014) 187
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 187
Retirement of naval vessels (sec. 1021) 187
Termination of a Maritime Prepositioning Ship squadron (sec. 1022) . 188
Sense of Congress on recapitalization for the Navy and Coast Guard (sec. 1023) 188
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 189
Extension of certain prohibitions and requirements relating to detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1031) 189
Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 189
Enhancement of responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding the National Military Strategy (sec. 1041) 189
Modification of authority on training of special operations forces with friendly foreign forces (sec. 1042) 189
Extension of authority to provide assured business guarantees to carriers participating in Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1043) 190
Participation of veterans in the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense (sec. 1044) 190
Modification of the Ministry of Defense Advisors Program (sec. 1045) 190
Interagency collaboration on unmanned aircraft systems (sec. 1046) .. 191
Sense of Senate on notice to Congress on unfunded priorities (sec. 1047) 192
Subtitle F—Reports 192
Report on strategic airlift aircraft (sec. 1061) 192
Repeal of biennial report on the Global Positioning System (sec. 1062) 192
Repeal of annual report on threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, ballistic missiles, and cruise missiles (sec. 1063) 192
Subtitle G—Nuclear Matters 192
Strategic delivery system (sec. 1071) 192
Requirements definition for combined warhead for certain missile systems (sec. 1072) 193
Congressional Budget Office estimate of costs of nuclear weapons and delivery systems (sec. 1073) 193
Subtitle H—Other Matters 193
Redesignation of Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies as the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (sec. 1081) ... 193

Page

Title X—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle H—Other Matters—Continued
Technical amendments to repeal statutory references to United States Joint Forces Command (sec. 1082) 193
Sense of Congress on non-United States citizens who are graduates of United States educational institutions with advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (sec. 1083) 193
Items of Special Interest 194
Arctic region 194
B–52 Combat Network Communications Study 195
B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement 195
Clarification of scope of requirements for periodic detention review of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 195
Combat Network Communications Technology 196
Funds transfers between Department of Defense accounts 196
Government Accountability Office Report on duplication, overlap and fragmentation in federal programs 198
Government Accountability Office review of the Nuclear Command, Control and Communications System 199
Hazard assessments related to new construction of obstructions on military installations and operations 199
Impacts of "Sequestration" on the Department of Defense 200
Resiliency and survivability for nuclear air-launched cruise and missile basing 201
Roles of the Air Force Global Strike Command and Air Combat Command 202
Safety and security standards for Department of Defense hazardous materials transport 202
Use of general purpose forces and special operations forces for security force assistance 203
Vacancies in critical Inspector General positions 204
Working partnerships with State and local law enforcement authorities 204
Title XI—Civilian Personnel Matters 207
Authority for transportation of family household pets of civilian personnel during evacuation of non-essential personnel (sec. 1101) 207
Expansion of experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (sec. 1102) 207
One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to personnel on official duty in a combat zone (sec. 1103) 207
Item of Special Interest 207
Department of Defense strategic workforce plan 207
Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations 209
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 209
Extension of authority to build the capacity of foreign military forces and modification of notice in connection with initiation of activities (sec. 1201) 209
Extension of authority for non-reciprocal exchange of defense personnel between the United States and foreign countries (sec. 1202) 209
Authority to build the capacity of certain counterterrorism forces in Yemen and East Africa (sec. 1203) 209
Limitation on availability of funds for State Partnership Program (sec. 1204) 210
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan 210
Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1211) 210
Extension of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1212) 211
One-year extension and modification of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1213) 211
One-year extension and modification of authority for program to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in Afghanistan (sec. 1214) 211
Extension of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (sec. 1215) 212

Page

Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations —Continued
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan —Continued
Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1216) 213
Extension and modification of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1217) 213
Strategy for supporting the achievement of a secure presidential election in Afghanistan in 2014 (sec. 1218) 214
Independent assessment of the Afghan National Security Forces (sec. 1219) 214
Report on Afghanistan Peace and Reintegration Program (sec. 1220) . 214
Subtitle C—Reports 215
Review and reports on Department of Defense efforts to build the capacity of and partner with foreign security forces (sec. 1231) 215
Additional elements in annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China (sec. 1232) 215
Subtitle D—Other Matters 216
Improved administration of the American, British, Canadian, and Australian Armies' Program (sec. 1241) 216
United States participation in Headquarters Eurocorps (sec. 1242) 216
Department of Defense participation in European program on multilateral exchange of air transportation and air refueling services (sec. 1243) 217
Authority to establish program to provide assistance to foreign civilians for harm incident to combat operations of the armed forces in foreign countries (sec. 1244) 217
Limitation on availability of funds for certain capital projects in connection with overseas contingency operations (sec. 1245) 218
Items of Special Interest 218
Insider threat 218
North Atlantic Treaty Organization capabilities and burden-sharing .. 219
Review of United States-Egypt military-to-military relations 219
Special operations security force assistance activities 220
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction 223
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301) 223
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) 223
Item of Special Interest 223
Metrics for Cooperative Threat Reduction 223
Title XIV—Other Authorizations 225
Subtitle A—Military Programs 225
Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401) 225
National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402) 225
Defense Health Program (sec. 1403) 225
Chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense (sec. 1404) 225
Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide (sec. 1405) 225
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1406) 225
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 225
Release of materials needed for national defense purposes from the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile (sec. 1411) 225
Subtitle C—Chemical Demilitarization Matters 226
Supplemental chemical agent and munitions destruction technologies at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, and Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky (sec. 1421) 226
Subtitle D—Other Matters 227
Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1431) 227
Additional Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (sec. 1432) 227
Budget Items 228
Defense Health Program funding 228
Demand Reduction Program—expanded drug testing 228
Department of Defense Inspector General growth plan 229
Title XV—Authorization of Appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations 231

Page

Title XV—Authorization of Appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations —Continued
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 231
Purpose (sec. 1501) 231
Procurement (sec. 1502) 231
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1503) 231
Operation and maintenance (sec. 1504) 231
Military personnel (sec. 1505) 231
Working capital funds (sec. 1506) 231
Defense Health Program (sec. 1507) 231
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1508) 231
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1509) 232
Subtitle B—Financial Matters 232
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521) 232
Special transfer authority (sec. 1522) 232
Subtitle C—Limitations and Other Matters 232
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1531) 232
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1532) 233
Plan for transition in funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding under the future-years defense program (sec. 1533) 233
Extension of authority on Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1534) 234
Assessments of training activities and intelligence activities of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (sec. 1535) . 234
Budget Items 234
AH–64 Apache Block IIIB new build 234
Rapid equipping soldier support equipment 235
Solar power units 235
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund 235
Commanders' Emergency Response Program 235
Installation information infrastructure support for United States Southern Command 236
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 236
Items of Special Interest 237
Department of Defense procurement of Mi–17 helicopters through Rosoboronexport 237
Future size of the Afghan National Security Forces 238
Title XVI—Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission 241
Short title (sec. 1601) 241
Purpose (sec. 1602) 241
Definitions (sec. 1603) 241
Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (sec. 1604) 241
Commission hearings and meetings (sec. 1605) 242
Principles and procedure for commission recommendations (sec. 1606) 242
Consideration of commission recommendations by the President and Congress (sec. 1607) 243
Pay for members of the commission (sec. 1608) 243
Executive Director (sec. 1609) 243
Staff (sec. 1610) 243
Contracting authority (sec. 1611) 244
Judicial review precluded (sec. 1612) 244
Termination (sec. 1613) 244
Funding (sec. 1614) 244
Title XVII—National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force 245
National commission on the structure of the Air Force (secs. 1701–1709) 245
Retention of core functions of the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base pending future structure study (sec. 1710) 247
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations 249
Summary and explanation of funding tables 249
Short title (sec. 2001) 249

Page

Division B—Military Construction Authorizations —Continued
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002) 249
Title XXI—Army Military Construction 251
Summary 251
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 252
Family housing (sec. 2102) 252
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103) 252
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2104) 252
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2009 projects (sec. 2105) 252
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2106) 252
Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2107) 253
Title XXII—Navy Military Construction 255
Summary 255
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) 255
Family housing (sec. 2202) 255
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) 255
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) 256
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2205) 256
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2009 projects (sec. 2206) 256
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2207) 256
Realignment of Marines in the Asia-Pacific region (sec. 2208) 256
Items of Special Interest 256
Comptroller General of the United States assessment of the costs of realignment of the Marines in the Asia-Pacific region 256
U.S. force posture in the Asia-Pacific and realignment of the U.S. Marines on Okinawa 257
Title XXIII—Air Force Military Construction 261
Summary 261
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) 261
Family housing (sec. 2302) 261
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) 262
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) 262
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2305) 262
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies Military Construction 263
Summary 263
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 263
Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) 263
Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) 264
Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2403) 264
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2404) 264
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2405) 264
Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2406) 264
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations 264
Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2411) 264
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1997 project (sec. 2412) 264
Item of Special Interest 265
Excess overseas facilities for defense agencies 265
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program 267
Summary 267

Page

Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program—Continued
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) ... 267
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) ... 267
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities ... 269
Summary ... 269
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ... 269
Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) ... 269
Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602) ... 269
Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603) ... 269
Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604) ... 269
Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605) ... 269
Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606) ... 270
Subtitle B—Other Matters ... 270
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2009 project (sec. 2611) ... 270
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2612) ... 270
Title XXVII—Base Realignment and Closure Activities ... 271
Summary and explanation of tables ... 271
Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 1990 (sec. 2701) ... 271
Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 2005 (sec. 2702) ... 271
Technical amendments to section 2702 of fiscal year 2012 Act (sec. 2703) ... 271
Criteria for decisions involving certain base closure and realignment activities (sec. 2704) ... 271
Item of Special Interest ... 272
Government Accountability Office review of the systems and processes that the Department uses to identify the extent to which bases or facilities are excess to needs ... 272
Title XXVIII—Military Construction General Provisions ... 275
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ... 275
Authorized cost and scope variations (sec. 2801) ... 275
Comptroller General report on in-kind payments (sec. 2802) ... 276
Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2803) ... 276
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration ... 276
Authority to accept as consideration for leases of non-excess property of military departments and defense agencies real property interests and natural resource management services related to agreements to limit encroachment (sec. 2811) ... 276
Clarification of parties with whom Department of Defense may conduct exchanges of real property at military installations (sec. 2812) ... 276
Subtitle C—Energy Security ... 276
Guidance on financing for renewable energy projects (sec. 2821) ... 276
Continuation of limitation on use of funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) gold or platinum certification (sec. 2822) ... 277
Prohibition on biofuel refinery construction (sec. 2823) ... 277
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances ... 277
Land conveyance, local training area for Browning Army Reserve Center, Utah (sec. 2831) ... 277
Use of proceeds, land conveyance, Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida (sec. 2832) ... 277

Page

Title XXVIII—Military Construction General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle E—Other Matters 277
Clarification of authority of Secretary to assist with development of public infrastructure in connection with the establishment or expansion of a military installation (sec. 2841) 277
Petersburg National Battlefield boundary modification (sec. 2842) 277
Congressional notification with respect to oversight and maintenance of base cemeteries following closure of overseas military installations (sec. 2843) 277
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations 278
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs 278
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 278
Overview 278
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 278
Weapons activities 279
Directed stockpile work 279
Campaigns 280
Readiness in the technical base 281
Secure transportation asset 283
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response 283
Site stewardship 283
Safeguards and security 283
National security applications 283
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs 283
Nonproliferation and verification research and development 283
Nonproliferation and international security 284
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation 284
Fissile materials disposition 284
Global threat reduction initiative 284
Naval reactors 285
Office of the Administrator 285
Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102) 285
Savannah River Site 286
Waste Treatment Plant 286
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 286
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 286
Replacement project for Chemistry and Metallurgy Research building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico (sec. 3111) 286
Submittal to Congress of selected acquisition reports and independent cost estimates on nuclear weapon systems undergoing life extension (sec. 3112) 289
Two-year extension of schedule for disposition of weapons-usable plutonium at Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina (sec. 3113) . 289
Program on scientific engagement for nonproliferation (sec. 3114) 289
Repeal of requirement for annual update of Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities workforce restructuring plan (sec. 3115) ... 289
Quarterly reports to Congress on financial balances for atomic energy defense activities (sec. 3116) 290
Transparency in contractor performance evaluations by the National Nuclear Security Administration leading to award fees (sec. 3117) .. 290
Expansion of authority to establish certain scientific, engineering, and technical positions (sec. 3118) 290
Modification and extension of authority on acceptance of contributions for acceleration of removal or security of fissile materials, radiological materials, and related equipment at vulnerable sites worldwide (sec. 3119) 290
Cost containment for the Y–12 Uranium Processing Facility, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (sec. 3120) 291
Authority to restore certain formerly Restricted Data to the Restricted Data category (Sec. 3121) 292
Subtitle C—Reports 292
Report on actions required for transition of regulation of non-nuclear activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration to federal agencies (sec. 3131) 292
Report on consolidation of facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3132) 292
Regional radiological security zones (sec. 3133) 293

Page

Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued
Subtitle C—Reports—Continued
Report on legacy uranium mines (sec. 3134) 293
Comptroller General of the United States review of projects carried out by Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy pursuant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (sec. 3135) 293
Items of Special Interest 293
General Accountability Office Study of National Nuclear Security Administration Cost Estimating Practices 293
National Ignition Facility overhead structure 294
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities 294
Acquisition corps 294
Plan for use of Office of Science facilities 294
Independence of the National Nuclear Security Administration 295
Adherence to section 3114 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 295
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 297
Authorization (sec. 3201) 297
Title XXXV—Maritime Administration 299
Maritime Administration (sec. 3501) 299
Division D—Funding Tables 301
Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001) 301
Title XLI—Procurement 303
Procurement (sec. 4101) 304
Procurement for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4102) 350
Title XLII—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 363
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 4201) 364
Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4202) 399
Title XLIII—Operation and Maintenance 402
Operation and maintenance (sec. 4301) 403
Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4302) 418
Title XLIV—Military Personnel 427
Military personnel (sec. 4401) 428
Military personnel for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4402) 429
Title XLV—Other Authorizations 431
Other authorizations (sec. 4501) 432
Other authorizations for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4502) 434
Title XLVI—Military Construction 437
Military construction (sec. 4601) 438
Title XLVII—Department of Energy National Security Programs 461
Department of Energy national security authorizations (sec. 4701) 462
Legislative Requirements 473
Departmental Recommendations 473
Committee Action 473
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 474
Regulatory Impact 474
Changes in Existing Law 475
Additional Views 476
Additional Views of Mr. Begich 476
Additional Views of Mr. McCain 478
Additional Views of Mr. Inhofe 482
Additional Views of Mr. Chambliss 485
Additional Views of Ms. Ayotte 486

Calendar No. 419

112TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 112–173

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JUNE 4, 2012.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. LEVIN, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 3254]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2013 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2013;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2013;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

(5) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and research, development, test and evaluation actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013; and

73–387

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2013.

Committee overview

The United States Armed Forces have been involved in armed conflict for more than 10 years. U.S. forces are drawing down in Afghanistan and are no longer deployed in Iraq. However, real threats to our national security remain and our forces are deployed throughout the globe. Whether engaged in combat in Afghanistan, tracking down Al Qaeda and associated forces in the Arabian Peninsula, keeping a watchful eye on Iran or North Korea, delivering humanitarian assistance to victims of natural disasters at home or abroad, or training foreign national forces to combat terrorism in their own countries, the men and women of our armed forces, both active and reserve, are serving honorably and courageously to promote and defend our Nation's interests. They do so often at great personal risk and significant sacrifice to themselves and their families.

The Administration has completed a comprehensive strategic review in the light of current and anticipated threats, and has put in place a new strategic guidance. The Department of Defense's ability to implement that strategic guidance will be in question should the Administration and Congress fail to reach agreement on a plan to avoid automatic defense spending reductions scheduled to take effect in January 2013.

In Afghanistan, the surge force will be withdrawn by the end of this summer, as Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) embark on the third tranche of the transition that will result in the ANSF having primary responsibility for three-fourths of the Afghan people. The transition to Afghan security lead throughout Afghanistan is on track to be completed by the end of 2014.

To date in this Second Session of the 112th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services has conducted 32 hearings and formal briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013, the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan, and related defense matters.

In order to provide a framework for the consideration of these matters, the committee identified 10 guidelines to guide its work on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. These guidelines are:

1. Improve the quality of life of the men and women of the all-volunteer force (active duty, National Guard, and Reserves) and their families, as well as Department of Defense civilian personnel, through fair pay, policies, and benefits, and address the needs of the wounded, ill, and injured service members and their families.

2. Provide our service men and women with the resources, training, technology, equipment (especially force protection) and authorities they need to succeed in combat, counterinsurgency, and stability operations.

3. Enhance the capability of the U.S. Armed Forces to support the ANSF and Afghan Local Police as the lead responsibility for security throughout Afghanistan transitions to the ANSF.

4. Address the threats from nuclear weapons and materials by strengthening nonproliferation programs, maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent, reducing the size of the nuclear weapons stock-

pile, and ensuring the safety, security and reliability of the stockpile, the delivery systems and the nuclear infrastructure.

5. Improve the ability of the armed forces to counter nontraditional threats, focusing on terrorism, cyber warfare, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

6. Enhance the capability of the security forces of allied and friendly nations to defeat al Qaeda, its affiliates, and other violent extremist organizations.

7. Seek to reduce our Nation's strategic risk by taking action aimed at restoring, as soon as possible, the readiness of the military services to conduct the full range of their assigned missions.

8. Terminate troubled or unnecessary programs and activities, identify efficiencies, and reduce defense expenditures in light of the Nation's budget deficit problems. Ensure the future capability, viability, and fiscal sustainability of the all-volunteer force.

9. Emphasize the reduction of dependency on fossil fuels and seek greater energy security and independence and pursue affordable technological advances in traditional and alternative energy storage, power systems, operational energy tactical advantages, renewable energy production, and more energy efficient ground, air, and naval systems.

10. Promote aggressive and thorough oversight of the Department's programs and activities to ensure proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars and compliance with relevant laws and regulations.

Scoring of budgetary effects (sec. 4)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the budgetary effects of this Act be determined in accordance with the procedures established in the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 (title I of Public Law 111–139).

Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget implication

The administration's budget request for national defense discretionary programs within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services for fiscal year 2013 was $631.6 billion. Of this amount, $525.3 billion was requested for base Department of Defense programs, $88.5 billion was requested for overseas contingency operations, and $17.8 billion was requested for national security programs in the Department of Energy and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The bill authorizes $631.4 billion in fiscal year 2013, including $525.8 billion for base Department of Defense programs, $88.2 billion for overseas contingency operations, and $17.3 billion for national security programs in the Department of Energy and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The administration's fiscal year 2013 budget for national defense also included discretionary programs outside the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, discretionary programs that do not require further authorization, and mandatory programs that are in current law. When these programs are added to the administration's budget the request for national defense totaled $646.7 billion.

The following two tables summarize the direct authorizations and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2013 defense programs. The first table summarizes committee action on the authorizations within the jurisdiction of this committee. It includes the authorization for spending from the trust fund of the Armed Forces Retirement Home which is outside the national defense budget function. The second table summarizes the total budget authority implication for national defense by adding funding for items that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or do not require an annual authorization.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Division A: Base Budget (Titles I, II, III, IV, XIV, XVI)			
Title I: PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,853,729	–44,000	5,809,729
Missile Procurement, Army	1,302,689	0	1,302,689
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,501,706	188,817	1,690,523
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,739,706	–166,438	1,573,268
Other Procurement, Army	6,326,245	–19,212	6,307,033
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	227,414	–227,414	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	17,129,296	60,000	17,189,296
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,117,578	7,700	3,125,278
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	759,539	–100,800	658,739
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	13,579,845	777,679	14,357,524
Other Procurement, Navy	6,169,378	0	6,169,378
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,622,955	–275,200	1,347,755
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,002,999	–908,748	10,094,251
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,491,846	0	5,491,846
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	599,194	0	599,194
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,720,848	0	16,720,848
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,187,935	234,400	4,422,335
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	0	0	0
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	99,477	0	99,477
Subtotal, PROCUREMENT	**97,432,379**	**–473,216**	**96,959,163**
Title II: RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION			
RDT&E, Army	8,929,415	–425,661	8,503,754
RDT&E, Navy	16,882,877	–8,832	16,874,045
RDT&E, Air Force	25,428,046	–153,156	25,274,890
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	17,982,161	462,100	18,444,261
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	185,268	4,000	189,268
Subtotal, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION	**69,407,767**	**–121,549**	**69,286,218**
Title III: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	36,608,592	–145,300	36,463,292
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	41,606,943	–23,000	41,583,943

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,983,163	0	5,983,163
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	35,435,360	–32,000	35,403,360
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	31,993,013	39,500	32,032,513
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	3,162,008	0	3,162,008
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,246,982	0	1,246,982
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	272,285	0	272,285
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,166,482	0	3,166,482
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	7,108,612	0	7,108,612
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,015,455	0	6,015,455
Miscellaneous Appropriations	2,340,038	0	2,340,038
Subtotal, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	**174,938,933**	**–160,800**	**174,778,133**
Title IV: MILITARY PERSONNEL	**135,111,799**	**6,000**	**135,117,799**
Title XIV: OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS			
Working Capital Fund, Army	60,037	0	60,037
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	45,452	0	45,452
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	39,135	0	39,135
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,371,560	0	1,371,560
National Defense Sealift Fund	608,136	0	608,136
Defense Health Program	32,528,718	452,000	32,980,718
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Defense	1,301,786	0	1,301,786
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	999,363	0	999,363
Office of the Inspector General	273,821	59,100	332,921
Subtotal, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**37,228,008**	**511,100**	**37,739,108**
Title XVII: COMMISSION ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE AIR FORCE	**0**	**1,400,000**	**1,400,000**
Subtotal, Division A, Base Budget	**514,118,886**	**1,161,535**	**515,280,421**
Division A: Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Budget (Title XV)			
Title XV—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS			
PROCUREMENT, OCO			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	486,200	–71,000	415,200
Missile Procurement, Army	49,653	0	49,653
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	15,422	0	15,422
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	357,493	0	357,493
Other Procurement, Army	2,015,907	33,000	2,048,907
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	1,675,400	27,414	1,702,814
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	164,582	0	164,582
Weapons Procurement, Navy	23,500	0	23,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	285,747	0	285,747
Other Procurement, Navy	98,882	0	98,882
Procurement, Marine Corps	943,683	0	943,683
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	305,600	0	305,600
Missile Procurement, Air Force	34,350	0	34,350
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	116,203	0	116,203

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Other Procurement, Air Force	2,818,270	0	2,818,270
Procurement, Defense-Wide	196,349	0	196,349
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	100,000	0	100,000
Subtotal, PROCUREMENT, OCO	**9,687,241**	**–10,586**	**9,676,655**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, OCO			
RDT&E, Army	19,860	0	19,860
RDT&E, Navy	60,119	0	60,119
RDT&E, Air Force	53,150	0	53,150
RDT&E, Defense-Wide	112,387	0	112,387
Subtotal, RDT&E, OCO	**245,516**	**0**	**245,516**
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, OCO			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	28,591,441	–240,000	28,351,441
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	5,880,395	0	5,880,395
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,066,340	0	4,066,340
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	9,241,613	0	9,241,613
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	7,824,579	0	7,824,579
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	154,537	0	154,537
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	55,924	0	55,924
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	25,477	0	25,477
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	120,618	0	120,618
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	382,448	0	382,448
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	19,975	0	19,975
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	5,749,167	0	5,749,167
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund	400,000	–50,000	350,000
Subtotal, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, OCO	**62,512,514**	**–290,000**	**62,222,514**
MILITARY PERSONNEL, OCO	**14,060,094**	**0**	**14,060,094**
OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS, OCO			
Working Capital Fund, Army	42,600	0	42,600
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	240,400	0	240,400
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	220,364	0	220,364
Defense Health Program	993,898	0	993,898
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	469,025	0	469,025
Office of the Inspector General	10,766	0	10,766
Subtotal, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS, OCO	**1,977,053**	**0**	**1,977,053**
Subtotal, Division A, OCO Budget	**88,482,418**	**–300,586**	**88,181,832**
Total, Division A	**602,601,304**	**860,949**	**603,462,253**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Division B: Base Budget (Titles XXI—XXVII)			
Titles XXI—XXVI: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			
Military Construction, Army	1,923,323	–325,000	1,598,323

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	1,701,985	–53,757	1,648,228
Military Construction, Air Force	388,200	–65,657	322,543
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	3,654,623	–219,500	3,435,123
NATO Security Investment Program	254,163	0	254,163
Military Construction, Army National Guard	613,799	0	613,799
Military Construction, Air National Guard	42,386	0	42,386
Military Construction, Army Reserve	305,846	0	305,846
Military Construction, Navy Reserve	49,532	0	49,532
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	10,979	0	10,979
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	151,000	0	151,000
Subtotal, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	**9,095,836**	**–663,914**	**8,431,922**
Titles XXI—XXVI: FAMILY HOUSING			
Family Housing Construction, Army	4,641	0	4,641
Family Housing O&M, Army	530,051	0	530,051
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	102,182	0	102,182
Family Housing O&M, Navy and Marine Corps	378,230	0	378,230
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	83,824	0	83,824
Family Housing O&M, Air Force	497,829	0	497,829
Family Housing O&M, Defense-Wide	52,238	0	52,238
Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,786	0	1,786
Subtotal, FAMILY HOUSING	**1,650,781**	**0**	**1,650,781**
Title XXVII: BRAC			
Defense Base Closure Account 1990	349,396	0	349,396
Defense Base Closure Account 2005	126,697	0	126,697
Subtotal, BRAC	**476,093**	**0**	**476,093**
Total, Division B	**11,222,710**	**–663,914**	**10,558,796**
SUBTOTAL, BASE BUDGET, DIVISIONS A & B	**525,341,596**	**497,621**	**525,839,217**
SUBTOTAL, OCO BUDGET, DIVISION A	**88,482,418**	**–300,586**	**88,181,832**
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**613,824,014**	**197,035**	**614,021,049**
Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations			
Division C: (Titles XXXI and XXXII)			
Department of Energy Authorization (Title XXXI)			
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	6,000	–6,000	0
Title XXXI: NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
Weapons Activities	7,577,341	25,000	7,602,341
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,458,631	0	2,458,631
Naval Reactors	1,088,635	37,986	1,126,621
Office of the Administrator	411,279	–25,000	386,279
Subtotal, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	**11,535,886**	**37,986**	**11,573,872**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Title XXXI: ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,472,001	–463,000	5,009,001
Other Defense Activities	735,702	0	735,702
Subtotal, ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	**6,207,703**	**–463,000**	**5,744,703**
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	**17,749,589**	**–431,014**	**17,318,575**
Title XXXII: DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	29,415	0	29,415
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD	**29,415**	**0**	**29,415**
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	**17,779,004**	**–431,014**	**17,347,990**
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)	**631,603,018**	**–233,979**	**631,369,039**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	67,590	0	67,590
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADDS)			
Title X—General Transfer Authority (non-add)	[5,000,000]	0	[5,000,000]
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority (non-add)	[4,000,000]	0	[4,000,000]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, BASE BUDGET, DIVISIONS A & B	**525,341,596**	**497,621**	**525,839,217**
SUBTOTAL, OCO BUDGET, DIVISION A	**88,482,418**	**–300,586**	**88,181,832**
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**613,824,014**	**197,035**	**614,021,049**
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	**17,779,004**	**–431,014**	**17,347,990**
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)	**631,603,018**	**–233,979**	**631,369,039**
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	89,189		89,189
Indefinite Account: National Science Center, Army	25		25
Indefinte Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	7,855		7,855
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	12,029		12,029
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**109,098**		**109,098**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	104,000		104,000
Nuclear Energy	93,000		93,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**197,000**		**197,000**
Other Discretionary Programs	7,168,000		7,168,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**7,168,000**		**7,168,000**
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**7,474,098**		**7,474,098**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	613,933,112	197,035	614,130,147
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,976,004	–431,014	17,544,990
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,168,000		7,168,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	**639,077,116**	**–233,979**	**638,843,137**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	6,849,000		6,849,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,100,000		1,100,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,794,000		–1,794,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**6,155,000**		**6,155,000**
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,165,000		1,165,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,165,000**		**1,165,000**
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	57,000		57,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**571,000**		**571,000**
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	**7,891,000**		**7,891,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	620,088,112	197,035	620,285,147
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,141,004	–431,014	18,709,990
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,739,000		7,739,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	**646,968,116**	**–233,979**	**646,734,137**

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for procurement activities at the levels identified in section 4101 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

Multiyear procurement authority for Army CH–47F helicopters (sec. 111)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter a multiyear procurement contract in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, for up to 5 years for Army CH–47F Chinook helicopters.

The committee has taken the position that committing the Department of Defense, Congress, and the taxpayers to multiyear contracts is justified only when the multiyear contract results in substantial savings that would not be achieved by annual contracts and meets other statutory criteria. In this case, the Army is projecting savings for this next multiyear contract, if authorized, to be just over 10 percent. The committee recommends supporting the request for multiyear contract authority, but directs the Secretary of the Army to provide the congressional defense committees with an annual briefing during the execution of this contract on progress achieved in meeting or exceeding the projected savings used to justify granting this authority. This briefing shall accompany the Army's annual budget request.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. Abraham Lincoln (sec. 121)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide funding for the refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln* incrementally over a 2-year period.

Ford-class-aircraft-carriers (sec. 122)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to buy Ford-class aircraft carriers designated

CVN–79 and CVN–80 over a 6-year period, rather than over a 5-year period as currently allowed.

Limitation on availability of amounts for second Ford-class aircraft carrier (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit fiscal year 2013 obligations for the *Ford*-class aircraft carrier program to 50 percent of the amount in the budget, pending submission of a report by the Secretary of the Navy to the congressional defense committees setting forth a description of the program management and cost control measures that will be employed in constructing the second *Ford*-class aircraft carrier.

The Secretary would be required, at a minimum, to describe a plan to:

(1) maximize planned work in shops and early stages of construction;

(2) sequence construction of structural units to maximize the effects of lessons learned;

(3) incorporate design changes to improve producibility for the *Ford*-class aircraft carriers;

(4) increase the size of erection units to eliminate disruptive unit breaks and improve unit alignment and fairness;

(5) increase outfitting levels for assembled units before erection in the dry-dock;

(6) increase overall ship completion levels at each key construction event;

(7) improve facilities in a manner that will lead to improved productivity; and

(8) ensure the shipbuilder initiates plans that will improve productivity through capital improvements that would provide targeted return on investment, including—

(a) increasing the amount of temporary and permanent covered work areas;

(b) adding ramps and service towers for improved access to work sites and the dry-dock; and

(c) increasing lift capacity to enable construction of larger, more fully outfitted superlifts.

The committee also expects the Secretary of the Navy to re-certify the statutory cost cap for the CVN–79 and that the Navy and the contractor will build this ship within the amount permitted by law.

Multiyear procurement authority for Virginia-class submarine program (sec. 124)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to buy *Virginia*-class submarines under a multiyear procurement contract. This would be the third multiyear contract for the *Virginia*-class program. The Navy estimates that the previous two multiyear procurement contracts (fiscal years 2003–2008 and fiscal years 2009–2013) achieved savings of greater than 10 percent as compared to annual procurements. For the third contract (for fiscal years 2014–2018), the Navy is estimating that the expected savings will be 14 percent for the multiyear approach as compared to annual procurement contracts.

The Navy is expecting that the number of attack submarines will fall short of meeting the requirement in each of the 13 years (2022–2034), starting in the next decade, when the inventory of attack submarines will be below the requirement of 48 boats. The committee appreciates that fiscal year 2014 is the only year for the foreseeable future where we might afford to buy an additional attack submarine to mitigate that shortfall. In other years, we are already buying two boats or more, or a single attack submarine and a ballistic missile submarine. The next opportunity where the Navy intends to buy only one boat is 2036, far too late to have any effect on the projected requirements shortfall.

Therefore, the provision would also permit the Navy to use incremental funding within the second and third multiyear for the explicit purpose of buying an extra boat in 2014. During budget deliberations surrounding the fiscal year 2013 budget, the Navy had to delete one of the two boats planned for fiscal year 2014 due to top line pressures on the budget, not due to any schedule or cost performance issues. The Navy believes that, if the Navy were allowed to incrementally fund the boats within these years, the Navy could buy an additional and restore the rate of two per year in 2014 without requiring additional resources. This would have two-fold benefit of stabilizing production at a more affordable rate, and reducing the planned shortfall of attack submarines in each of the 13 years when the Navy attack submarine inventory falls short of requirements, and would be consistent with congressional authorization in section 2308 of title 10, United States Code, for the Secretary to buy-to-budget.

The committee appreciates that multiyear procurement authority already represents a departure from the full funding policy. In addition to the normal advance procurement (which is a lesser departure from full funding in itself), multiyear procurement authority allows the Department to contract for parts and construction effort on procurement items for which full funding has not been provided. The committee believes that, facing the choice between living with a shortfall in requirements and with a very stable production program, departing from the full funding policy for this very important program is an appropriate step at this time.

The committee also recommends an increase of $777.7 million in advance procurement to provide a down payment on the second boat in fiscal year 2014.

Multiyear procurement authority for Arleigh Burke-class destroyers and associated systems (sec. 125)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to buy up to 10 *Arleigh Burke*-class Flight IIA destroyers under a multiyear procurement contract. This would be the third multiyear contract for the *Arleigh Burke*-class program. The Navy estimates that the previous two multiyear procurement contracts (fiscal years 1998–2001 and fiscal years 2002–2005) achieved savings of greater than $1.0 billion, as compared to annual procurements. For the third contract (for fiscal years 2013–2017), the Navy is estimating that the expected savings will be 8.7 percent, or in excess of $1.5 billion, for the multiyear approach as compared to annual procurement contracts.

While the Navy's shipbuilding plan currently provides for only nine *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers during the period of the planned multiyear contract, the committee understands from the Navy that competition between the two shipyards in fiscal year 2011 and 2012 has led to significant savings in the program compared to the original budget request. The Navy program office believes that competition for the multiyear contract starting in fiscal year 2013 could also yield additional savings, and that the sum total of those savings might be sufficient to purchase an additional destroyer in fiscal year 2014. The committee is recommending approval of a multiyear authority for up to 10 ships with the prospect that the Navy may be able to combine the savings from fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013 and buy an additional destroyer, which is consistent with congressional authorization in section 2308 of title 10, United States Code, for the Secretary to buy-to-budget.

The committee believes that continued production of *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers is critical to provide required forces for sea-based ballistic missile defense (BMD) capabilities. The Navy envisions that, if research and development activities yield an improved radar suite and combat systems capability, they would like to install those systems on the destroyers in fiscal years 2016 and 2017, at which time the designation for those destroyers would be Flight III. Should the Navy decide to move forward with the integration of an engineering change proposal (ECP) to incorporate a new BMD capable radar and associated support systems during execution of this multiyear procurement, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than with the budget request for the year of contract award of such an ECP. The report will contain a description of the final scope of this ECP, as well as the level of maturity of the new technology to be incorporated on the ships of implementation and rationale as to why the maturity of the technology and the capability provided justify execution of the change in requirements under that ECP during the execution of a multiyear procurement contract.

Authority for relocation of certain Aegis weapon system assets between and within the DDG–51 class destroyer and Aegis Ashore Programs in order to meet mission requirements (sec. 126)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Defense Department to transfer AEGIS weapon systems (AWS) equipment between ships in the DDG–51 class destroyer program, or between the DDG–51 class destroyer program and Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) AEGIS Ashore Program, part of the European Phased, Adaptive Approach to missile defense. The Department anticipates that under the current budgets, MDA will be unable to obtain AWS equipment with ballistic missile defense (BMD) capability to support its first planned Aegis Ashore deployment in December 2015. If MDA is going to maintain that schedule, MDA would have to take delivery of AWS equipment with BMD capability in February 2013, to complete appropriate system integration and testing prior to shipment to the deployment site. MDA is requesting research, development, test, and evaluation funds in the fiscal years 2012 and 2013 budgets for the AWS equipment for the

first deployment, but AWS equipment production lead times will not support delivery of an AWS with BMD capability in 2013 using those MDA funds alone. This provision would allow the Department to support the first MDA deployment by diverting AWS equipment from the DDG–51 program to support the MDA, and, using the MDA contract dollars to replace that diverted AWS equipment, still support the planned delivery dates of the AEGIS destroyers.

Designation of mission modules of the littoral combat ship as a major defense acquisition program (sec. 127)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the effort to develop and produce all variants of the mission modules in support of the Littoral Combat Ship program as a major defense acquisition program under section 2430 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee seeks greater visibility into the procurement costs associated with mission modules supporting the Littoral Combat Ship program. The committee believes that, to ensure that it has the visibility required to fully understand and closely track the costs of developing and producing each variant of the mission module, the overall effort should be designated as a major defense acquisition program (MDAP). In so doing, the committee expects to receive all of the cost, schedule, and performance information on this effort that is typically produced in connection with typical MDAPs, including, selected acquisition reports, unit cost reports and program baselines. The committee hopes that this initiative will help discipline how the Department of the Navy has structured its plan to develop and produce each variant of the mission modules and improve Congress' ability to subject the overall effort to strong oversight.

As part of this initiative, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide the congressional defense committees, no later than 30 days after enactment of this Act, with the Department of the Navy's estimates as to the cost of completing the development and production of each mission module, operative as of May 31, 2012.

The committee understands that in the fourth quarter of 2012, the Department of the Navy expects to approve the mission modules for entry into Milestone B, that is, the engineering and manufacturing development phase of the Defense Acquisition Management System. At that time, the committee expects that the Milestone Decision Authority will certify that, as required under section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, reasonable cost and schedule estimates have been developed to execute, with the concurrence of the Director of the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, the product development and production plan under the program. To ensure that the Department of the Navy's plans to develop and produce these mission modules is realistic and affordable, the committee looks forward to receiving these cost and schedule estimates, will exercise close oversight of this certification, and expects that the Department will not waive the certification.

Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps funds (sec. 128)

The committee recommends a provision that, to the extent provided in appropriations acts, the Secretary of the Navy may transfer $88.3 million of fiscal year 2012 funds made available for ammunition procurement for the Marine Corps to other higher priority programs. These funds are excess to Marine Corps needs for the procurement of small arms, 60mm and 81mm mortar rounds, grenades, artillery rounds, demolition munitions, and fuses. According to the Government Accountability Office, funds for procurement of these items are excess to need as a result of a change in the methodology for calculating consumption requirements for training, war reserves, and operations.

Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Procurement, Marine Corps funds for procurement of weapons and combat vehicles (sec. 129)

The committee recommends a provision that, to the extent provided in appropriations acts, the Secretary of the Navy may transfer $135.2 million of fiscal year 2012 funds made available for procurement of weapons and combat vehicles for the Marine Corps to other higher priority programs. These funds are excess to Marine Corps needs for the procurement of the Light Armored Vehicle–25 (LAV–25) due to a reduction in the number of such vehicles that the Marine Corps intends to buy and sustain in the inventory.

For the same reason, the committee recommends a reduction of $140.0 million to the budget request for LAV–25 procurement for fiscal year 2013.

Sense of Congress on Marine Corps amphibious lift and presence requirements (sec. 130)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that:

(1) the Department of Defense should carefully evaluate the maritime force structure necessary to execute demand for forces by the commanders of the combatant commands;

(2) the Department of the Navy carefully evaluate amphibious lift capabilities to meet current and projected requirements;

(3) the Department of the Navy should consider prioritization of investment in and procurement of the next-generation of amphibious assault ships, as a component of the balanced battle force;

(4) the next-generation amphibious assault ships should maintain survivability protection;

(5) operation and maintenance requirements analysis, as well as the potential to leverage a common hull form design, should be considered to reduce total ownership cost and acquisition cost; and

(6) maintaining a robust amphibious ship building industrial base is vital for the future of the national security of the United States.

Sense of Senate on Department of Navy fiscal year 2014 budget request for tactical aviation aircraft (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that, if the budget request of the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2014 for F–18 aircraft includes a request for funds for more than 13 new F–18 aircraft, the budget request of the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2014 for F–35 aircraft should include a request for funds for not fewer than 6 F–35B aircraft and 4 F–35C aircraft, presuming that development, testing, and production of the F–35 aircraft are proceeding according to current plans.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Reduction in number of aircraft required to be maintained in strategic airlift aircraft inventory (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8062(g)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the number of strategic airlift aircraft the Air Force must maintain from 301 aircraft to 275 aircraft. It would also correspondingly change the certification requirement in section 137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Finally, it would require that the Secretary of the Air Force maintain any C–5A aircraft retired after September 30, 2012, in inviolate storage with only the Secretary of Defense permitted to authorize the Air Force to take any spare parts from those aircraft.

Treatment of certain programs for the F–22A Raptor aircraft as major defense acquisition program (sec. 142)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Air Force report F–22A modernization and upgrade programs under the system of the Selected Acquisition Reports (SAR). The committee was informed that, with new production of the F–22A coming to an end, the Air Force intends to stop reporting within the SAR system on the F–22A, despite the fact that there could be as much as $11.7 billion remaining to be spent on defined F–22A upgrade programs. The committee believes the category "major defense acquisition programs" is not limited only to programs that are acquiring brand new weapon systems, and that any F–22A program for modifications or upgrades, if it would otherwise meet the statutory definition of a major defense acquisition program, should be treated that way.

The committee believes there is ample justification for continuing to track F–22A modernization past the end of new production.

(1) In April 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report on the program to modernize the F–22A Raptor fleet, estimated to cost almost $10.0 billion through 2023. In this report, GAO noted that similar efforts to modernize Air Force and Navy tactical fighters in the past involved building upgrades into newly produced jets, resulting in entirely new, fresh airplanes.

(2) In another report, issued in May 2012, GAO found that the total projected cost to modernize the F–22A Raptor fighter jet more than doubled from $5.4 billion to $11.7 billion since the program

started and the schedule for delivering full capabilities slipped 7 years from 2010 to 2017.

(3) Upgrades to the F–22A are much more complicated than those made to other legacy fighters, giving rise to likelihood of schedule slips and cost growth.

(4) With these factors in mind, GAO believes that many of the Air Force's F–22A Raptors may not get their long-promised capability upgrades until they will have, in some cases, expended as much as 20 percent of their service lives. This could limit the amount of utility the Air Force will be able to extract from this enormously expensive modernization program.

F–22A Raptor Sustainment

In addition to the near-term modernization, sustainment over the life cycle of a weapon system represents a significant expenditure of resources. On average, about two-thirds of the total life cycle cost of a major defense system lies in post-production—in its operation and sustainment over its useful life. If that rule were to hold true, with a charge of roughly $79.0 billion to buy the F–22A, the Air Force could be facing a demand for roughly $160.0 billion in F–22A sustainment costs. Moreover, under its "structures retrofit program", over the next few years the Air Force will need more than $100.0 million to retrofit the F–22A fleet just to ensure these aircraft can fly for the full 8,000 hours for which they were designed. Over just the last 2 years, the Air Force issued sole-source contracts for sustainment of the F–22A fleet to the prime contractor totaling almost $1.4 billion.

The Air Force recently completed an F–22A sustainment strategy review that concluded that a joint contractor/government approach could save more than $1.0 billion in sustainment costs over the life of the aircraft. The committee believes that the Air Force must transition its sustainment strategy to adopt the least expensive sustainment strategy now, while continuing to be aggressive in exploring opportunities to compete F–22A sustainment work.

F–22A Raptor Pilot Air-Supply Problems

The Air Force has been having problems with the oxygen-supply for its F–22A Raptor pilots. The committee is aware of, and has been closely monitoring, these problems. The Air Force has documented 11 reported incidents of hypoxia-like symptoms in 10,000 sorties (about 0.1 percent) since late 2011, with 6 of these incidents having occurred as recently as February and March 2012. Since reports of pilots experiencing hypoxia-like symptoms in flight first arose, the Secretary of the Air Force, among other actions, directed the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) to conduct a quick-look study; gather and evaluate information; and recommend any corrective actions on aircraft using on-board oxygen generation systems. Unfortunately, to date, the Air Force has not been able to identify conclusively a root cause for the problem. But, the committee has been assured that the Air Force has put in place measures intended to ensure that these aircraft are safe to fly, including new commercial oxygen status sensors and emergency oxygen handles in the aircraft. For this reason, after having grounded the fleet after initial reports of hypoxia-related symptoms in its pilots late

last year, the Air Force returned the F–22A to flying under its full mission envelope and, in fact, deployed it to Southwest Asia and the United Arab Emirates in late April. Despite that a small number of pilots have asked not to fly the F–22A or to be reassigned because of this issue, Air Force leadership has conveyed to the committee that, while the Air Force continues to investigate this problem, these aircraft are safe to fly today.

Notably, the Navy had similar problems with F–18s; there were 64 incidents from 2002 to 2009, resulting in 2 deaths. Ultimately, however, the Navy overcame these problems. The committee remains hopeful that the Air Force will be similarly successful. In the meantime, the committee will continue to exercise close oversight of this problem and how the Air Force addresses it. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to explain, no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, how the Air Force has implemented or will implement each of the recommendations provided by the SAB. If the Secretary disagrees with any of these recommendations, he should explain why and describe what other corrective actions he may be taking to respond to the concern underlying that recommendation.

Finally, as the Air Force continues to investigate this matter, the committee will view as unacceptable any act of retaliation against any F–22A Raptor pilot who raises concerns about the safety of this aircraft or declines to fly it on that basis.

Avionics systems for C–130 aircraft (sec. 143)

The committee recommends a provision that would delay Air Force implementation of the cancellation or modification of the Avionics Modernization Program for the C–130 aircraft until 30 days after the receipt of a report submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Procurement of space-based infrared system satellites (sec. 144)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to acquire two Space Based Infrared System Satellites (SBIRS) under a fixed price contract. The provision would further cap the total cost of the satellites at $3.9 billion but provide limited exceptions to this cap. The provision would also permit the Secretary to incrementally fund the contract over a 6 year period.

Thirty days after entering into the contract, the provision would direct the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees setting forth the specifics of the contract, which would include the cost savings and total cost of the contract. A second report would be due 90 days after the date of the contract describing the amount of the cost savings achieved and how the Secretary plans to use the savings to improve the capability of military infrared and early warning satellites. In addition, the provision would authorize the Secretary to use prior year funds for advance procurement for SBIRS satellite 6. Finally, the provision would set forth a sense of Congress that the cost savings achieved through the contracting authority provided in the provision should result in no less than 20 percent cost savings.

Transfer of certain fiscal year 2011 and 2012 funds for aircraft procurement for the Air Force (sec. 145)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Air Force to use, subject to appropriations, prior year funds that have been made available from program cancellations reflected in the fiscal 2013 budget request. The funds available from cancellations are as follows:

Program	Recommended Amount (Dollars in millions)
Light attack armed reconnaissance	$115.0
Light mobility aircraft	65.3
Common vertical lift support platform	52.8
C–130 avionics modernization program	207.2
RQ–4 Global Hawk Block 30	480.4
Total	$920.7

Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters

Multiyear procurement authority for V–22 Joint Aircraft Program (sec. 151)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to buy V–22 aircraft for the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the United States Special Operations Command under a multiyear procurement contract. This would be the second multiyear contract for the V–22 program. The Navy estimates that for the second contract (for fiscal years 2013–2017), the Navy stands to achieve almost 12 percent savings under the multiyear approach, as compared to annual procurement contracts.

Limitation on availability of funds for full-rate production of Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form/Fit radios under the Joint Tactical Radio System program (sec. 152)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of any funds for full rate production of the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS), Handheld, Manpack, and Small Form/Fit (HMS) radios until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD–ATL) certifies to the congressional defense committees that there is an approved acquisition strategy that promotes full and open competition to the maximum extent practicable.

The committee continues to support the JTRS program and remains convinced that managing program costs through competition will contribute significantly to the success and affordability of the Army's tactical network objectives. The committee is also aware that for over a year the Joint Program Office for JTRS has been preparing a detailed plan for an innovative acquisition model that would take advantage of competition based upon the availability of several developers of software programmable tactical radios that could meet the standards of JTRS. Accordingly, in last year's Senate report accompanying S. 1253 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee directed that the USD–ATL provide a briefing on the approved com-

petition strategy for JTRS HMS radios. The committee is concerned that after nearly 1 year there is still no approved competition strategy and that additional delay will make it more difficult for potential JTRS tactical radio producers to meet the Army's testing, certification, competition, and production objectives. The committee believes that competition, taking maximum advantage of both government and commercially developed and available tactical radios that meet JTRS technical and operational requirements, provides the Army the most affordable and flexible means of realizing its plans for a fully networked operational force.

Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program (sec. 153)

On November 9, 2010, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) provided the committee with a notification that the Command had awarded a sole source contract for the Shallow Water Combat Submersible (SWCS) program and stated "the contract provides only for firm-fixed-price task orders which are established in the contract." USSOCOM has requested a modification to its fiscal year 2013 budget request that would transfer $8.0 million from Procurement, Defense-wide, to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, to pay for cost growth in the engineering and manufacturing development phase of the SWCS program. According to U.S. USSOCOM, "extreme schedule variations from the baseline resulted in the inability to accurately track progress and cost." In response to an inquiry from committee staff following notification of SWCS cost and schedule variations, USSOCOM indicated "the contract has a combination of cost contract line items and firm fixed price contract line items."

The committee is concerned by the inaccurate and misleading contract notification described above and that it only learned of the projected SWCS schedule and cost overruns following the release of the fiscal year 2013 budget. The committee expects full and accurate notification of contract awards and reiterates its expectation that USSOCOM will keep it adequately informed of such acquisition program deviations at the time they are identified.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Commander of USSOCOM, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, to provide the congressional defense committees with a report describing: efforts by the contractor and USSOCOM to more accurately track schedule and cost; the revised timeline for SWCS initial and full operational capability; and the projected cost to meet the basis of issue requirement. The provision would also require that the Commander submit quarterly updates on the metrics from the earned value management system with which the Command is tracking cost and scheduled performance of the contractor. That requirement shall lapse once the SWCS has completed operational testing and has been found to be operationally effective and operationally suitable.

Budget Items

Army

Joint tactical radio systems integration

The budget request included $46.8 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA), for the integration of the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) onto the UH–60M Black Hawk and CH–47 Chinook helicopters. The committee notes that the airborne and maritime/fixed portion of the JTRS program is in the process of a restructuring that will result in an updated acquisition strategy, revised acquisition program baseline, and updated test and evaluation master plan. It is unlikely that JTRS radios will be available for integration before the end of fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends a decrease of $44.0 million in APA for aircraft integration of the JTRS radio.

M88A2 improved recovery vehicle

The budget request included $107.9 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the M88A2 (Hercules) improved recovery vehicle. The committee notes that the M88A2 is an upgrade program to the existing M88A1 recovery vehicle making it the only vehicle capable of towing an M1 Abrams tank without assistance from other vehicles. The Army planned to use a mixed fleet of M88A2s and older M88A1s in its armor brigade combat teams. M1 Abrams tanks require M88A2 recovery vehicles, but the current M2 Bradley vehicles, and other armored vehicle variants, can be recovered by the M88A1. The Army would reconsider its recovery vehicle mix, if any, when the M2 Bradley replacement Ground Combat Vehicle program matures and the recovery requirements of that vehicle are known. In the meantime, there is risk of a suspension of the industrial capability and capacity for production of M88A2 vehicles, as well as likely production of the Paladin Integrated Management program, and the potential production of a replacement for the M113 family of armored personnel carriers.

The committee recommends an increase of $123.0 million in WCTV for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle to mitigate the risk of the suspension of production through fiscal year 2013.

Advanced procurement for M1 Abrams tank upgrade program

The budget request included $74.4 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the M1 Abrams tank upgrade program. The budget request funds technical support services and the cost of fielding M1A2 System Enhancement Package (SEP) tanks to the Army, but does not fund additional tank upgrades. The committee recommends an increase of $91.0 million in WTCV only for the advanced procurement of critical long-lead materials for the Abrams upgrade program.

The committee is aware that beginning in fiscal year 2014 the Army will suspend its M1 Abrams tank upgrade program for up to 3 years at which time it plans to start its next series of improvements. Congress provided additional funds in the fiscal year 2012

appropriation to sustain tank production at the facility through 2013 and into 2014. However, not enough tank upgrade production is funded in the fiscal year 2013 request to sustain the facility throughout 2014.

The Army's tank industrial base and production facility could sustain its minimum capability and capacity over the next 3 years if a number of potential tank and other armored vehicle sales to foreign allies are approved and orders finalized over the next several months. If all projected and potential foreign sales materialize, armored vehicle production could exceed the minimum sustaining requirement asserted by the contractor until the Army starts its next tank upgrade program.

Given that funds added by Congress in fiscal year 2012 already sustains production through fiscal year 2013, the industrial base risk is limited to long-lead materials related to potential production shortfalls in fiscal year 2014. Accordingly, in order to reduce industrial risk among second and third tier suppliers, the committee recommends an increase of $91.0 million in WTCV for advance procurement of long-lead materials for 33 additional tanks in the M1 Abrams upgrade program. Advanced procurement is common to many large, complex weapon systems programs in which funds are provided in 1 or more years prior to the year of final production in order to ensure the availability of those components that require a long time to produce for installation at the appropriate point in the assembly process.

Additional funds for M1 Abrams tank upgrade advanced procurement should be targeted in a manner that best mitigates the most acute criticality and fragility risks in the industrial base among small suppliers who are in danger of getting out of the tank components business 6 months or more ahead of final tank production. The committee expects the Army to use data developed by the Department of Defense's ongoing sector by sector/tier by tier analysis of the defense industrial base in making decisions on the allocation of these funds.

Supporting long-lead suppliers with additional funds in fiscal year 2013 also manages financial risk in this challenging budget environment and allows time for the resolution of sales to foreign allies that could stabilize and sustain the flow of workload throughout the production cycle for the Army's facility and suppliers. Congress retains the flexibility to fund the completion of this tank production, if necessary to sustain the facility's minimum requirements, in fiscal year 2014.

Finally, the committee recognizes that the Army is working through force structure and capability mix analysis and decision making processes that to a significant extent will determine the demand for tank production for the next 10 or more years. Additionally, the Defense Department's and Army's increased focus on building the capacity of partner nations will create particular combat vehicle production demands. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report not later than March 31, 2013, on the Army's analysis and plans to utilize and configure it's government-owned/contractor-operated tank production facility to efficiently and effectively meet the Army's tank and other tracked and wheeled vehicle production related requirements and foreign mili-

tary sales to meet Department partnership building capability goals to 2025 and beyond.

Lightweight .50 caliber machine gun

The budget request included $25.2 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV), Army, for the XM806 lightweight .50 caliber machine gun. The committee understands that the Army will terminate this program and therefore recommends a decrease of $25.2 million in WCTV for the XM806 lightweight .50 caliber machine gun.

The committee also understands that the decision to cancel the XM806 program was based on the Army's recalculation of its machine gun requirements given pending force structure reductions and cost tradeoffs compared to upgrading the currently fielded version of the M2A1 .50 caliber machine gun.

The committee is concerned that this decision may be inconsistent with the Army's broader equipping objectives to reduce the soldier's load while at the same time increasing the capability and reliability of weapons. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit with its fiscal year 2014 budget request submission, a report to the congressional defense committees on its revised requirements for M2 .50 caliber machine guns, in light of proposed force structure reductions, with a description of its plan to meet those requirements. The report should include: cost and schedule plans for the overhaul of M2 .50 caliber weapons through the future-years defense program (FYDP); the estimated procurement average unit cost of M2 .50 caliber overhaul compared to the cost of producing the XM806; the current number of M2 and M2A1 machine guns in the Army inventory; the total number of .50 caliber machine guns that would be in the inventory at the end of the FYDP if funds for M2 overhaul were allocated for new XM806 machine guns; the costs and benefits of the XM806 compared to M2 and M2A1 weapons; and an assessment of the potential impact of the Army's M2 and M2A1 plan to the machine gun industrial base.

30mm and 40mm ammunition reductions for excess

The budget request included $1.7 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $72.1 million was for 30mm and $60.1 million was for 40mm.

The Government Accountability Office has identified $37.0 million in excess to requirements for 30mm in fiscal year 2013 due to changes in pricing. Additionally, $75.0 million in excess to requirements in fiscal year 2011 funding for 40mm ammunition has been identified and has been returned by the Army's Program Executive Office for Ammunition to the Army Budget Office for potential reprogramming. This funding remains available for obligation until September 30, 2013, and if released back to the program, $60.1 million could be used to cover the Army's entire fiscal year 2013 procurement budget request for 40mm ammunition.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $97.1 million in PAA: $37.0 million in 30mm and $60.1 million in 40mm.

Excalibur 1–b round schedule delay

The budget request included $110.3 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), for 155mm extended range XM–982 (Excalibur 1–b).

The committee was briefed by the Army that the Excalibur 1–b round will have a schedule delay in fiscal year 2013.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $55.0 million in PAA for 155mm extended range XM–982 munitions.

Spider network munitions reduction

The budget request included $1.7 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $17.4 million was for Spider network munitions.

The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation expressed concerns with respect to the XM–7 Spider.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $14.3 million in PAA for Spider network munitions.

Family of medium tactical vehicles

The budget request included $346.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the procurement of Family of Medium Tactical Vehicle (FMTV) trucks. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in OPA for FMTV trucks for the U.S. Army Reserve.

Joint tactical radio system airborne and maritime/fixed radios

The budget request included $74.0 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the procurement of airborne and maritime/fixed (AMF) radios. The committee notes that the AMF portion of the Joint Tactical Radio System program is in the process of a restructuring that will result in an updated acquisition strategy, revised acquisition program baseline, and updated test and evaluation master plan. It is unlikely that JTRS radios will be available for integration onto Army helicopters before the end of fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in OPA for AMF radio.

Spider remote control unit

The budget request included $34.4 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the Spider remote control unit. The committee notes that this technology is not performing as expected and will not be approved for service use until awarded a full material release and type classification late in fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends a decrease of $21.0 million in OPA for Spider remote control units.

Sense-through-the-wall sensor program

The budget request included $6.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the sense-through-the-wall (STTW) sensor. The committee notes that the program has been delayed due to technology performance issues and that most of the funds provided in prior year appropriations remains unobligated. The committee recommends a decrease of $6.2 million in OPA for STTW.

Small unmanned ground vehicle

The budget request included $83.9 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the small unmanned ground vehicle (SUGV). At the Army's request, the committee recommends a decrease of $12.0 million in OPA for SUGV and an increase of $12.0 million in PE 64641A for continued SUGV research and development.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request included $227.4 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF) staff and infrastructure line of operation. The committee recommends transferring all of JIEDDF funds from title I to the same budget activity in title XV, which funds the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) of the Department. The committee believes JIEDDO should be in the OCO portion of the budget request as it was established in response to threats confronted by U.S. forces in Afghanistan.

Navy

F/A–18E/F

The budget request included $3,063.6 million to purchase 26 F/A–18E/F aircraft and 12 EA–18G aircraft. The budget also included $30.3 million for advance procurement of 13 F/A–18E/F aircraft in fiscal year 2014. Fiscal year 2014 would represent the final year of production for the Department of the Navy. Throughout the past several years, the committee has expressed concern that the Navy is facing a sizeable gap in aircraft inventory as older F/A–18A–D Hornets retire before the aircraft carrier variant (F–35C) of the Joint Strike Fighter is available.

This year, the Navy says that the maximum shortfall is now projected to be around 56 aircraft. The Navy claims that the estimated shortfall has not increased much since last year even though the Department removed a total of 64 F–35B and F–35C aircraft from the future-years defense program (FYDP). The Navy's estimate of the shortfall is based on conducting intensive management of the current inventory, making some reduction in force structure within Marine Corps aviation, and pursuing a service life extension program (SLEP) of 150 F/A–18 aircraft.

The Navy intends that a SLEP would extend the life of select legacy F/A–18s from 8,600 to 10,000 flight hours. As yet, the Navy does not have sufficient data to predict the failure rate for aircraft being inducted into the SLEP program. Too high a failure rate could leave the Navy with too few aircraft that could benefit from the SLEP program, which would exacerbate the shortfall projections.

The FYDP projection shows that the Navy intends to buy no more EA–18G aircraft, despite the fact that the Marine Corps intends to retire their fleet of EA–6B electronic warfare aircraft without fielding a direct replacement.

Either a realization of a larger shortfall of strike fighter inventory, or a new requirement to replace the capability currently provided by the Marine Corps' EA–6B aircraft could result in a de-

mand for more aircraft beyond the 13 aircraft planned in fiscal year 2014. Therefore, the committee believes it would be prudent to provide some additional advance procurement funding in fiscal year 2013 to allow the Navy and the Defense Department time to get better data on the SLEP program and evaluate proposals to increase requirements for the EA–18G aircraft to account for the impending loss of the EA–6B aircraft. The committee recommends an additional $60.0 million for advance procurement for F/A–18E/F or EA–18G aircraft, to be obligated only if the Navy budget request for fiscal year 2014 for F–18 aircraft includes buying more than 13 new aircraft.

Close-in weapon system modifications

The budget request included $59.3 million to purchase and install various modifications for the close-in weapon system (CIWS), including $9.7 million for reliability, maintainability and availability (RMA) kits. The CIWS is the primary, last ditch self defense system in the Navy fleet.

The Navy has begun experiencing reliability problems with the latest CIWS version, the Block 1B. To deal with these issues, the Navy has developed the RMA kit that will fix known reliability problems and also deal with issues of parts obsolescence. The Navy can install the RMA kits dockside, without having to send the CIWS or its modules to the depot. In addition, installing these kits will allow the Navy to extend time between major CIWS overhauls to be extended, while still maintaining an acceptable level of operational availability. The committee believes that the Navy should move more expeditiously on fielding these kits to the fleet, and recommends an additional $7.7 million to buy 28 additional RMA kits.

81mm, grenade, and demolition munitions reductions for excess

The budget request included $759.5 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (PANMC), of which $13.7 million was for 81mm, $7.6 million was for grenades, and $2.0 million was for demolition munitions.

The Government Accountability Office has identified $12.5 million in excess to requirements for the Marine Corps' fiscal year 2013 ammunition procurement request. Program officials stated that changes in Marine Corps' methodology for determining ammunition requirements for training, changes to assumptions for calculating the necessary war reserves, and the large amount of ammunition already in inventory or expected for delivery, have made a portion of the fiscal year 2013 budget request for specific ammunition types excess to program needs.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $12.5 million in PANMC: $10.0 million in 81mm, $0.5 million in grenades, and $2.0 million in demolition munitions.

Air Force

Joint surveillance/target attack radar system

The budget request included $59.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the E–8 modifications program and

$24.2 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E), Air Force for Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar Systems (JSTARS). Unlike previous years, the Air Force did not request procurement funding for the program to re-engine JSTARS aircraft. A portion of RDT&E funding supports continuing system development and demonstration (SDD) in the re-engining program. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to the budget request for APAF to restart the production line for the re-engining program.

The committee remains concerned by the slow progress of the re-engining program despite years of significant congressional support. The Air Force decided to delay the re-engining program pending an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) of overall ground moving target indicator (GMTI) requirements. Last year, the Senate report accompanying S. 1235 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 said, "Regardless of what that study concludes, however, the committee believes that re-engining the JSTARS fleet makes sense. . . . However, even if the Air Force study were to conclude that some new system or combination of systems would provide better broad area GMTI for the future, it is hard to imagine that another alternative would actually begin complete fielding of a JSTARS replacement capability before the re-engining pays for itself."

Therefore, the committee was troubled that funding authorized and appropriated for re-engining over the past several years has either been reprogrammed or remains unspent. Last year, the committee recommended a provision requiring the Air Force Audit Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees the results of a financial audit of the funds previously authorized and appropriated for the JSTARS aircraft re-engining program. The committee still has not received the results of that audit.

The Air Force has still not produced the AoA either, so the budget remains silent on course of action for modernizing GMTI capability. However, in testimony before the committee on March 22, 2012, Air Force Chief of Staff General Norton Schwartz confirmed that the Air Force was going to stick with the E–8C program, testifying, "Notwithstanding the AoA . . . we will continue with the combination of the JSTARS GMTI capability, with the Block 40 Global Hawk." This prospect was confirmed in the Department of Defense's Annual Aviation Inventory and Funding Plan for Fiscal Years 2013–2042, which indicated that the Department has no alternatives to JSTARS expected to emerge in that 30-year period.

Since the Air Force will now clearly be keeping the E–8C aircraft for the foreseeable future, the committee believes it is even more critical that the Air Force budget sufficient funds to sustain JSTARS for the long term. The committee understands the need to proceed carefully through re-engining SDD to collect all necessary data to inform decisions about this program, as well as the difficulties associated with restarting the re-engining process on a small fleet of aircraft in a constant state of high operational tempo.

However, the committee believes that proceeding with re-engining of the JSTARS fleet to improve performance and fuel efficiency is consistent with warfighter requirements and Air Force priorities.

Also, if the Air Force continues to operate the JSTARS platform for the foreseeable future, the Service will have to modernize other aspects of the JSTARS airframe and system. To keep the JSTARS system viable and avoid erosion in performance, the Air Force will have to pursue such modernization efforts as upgrading radars, replacing diminishing manufacturing source items (including those for primary mission equipment and avionics), and improving communications and target identification systems. From that perspective, the committee is concerned that the current future-years defense program (FYDP) includes minimal funding for JSTARS modernization efforts. Therefore, the committee believes the Air Force should devote increased funding toward JSTARS modernization in the next FYDP to ensure that the JSTARS aircraft continue to fly and operate for the foreseeable future, without any decrease in mission capable rates or system performance.

Defense-wide

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

The budget request included $460.7 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for procurement of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) interceptors. The committee notes that the THAAD interceptor system has experienced difficulties with its production process and has not yet been able to achieve the planned production rate of four interceptors per month. Over the past 2 years, this has led Congress to reduce funds below the level requested for THAAD interceptor procurement by nearly $400.0 million. As a result of these production challenges, the schedule for THAAD interceptor deliveries has been delayed and reduced significantly.

In the budget request, the Department of Defense would reduce the planned number of THAAD batteries in the future-years defense program (FYDP) from 9 to 6, and reduce the corresponding number of THAAD interceptors by 157. Although the Department maintains its previous procurement objective of 503 THAAD interceptors, this level would not be achieved until after the FYDP. According to LTG Richard Formica, the Commander of U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, and Commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense, the decision to reduce THAAD procurement during the FYDP was made by a broad range of senior defense and military officials after careful consideration of the integrated missile defense priorities of the combatant commanders and the need to maintain a balance between homeland defense and regional missile defense investments and capabilities.

The committee notes that, as LTG Formica testified, "the demand for THAAD and TPY–2 radars—like the demand for other missile defense assets—continues to increase and has not been reduced by combatant commanders." The committee believes that increasing the number of THAAD interceptors is the most cost-effective and affordable way to provide increased capability to regional combatant commanders.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million to Procurement, Defense-wide, for procurement of additional THAAD interceptors.

Special operations aviation

The budget request included $99.8 million for the procurement of seven Aviation Foreign Internal Defense (AvFID) aircraft and $7.5 million for low cost modifications to U–28 aircraft in Procurement, Defense-wide.

Last year, the congressional defense committees expressed concern about the AvFID and Non-Standard Aviation (NSAv) programs and required a report from the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) describing these programs, justifying their requirement, and analyzing efficiencies that could be gained from procuring common special operations aviation platforms, among other things. On March 5, 2012, the Commander of USSOCOM delivered the required report to the congressional defense committees with a revised strategy that combines special operations AvFID and NSAv missions while gaining additional manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities. The committee supports this revised strategy because it provides training and maintenance efficiencies through the procurement of multi-mission platforms for AvFID and NSAv missions, while also increasing much needed ISR capacity to support deployed special operations forces.

Consistent with the new strategy outlined by the Commander of USSOCOM, the committee recommends a transfer of $62.8 million within Procurement, Defense-wide, from the Non-Standard Aviation budget line to the U–28 budget line. This transfer would reduce AvFID procurement from seven to two aircraft and increase the quantity of U–28 aircraft by four. Additionally, the committee supports use of previously authorized funds to re-mission previously acquired aircraft consistent with the strategy laid out by the Commander of USSOCOM.

High definition full motion video

The budget request included no funding in Procurement, Defense-wide, for high definition full motion video (HD FMV) capabilities for airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) platforms. The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has indicated that the requirement for HD FMV was not quantified until after the fiscal year 2013 budget request was finalized and has identified it as the only fiscal year 2013 unfunded requirement for special operations forces.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on March 27, 2012, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict stated "the high definition capability is a game changer for decision makers" because it provides a greater degree of clarity in making decisions regarding the use of force, while minimizing the risk of collateral damage. Additionally, the Commander of USSOCOM has told the committee "Recent operational success highlighted the need for the HD FMV capability to be fielded on special operations platforms as soon as possible."

The committee recommends total increases of $142.4 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, $16.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, and $0.6 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for the fielding of additional

HD FMV capabilities. The committee is aware that USSOCOM intends to begin to address this urgent requirement using previously authorized and appropriated funds, including $9.5 million in Combat Mission Requirements funds and a $29.6 million Above Threshold Reprogramming request.

Items of Special Interest

Common remotely operated weapon station

The committee notes that funding for the common remotely operated weapon station (CROWS) has been transferred from the Overseas Contingency Operations budget to the Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles appropriation in the Army's base budget for fiscal year 2013. The committee is also aware that the Army released a request for proposals in January 2012, to initiate a competition for the next-generation of CROWS systems with contract award projected for early in fiscal year 2013.

The committee supports this competitive acquisition strategy; however, the Army has not yet decided on a CROWS basis of issue plan and therefore there is uncertainty with respect to the overall Army acquisition objective for this system. The committee is aware that the Army currently has over 6,400 CROWS systems in its inventory and estimates for an acquisition objective vary from as few as just over 11,000 to as many as 14,000.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology (ASA–ALT) to notify the congressional defense committees when decisions are made that establish a CROWS basis of issue plan and an acquisition objective. Following notification, the ASA–ALT shall provide a briefing that describes the CROWS acquisition strategy including a full and open competition, Army acquisition objective, other services' acquisition objectives, if any, as well as a funding profile and schedule through the future-years defense program.

Impact of Global Hawk Block 30 termination

The committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provide a briefing to the congressional defense and intelligence committees on the likely impact of the termination on the MQ–4C Broad-Area Maritime Surveillance System (BAMS) program no later than July 31, 2012.

The committee understands that the unit price of the BAMS aircraft could also be affected by decisions on the continued production of Global Hawk Block 40 aircraft for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) program and for the Air Force. Therefore, the committee would also like to understand the impact on the unit price of BAMS if the NATO AGS program does not proceed with the acquisition of five Global Hawk aircraft, or if the Air Force terminates its Block 40 program, or if both of these contingencies were to occur.

Integrated base defense

The committee is aware of Department of Defense efforts to develop and field technologies that address threats to forward stationed and deployed military installations as well as those within

the United States. The committee is encouraged by the inclusion of funds for integrated base defense programs in the fiscal year 2013 budget and the potential of a variety of technologies that could provide joint, interoperable force protection systems and better protect our installations, regardless of size, with increased efficiency and affordability.

The committee directs that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, or his designee, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, provide the congressional defense committees with a briefing not later than March 31, 2013, on the Department of Defense's requirements determination and technology development, acquisition, and fielding plans to provide capabilities to improve integrated base defense systems.

Joint strike fighter program

Department of Defense (DOD) officials have testified that the F–35 "Lightning II" Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program is the most concurrent program in DOD recent experience. Concurrency refers to the overlap between system development and testing, and production. Excessive concurrency arises when a program's development and production overlap to the extent that major, expensive changes identified in testing have to be made in production items after they are on the production line or after they are delivered.

According to JSF's Program Executive Officer, "Fundamentally, that was a miscalculation . . . You'd like to take the keys to your shiny new jet and give it to the fleet with all the capability and all the service life they want. What we're doing is, we're taking the keys to the shiny new jet, giving it to the fleet and saying, 'Give me that jet back in the first year. I've got to go take it up to this depot for a couple of months and tear into it and put in some structural mods, because if I don't, we're not going to be able to fly it more than a couple, three, four, five years.' That's what concurrency is doing to us."

The Acting Under Secretary of Defense of Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics was considerably more pointed in his assessment, referring to the decision made years ago to put JSF into production before flight testing had started as "acquisition malpractice." He noted that the program was started with "the optimistic prediction that we were good enough at modeling and simulation that we would not find problems in flight test . . . That was wrong, and now we are paying for that."

The committee agrees with these appraisals and views them as a valuable starting point that may help ensure that the additional 33 months and $7.9 billion that DOD has added to the previous JSF development plan will result in a sustainable program capable of delivering the required capability to the warfighter. The committee remains concerned that, even with these changes, the level of concurrency risk that still resides in the program may be excessive.

Because of concern about the lack of a coherent concurrency change management strategy in the JSF program, the committee declined to approve DOD's request to reprogram funds from other

programs to cover part of a roughly $771.0 million cost overrun in low-rate initial production lots (LRIP) lots 1 through 3.

Unfortunately, the cost growth problem persists. As of March 2012, DOD estimates total concurrency costs for LRIP–1 at $50.1 million; LRIP–2, $300.3 million; LRIP–3, $319.1 million; and LRIP–4, $523.3 million. The committee does not find this trend encouraging and believes that the program must ensure that these costs are managed more effectively and that the prime contractor share equitably in them.

In addition to concurrency change management, the committee is concerned about the JSF program's lack of progress in software development. The most recent Selected Acquisition Report for this program identified this issue as "a significant area of focus," Challenges facing efforts to develop and integrate software Block 1B and Block 2A appear to be affecting the successful delivery of Block 2B capability. While the program has built capacity in the integrated master schedule for discovering and dealing with problems in the development of Blocks 2 and 3, the potential cascading effect of failures to deliver software capability on the balance of a major developmental program like JSF can be particularly pernicious.

The committee, therefore, believes that the contracting strategy for this program should target improved performance in the development of software to ensure that the Block 2A schedule will be met. To ensure the dependable delivery of needed software capability, the Joint Program Office (JPO) and the prime contractor must work collaboratively to properly assess software maturity for readiness to proceed to flight-testing and for production-release; provide for sufficient schedule capacity to support the production and delivery of unscheduled software builds; move towards automatically generated, data-driven capability maturity metrics across the entire air-system; and structure the program's management of software development to enable premeditated trades among capability, cost, and schedule.

The committee is similarly concerned about production quality and whether it is sufficient to ensure the delivery of JSF aircraft to the U.S. and its allies at an affordable price. The average rate of scrap, rework, and repair at the prime contractor's main manufacturing facility from 2009 through the first 2 months of 2012 gives rise to concern. Inattention to production quality also appears to have contributed to discovery of a potentially serious issue with an aperture on the aircraft critical to its electronic warfare capability. While the full extent of this problem is presently unknown, it underscores the fact that DOD and the contractor team must rigorously manage production quality.

With the foregoing in mind, the committee is hopeful about an approach that DOD has taken to try to address some of the issues described above. Under this approach, called a "development dial" or "dial-up" approach, DOD would modulate its purchase of future aircraft for which funding has been authorized and appropriated based on how the prime contractor performs in the areas of concurrency risk reduction, software development, flight-testing, and durability.

While the committee believe this approach holds merit, it also believes that the approach's success in incentivizing desired con-

tractor performance will require that DOD identify a very clear, specific, and realistically achievable set of performance criteria upfront. The specificity of these criteria should be sufficient to convey to the prime contractor what constitutes desired performance and how its performance, once rendered, would be assessed. The committee directs DOD to provide these criteria to the congressional defense committees before they are actually implemented so that the committees may assess their efficacy.

Paladin integrated management program

The committee has observed over many years and programs that the challenges of development, testing, production, and fielding schedules must be carefully estimated and tradeoffs managed to avoid increasing risk and cost to the overall program. In the case of the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program, however, the committee recognizes the potential to accelerate elements of the development and production schedules that could result in the earlier delivery of improved artillery capability to the Army. According to the Army's current production schedule, the PIM program will receive a Milestone C decision in June 2013, and a full-rate production decision in January 2017. The committee is aware that the Army is conducting a business case analysis to identify and assess options with respect to the cost effectiveness of the program's schedule, the health and readiness of the industrial base, and opportunities, if any, to accelerate development, production, and fielding of this system.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the completion of the business case analysis. The report shall include delineation and an assessment of feasible and affordable courses of action that includes contract and accelerated schedule options and a detailed explanation of any program decisions that result from the business case analysis.

Rotary-wing planning tools

The committee is aware that the Army has no documented requirement for a rotary wing performance mission planning tool but that a variety of tools and capabilities are available that could increase the safety and effectiveness of helicopter operations. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing and corresponding data to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2013, assessing the Army's current helicopter operations mission planning tools and capabilities, and efforts to develop or acquire such capabilities if required, suitable, effective, and affordable.

Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget implication

The administration's budget request for national defense discretionary programs within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services for fiscal year 2013 was $631.6 billion. Of this amount, $525.3 billion was requested for base Department of Defense programs, $88.5 billion was requested for overseas contingency operations, and $17.8 billion was requested for national secu-

rity programs in the Department of Energy and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The bill authorizes $631.4 billion in fiscal year 2013, including $525.8 billion for base Department of Defense programs, $88.2 billion for overseas contingency operations, and $17.3 billion for national security programs in the Department of Energy and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The administration's fiscal year 2013 budget for national defense also included discretionary programs outside the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, discretionary programs that do not require further authorization, and mandatory programs that are in current law. When these programs are added to the administration's budget the request for national defense totaled $646.7 billion.

The following two tables summarize the direct authorizations and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2013 defense programs. The first table summarizes committee action on the authorizations within the jurisdiction of this committee. It includes the authorization for spending from the trust fund of the Armed Forces Retirement Home which is outside the national defense budget function. The second table summarizes the total budget authority implication for national defense by adding funding for items that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or do not require an annual authorization.

Use of advance procurement for major systems

The Department of Defense (DOD) has traditionally requested advance procurement funding to support the efficient procurement and production rates for significant annual buys and multiyear purchases of weapon systems and equipment. The fiscal year 2012 budget request did not include any advance procurement funding for C–130J aircraft the Air Force intended to purchase in fiscal year 2013. However, Congress added $120.0 million for this purpose in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), based on information that such advance procurement would reduce overall costs of the program.

In the fiscal year 2013 budget request, the Air Force again failed to ask for advance procurement funding for the 27 HC/MC/AC–130J aircraft the Department intends to purchase in fiscal year 2014. In responding to questions from the committee last year, DOD indicated that adding advance procurement funding for C–130J aircraft in fiscal year 2012 could result in net savings to the government. Also, internal Air Force documents asserted that failure to include advance procurement funding would result in increased unit cost and delayed delivery of aircraft to the warfighter.

The committee believes that DOD should apply traditional advance procurement funding practices consistently across all DOD aircraft procurement programs, particularly when having advance procurement funding would result in more efficient production and lower costs. The committee expects that DOD will explain the rationale for any departure from the normal practice of providing advance procurement funding, including why such a departure is more efficient or more effective.

U.S. Special Operations Command Budget line items

The committee notes that in recent years the number of budget line items associated with U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) research and development and procurement activities has grown. The committee believes adequate fidelity in USSOCOM's budget justification documents is critical to performance of its oversight responsibilities. However, the committee also understands that congressionally imposed reprogramming thresholds may, in some cases, have a disparate impact on USSOCOM as compared to the military departments because of the number of relatively small USSOCOM budget line items, thereby reducing USSOCOM's budget flexibility to meet command requirements. The committee would welcome a proposal from USSOCOM to address this issue by consolidating appropriate budget line items in future years, while providing equal or better fidelity in the budget justification documents to the congressional defense committees.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation activities at the levels identified in section 4201 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Next Generation Foundry for the Defense Microelectronics Activity (sec. 211)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense from executing any funds in PE 603720S for the 90 nanometer Next Generation Foundry until 60 days after the Department delivers to the congressional defense committees a defense microelectronics strategy and a full life cycle cost estimate of the Defense Microelectronics Activity's Next Generation Foundry. This strategy, as well as the committee's recommendation to decrease funds available in this program element, are described elsewhere in this report.

Advanced rotorcraft initiative (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) to develop and submit a strategy to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the use of integrated platform design teams and agile prototyping approaches for the development of advanced rotorcraft capabilities.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has recently stated that increasing prototyping of advanced technology capabilities is a potential approach to be able to keep the technical expertise of the defense industrial base exercised in a reduced budgetary environment. With declining budgets leading to reduced numbers of acquisition programs and quantities of weapon systems, it is crucial that design experience and skills in the various sectors of the defense industrial base be preserved. These skills are important not only to be readily available when the Department requires them, but the ability to sustain and pass these skills on to successive generations of engineers is intertwined intimately with the challenges of attracting and retaining the best and brightest engineers and technicians to work in both the public and private sectors of the national security enterprise. Such talent will not be

recruited or retained without the key attraction of multiple opportunities for very challenging work over the course of one's professional career.

One of the key challenges facing the defense industrial base today is that the design and development cycles of major defense acquisition programs (MDAP) are so protracted. The skills typically acquired and honed through multiple design cycles are not being adequately learned. The result is that many of the MDAPs are behind schedule and above cost because the design and development teams are actually doing "on the job training". Such a situation is far from acceptable, and hence the acknowledgement that the DOD needs to develop a comprehensive strategy identifying and growing integrated platform design teams. Providing these teams the opportunity to exercise their skills in a series of relatively frequent prototyping activities is long overdue.

The Department needs to go beyond the rhetoric of occasional speeches and needs to undertake a serious effort to develop a comprehensive strategy that encompasses elements within USD(AT&L) including the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (ASD(R&E)) and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, as well as the services. Two key elements that must be addressed in such a strategy are integrated platform design teams and agile prototyping activities.

Depending upon the defense industrial base sector, integrated platform design teams should be viewed as critical national assets. They can provide the capability to quickly develop and field revolutionary defense capabilities. These teams are small, by nature, typically consisting of an engineering and design core of less than 50 people. This core group is prized for its cross-disciplinary nature, breadth of knowledge, and past experience with successfully shepherding defense products all the way from concept to initial fielding.

As demonstrated in the "golden age" of aerospace development, integrated platform design teams were most effectively built and managed by running complex, integrated development projects in rapid succession, preferably with 1–4 year timelines. The most effective projects involved complex, integrated systems or platforms (such as complete aircraft), which also drove advancement of subsystems and component technologies beyond what was available off-the-shelf commercially.

Closing the design-to-initial operations cycle is essential to building and maintaining design capabilities. The successful core design team is typically surrounded by talented technicians and operators. In this manner, engineering, manufacturing, testing, and operations capabilities are tightly integrated without organizational or communications barriers. The close interactions between these various areas of expertise promote design validation through real-world operational experimentation.

Lastly, it is imperative that the core engineers work under streamlined management, driven to motivate and empower the team. To foster rapid technological advances, the team must be granted significant requirements leeway and be insulated from ex-

cessive pressures of process, thus focusing entirely on time and cost-effective development and fielding.

In the absence of sufficient new major defense acquisition programs, a mechanism to keep integrated platform design teams exercised is the use of agile prototyping. This concept, sometimes referred to as exploratory development, is a framework to ensure that rapid, higher risk technology development can continue without the linkages to formal requirements and the attendant commitment to production and a formal acquisition program. In the historical parlance of aeronautics, X-planes have been the classic example. The point of such technology development activities is not to produce systems that have a formal operational requirement, but to create technology options and reduce technical risk for whenever formal operational and programmatic requirements emerge in the future.

One area of the defense industrial base that has not seen significant new innovations is rotorcraft. Over the last decade, rotorcraft have been crucial in our war fighting operations. The committee believes that among the various defense industrial base sectors, the preservation of integrated platform design teams and the use of agile prototyping is most needed in this sector. The committee observes that it has been over 2 decades since the last completely new DOD rotorcraft, the V–22 Osprey, was developed.

Last year, the committee expressed its views on the state of DOD's rotorcraft science and technology (S&T) activities in its report. The committee continues to express concern over the overall state of DOD's rotorcraft S&T programs. Specifically, the committee strongly believes that the DOD is not engaging to the maximum possible extent in a coordinated fashion with its limited resources with the broadest range of industry and academia to foster innovative concepts for the next-generation of rotorcraft. The committee acknowledges the efforts that the ASD(R&E) is taking to coordinate the DOD's rotorcraft S&T activities, primarily by the Army, and its claims that it is making progress on the S&T plan in the Future Vertical Lift (FVL) Strategic Plan.

USD(AT&L)'s Vertical Lift Consortium (VLC)—self-formed by industry over 2 years ago—is not being exercised adequately by the services. The VLC is an open and competitive forum that leverages all sectors of the vertical lift community to encourage teaming of innovative small business and non-traditional contractors with major defense firms and academia. The VLC is contracted with the DOD through the establishment of an Other Transaction Authority (OTA). The OTA allows the formation of competitive teams to rapidly develop and flight demonstrate innovative vertical lift technologies that address capability gaps identified in the DOD FVL Strategic Plan such as performance, survivability, and affordability. The committee understands the DOD is completing an overdue report on the VLC that was called for by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives last year that was due April 1, 2012.

The Army is pursuing its Joint Multi-role (JMR) development program—without funding from other services. Absent further funding, current plans envision only one technology demonstrator in the 2017–2020 timeframe and initial fielding of a platform in the 2030 timeframe. The committee is concerned that only a single

technology demonstrator will fly and that pressures will be such that this vehicle will ultimately turn into the platform for the program of record—thus suppressing a truly competitive process for innovative concepts. Furthermore, the committee strongly urges that the Army develop Technology Capability Enabled Demonstrations, as it has for soldier-centric technologies, for advancing rotorcraft capabilities.

In addition, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has launched an X-Plane Rotorcraft program in fiscal year 2013 and it remains to be seen what this program will lead to. The committee strongly urges DARPA to structure its X-Plane Rotorcraft program to develop specific performance steps beyond the Army's desired attributes for platforms under the JMR program. DARPA should also consider expanding its X-Plane Rotorcraft program to provide for at least two competing teams. In addition, the committee urges DARPA to investigate how advances that it is making in advanced manufacturing can be applicable to the rotorcraft sector.

Given the situation depicted above, the committee directs that the USD(AT&L), working with the services and DARPA, develop and submit to the congressional defense committees a strategy that will address measures that DOD will take to retain—and where appropriate—develop, integrated platform design teams. Given the complexity of this problem, this strategy shall focus initially on the rotorcraft sector. The strategy shall also address how agile prototyping practices and programs can be established, including rotorcraft X-planes, and what level of resources would be required. The strategy should consider possibly restructuring the Army's JMR program to include more technology demonstration platforms with challenge goals of significant reductions in cost and time to flight.

Lastly, the strategy should also address how other innovative approaches such as competitive prize awards can be applied. The committee found it disappointing that in a report by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, dated March 2012, "Implementation of Federal Prize Authority: Progress Report", there was only one example of DOD using this prize authority. The strategy should address how prizes could be potentially used to address some challenge problems, primarily for unmanned rotorcraft, such as: nap-of-earth automated flight, urban operation near buildings, slope landings, automated autorotation or power-off recovery, and automated selection of landing areas.

In the development of this strategy, the committee directs the USD(AT&L) to work with the VLC for their inputs and to consider both manned and unmanned rotorcraft across the broad range of DOD missions.

Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Navy research, development, test, and evaluation funds (sec. 213)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Navy to use, subject to appropriations, prior year funds that have been made available from program cancellations reflected in the fiscal 2013 budget request. The funds available from cancellations are as follows:

Program	Recommended Amount (Dollars in millions)
Medium-range Maritime Unmanned Aerial System	$8.8
Total	$8.8

Authority for Department of Defense laboratories to enter into education partnerships with educational institutions in United States territories and possessions (sec. 214)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon a Department of Defense legislative proposal, that would authorize the directors of defense laboratories to enter into education partnership agreements with educational institutions in United States territories and possessions. Currently, a defense laboratory can only enter into an education partnership with educational institutions in the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

This provision will increase opportunities for defense laboratories to interact with additional educational institutions to further science, technology, engineering, and mathematics objectives. In addition, this provision would provide a potential opportunity for educational institutions in the U.S. territories and possessions to contribute to the national defense through a partnership with a Department of Defense laboratory.

Transfer of certain fiscal year 2012 Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation funds (sec. 215)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Air Force to use, subject to appropriations, prior year funds that have been made available from program cancellations reflected in the fiscal 2013 budget request. The funds available from cancellations are as follows:

Program	Recommended Amount (Dollars in millions)
C–130 avionics modernization program	$6.5
Miniature air-launched decoy, phase II	7.9
RQ–4 Global Hawk Block 30	64.0
Total	$78.4

Subtitle C—Missile Defense Matters

Homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress on homeland ballistic missile defense, and would require a report on the status of efforts to improve the homeland defense capability of the United States.

The committee notes that the first policy priority described in the February 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review is to continue providing homeland ballistic missile defense against the potential future threat of limited ballistic missile attack from nations such as North Korea and Iran. The currently deployed Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, with 30 Ground-Based Interceptors deployed in Alaska and California, provides protection of the

United States against such future threats. This policy relies on two approaches: 1) improving the reliability and performance of the GMD system, particularly its Ground-Based Interceptors; and 2) taking prudent steps to hedge against the possibility that the threat might grow faster or larger than anticipated. The Department of Defense is taking significant steps on both approaches. The provision would require the Department to report on the steps it is taking on both approaches, including the results of its efforts to demonstrate in flight testing the correction to the problem that caused the GMD flight test failure of December 2010.

Regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress on regional ballistic missile defense, and would require a report on the European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense and other regional missile defense efforts of the United States.

The committee notes that the threat to forward-deployed U.S. forces, allies and partners from regional ballistic missiles, particularly from Iran and North Korea, is serious and growing rapidly. Consequently, the Department of Defense has "made defending against near-term regional threats a top priority in our missile defense plans, programs and capabilities," as Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review of February 2010.

The committee believes the Department of Defense has an obligation to provide force protection to forward-deployed U.S. forces, assets, and facilities, and to defend allies, from the threat of regional ballistic missile attack. The Department is implementing a set of programs and efforts to enhance U.S. and allied capabilities to defend against such regional ballistic missiles, especially against Iran and North Korea. These efforts, which include the European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense and similar phased and adaptive efforts tailored to the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific region, are essential to providing force protection for our deployed forces. These efforts are balanced with programs to enhance homeland defense, and are designed to meet the integrated missile defense priorities of the geographic combatant commands. Some of the regional missile defense capabilities, such as forward-deployed AN/TPY–2 missile defense radars in Japan and Turkey, and development of the Standard Missile–3 Block IIB interceptor missile, are intended to enhance homeland defense.

The Department also has numerous programs of cooperation with international partners to improve regional missile defense capabilities, including our North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, Israel, and Japan, among others. The committee supports these regional missile defense programs and partnerships, and believes they are an important component of regional security and stability.

Missile defense cooperation with Russia (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress in support of efforts of the United States to pursue missile defense cooperation with Russia that would enhance the security of the United States, its North Atlantic Treaty Organi-

zation (NATO) allies, and Russia, particularly against missile threats from Iran. The provision states that the United States should pursue such cooperation in a manner that does not in any way limit United States missile defenses and that ensures the protection of United States classified information. The provision also states the view that the United States should not provide Russia with sensitive missile defense information that would in any way compromise United States national security, including "hit-to-kill" technology and interceptor telemetry.

The committee notes that, for more than a decade, the United States has been pursuing and discussing, cooperation with Russia on shared early warning and ballistic missile defense issues. Congress has supported such efforts, and section 221 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) states the sense of Congress "to support the efforts of the United States government and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to pursue cooperation with the Russian Federation on ballistic missile defense relative to Iranian missile threats."

In addition to United States bilateral efforts with Russia on missile defense cooperation, NATO has undertaken efforts to seek such cooperation with Russia. At the Lisbon Summit in November 2010, NATO committed to "actively seek cooperation on missile defense with Russia," and declared that "NATO-Russia cooperation is of strategic importance," and that "the security of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Russia is intertwined."

The committee believes that missile defense cooperation with Russia could enhance the security of the United States, and could send a strong signal to Iran that the United States and Russia are joined in their opposition to Iran's nuclear and missile programs. The committee commends the administration for seeking such cooperation, and for its commitment to take the steps necessary to ensure that United States information is adequately safeguarded, including its commitment to "not provide Russia with sensitive information that would in any way compromise our national security, including hit-to-kill technology and interceptor telemetry," as stated by Robert Nabors, Assistant to the President and Director of the Office of Legislative Affairs in a letter dated April 13, 2012.

Next-generation Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (sec. 234)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to develop a long-term plan for the Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV) that addresses both modifications and enhancements to the current EKV and options for the competitive development of a next-generation EKV for the Ground-Based Interceptor of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense system and any other interceptor that might be developed for the defense of the United States against long-range ballistic missiles. The provision would also require the Director to submit a report to Congress setting forth the plan and an estimate of the cost and schedule of implementing the plan.

Modernization of the Patriot air and missile defense system (sec. 235)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit to the congressional defensecommittees a plan for support of requirements in connection with the modernization of the Patriot air and missile defense system. The plan would also include an assessment of the integrated air and missile defense capabilities required to meet the demands of evolving and emerging threats, and a plan for achieving reductions in the life cycle cost of the Patriot system.

Medium Extended Air Defense System (sec. 236)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2013 funds for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

Section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) limited the obligation or expenditure of more than 25 percent of the fiscal year 2012 funds authorized for MEADS until the Department of Defense submitted to the congressional defense committees a plan to use such funds as final obligations for the MEADS program. The Department submitted that plan in April 2012, as described elsewhere in this report.

Although the budget request included $400.9 million for the MEADS program, the committee believes it would be inconsistent with section 235 to authorize additional funds for MEADS, or to allow additional funds to be obligated or expended for MEADS.

The committee is aware that additional funding would be needed for the Army to continue providing security and technology transfer support for sensitive MEADS-related technology and equipment furnished by the United States to Germany and Italy on a temporary basis, in the event Germany and Italy choose to proceed without the United States for an additional year of MEADS design and development.

The committee understands the importance of ensuring the necessary security and technology transfer support for this sensitive technology and equipment until it is returned to the United States, and does not intend to hinder the ability of the Army to provide such security.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide the committee, within 30 days after the enactment of this Act, a revised estimate as to how much it would cost for the United States MEADS National Program Office to provide appropriate oversight and security of the sensitive U.S. Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) relative to the program. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide the committee with a plan for how the Army intends to budget for these costs through fiscal year 2013 utilizing funds authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2012.

The committee is aware of the possibility that additional legislative authority may be necessary to permit the Army to ensure continued security and technology transfer support for the sensitive GFE. The committee directs the Army to provide the committee with any views on this matter on an expedited basis, to permit early committee consideration of such views.

Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program (sec. 237)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $210.0 million in fiscal year 2013 funds to the Government of Israel for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

After the budget request was submitted, the Department of Defense announced it would submit a request for additional funding to provide to the Government of Israel to procure additional Iron Dome short-range rocket defense systems. Although the Department has not yet submitted the request, the committee understands that the fiscal year 2013 funding request will be for $210.0 million. The committee is aware of reports that the request being considered by the Department could include funding of as much as $680.0 million over multiple fiscal years, including fiscal year 2013. The committee looks forward to receiving the Department's request, and to continuing its support for Israel's missile defense programs, as described elsewhere in this report.

The committee notes that Israel has recently come under fire from short-range rockets from the Gaza strip. Israel currently has three operational Iron Dome batteries, and a fourth battery nearing deployment. However, these existing batteries do not provide adequate protection for the populated areas in Israel within range of short-range rocket attacks. The funding authorized in the provision would permit Israel to acquire additional Iron Dome systems to provide protection for more of its population against recurring short-range rocket attacks.

Subtitle D—Reports

Mission packages for the littoral combat ship (sec. 251)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to produce a report, in consultation with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, on the mine countermeasures warfare, antisubmarine warfare, and surface warfare mission packages for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS).

The Secretary's report would be required, at a minimum, to set forth the following:

(1) A plan for the Mission Packages demonstrating that Preliminary Design Review for every capability increment precedes Milestone B or equivalent approval for that increment;

(2) A plan for demonstrating that the capability increment for each Mission Package, combined with a Littoral Combat Ship, on the basis of a Preliminary Design Review and post-Preliminary Design Review assessment, will achieve the capability specified for that increment; and

(3) A plan for demonstrating the survivability and lethality of the Littoral Combat Ship with its Mission Packages sufficiently early in the development phase of the system to minimize costs of concurrency.

The committee remains concerned about this program's ability to deliver combat-ready LCS when our sailors need them in support of worldwide maritime operations. The development and fielding of these mission module capabilities will require the Navy to field a

range of 24 critical technologies, including sensors, vehicles, and weapons. In addition, there have been perturbations in the objective systems to be deployed in the mission modules, as the Navy is replacing some items because of poor performance or increasing costs. All of this argues for pursuing the regular order in defining, developing, testing, and fielding incremental improvements in capability for the LCS. This provision will make it clear that the Navy should follow a regular, transparent process in managing the mission module program.

Comptroller General of the United States annual reports on the acquisition program for the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (sec. 252)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to conduct an annual review of the Marine Corps Amphibious Combat Vehicle acquisition program, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15 of each year, from 2013 until the award of the first contract for full rate production. Where appropriate and feasible, each report shall assess whether the program is meeting cost, schedule, performance, and risk mitigation goals; the progress and results of developmental and operational testing and plans to correct any shortcomings in vehicle performance, operational effectiveness, reliability, suitability, and safety; the procurement plans, production results, and efforts to improve manufacturing efficiency and supplier performance; the acquisition strategy, including whether it complies with acquisition management best practices and the acquisition policies and regulations of the Department of Defense; and, the risks reflected in the integrated master schedule and test and evaluation master plan related to probability of success, funding required for the vehicle compared to funding programmed, and development and production concurrency. In addition, the first report shall assess the sufficiency and objectivity of the analysis of alternatives, the initial capabilities document, and the capability development document.

While the committee fully supports the Marine Corps' efforts to develop and field a capable replacement for its Vietnam-era Assault Amphibious Vehicle, the committee is mindful of the cost increases, schedule delays, and performance problems associated with the Marine Corps' last attempt to develop such a replacement under the cancelled Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle program. Given the importance of the Amphibious Combat Vehicle, the committee intends to subject the program to continuing and robust oversight.

Conditional requirement for report on amphibious assault vehicles for the Marine Corps (sec. 253)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a report by February 1, 2013, if the ongoing Marine Corps ground combat vehicle fleet mix study recommends the acquisition of a Marine Personnel Carrier (MPC). The report would include an explanation of the role of the MPC in fulfilling the two Marine Expeditionary Brigades (MEB) forcible entry requirement; the fraction of the as-

sault echelon of the MEBs comprised of MPCs, along with an assessment of the operational risks associated with using ship-to-shore connectors to ferry MPCs rather than tanks and artillery; and an estimate of the acquisition and life cycle costs of a split fleet of Amphibious Combat Vehicles and MPCs as compared to the costs of a pure fleet of Amphibious Combat Vehicles.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Transfer of administration of Ocean Research and Resources Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (sec. 271)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon a Department of Defense legislative proposal, that would transfer responsibility for administration of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel (ORAP) from the Department of the Navy to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce. This change would allow the functions of the ORAP to be aligned more appropriately to address the full range of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes policy issues.

Budget Items

Army

Medium Extended Air Defense System

The budget request included $400.9 million in PE 64869A for development of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). Under the tri-national (United States, Germany and Italy) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on development of MEADS, the Department of Defense is obligated to seek fiscal year 2013 congressional funding for the MEADS program as the final increment of U.S. funding.

The committee notes that section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), limited the obligation or expenditure of more than 25 percent of the fiscal year 2012 funds for MEADS until the Department submits a plan to use such funds as final obligations under the MEADS program for either: (1) implementing a restructured program of reduced scope; or (2) contract termination liability costs with respect to the contracts covering the program. In keeping with section 235 of that Act, the committee recommends a reduction of $400.9 million in PE 64869A, the entire amount of the budget request for continued development of the MEADS program.

On April 26, 2012, the Department of Defense submitted a report to the congressional defense committees with the plan required by section 235. The Department reported that it plans to "use the FY [fiscal year] 2012 funds as final obligations to implement a restructured program of reduced scope." In accordance with section 235, Department of Defense officials proposed options to their German and Italian counterparts for reducing the scope of the MEADS Proof of Concept program, but the partner governments did not agree to the Department's proposals. The report noted that "[a]ll three MEADS Participants must reach unanimous agreement be-

fore the Proof of Concept can be amended or the prime contract can be terminated."

The Department's report also noted that, "[i]f Congress does not appropriate FY 2013 funding, the U.S. DOD [Department of Defense] would take the position that the FY 2012 funds represent the U.S. DOD's final financial contribution under the MOU. The U.S. DOD would also take the position that failure to provide FY 2013 funding would not be a unilateral withdrawal from the MOU, with reference to the MOU's provision subjecting Participants' activities under the MOU 'to the availability of funds appropriated for such purposes.'" In January 2012, Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Frank Kendall, informed his German and Italian counterparts that, "it is very unlikely that Congress will authorize and appropriate any U.S. FY 2013 funds for MEADS." Given that the U.S. responsibility under the MEADS MOU is made "subject to the availability of funds appropriated for the purposes of carrying out MEADS activities," and that the United States is not withdrawing unilaterally from the MOU, the committee urges the Department to continue its efforts to reach agreement with its German and Italian partners on a plan to restructure the MEADS program further to reduce its scope, using fiscal year 2012 funds as the final U.S. obligations for the program.

Improved turbine engine program

The budget request included $72.3 million in PE 23744A for the Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP). The committee notes that the fiscal year 2013 request assumed contract award for engineering and manufacturing development would occur in fiscal year 2012. The program is delayed, however, and contract award is not anticipated until fiscal 2014. The committee recommends a decrease of $54.0 million in PE 23744A for ITEP.

The committee also notes that the Army's ITEP strategy includes dual vendor competitive development through milestone C. The committee supports competition in technology development and encourages the Army to take advantage of the capability and interest of multiple helicopter engine developers through competitive prototyping.

Air Force

Next generation aerial refueling aircraft

The budget request included $1,815.6 million to continue development of the KC–46A, the next-generation aerial refueling aircraft.

The program office received fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011 Tanker Replacement Transfer Fund (TRTF) funds in fiscal year 2011 that provided $135.0 million more research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) funding than the Air Force believed it needed during that period. The Department of the Air Force applied $47.9 million of the $135.0 million to small business innovation research activities, leaving $87.1 million of the $135.0 million in excess fiscal year 2011 funding available to cover fiscal year 2012 activities. Since Congress already provided full funding of the

fiscal year 2012 requirement, the Department could apply $87.1 million in fiscal year 2012 funds against fiscal year 2013 funding requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $87.1 million in the budget request for the KC–46A EMD program.

Defense-wide

Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict Advanced Development and Combatting Terrorism Technology Support

The budget request includes $77.1 million in PE 603122D8Z for Combatting Terrorism Technology Support (CTTS) and $26.3 million in PE 603121 for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict (SO/LIC) Advanced Development. The budget lines fund a broad spectrum of technology development ranging from chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear countermeasures; to explosives detection and improvised explosive device (IED) defeat; to special reconnaissance capabilities; to decision, planning, and analytical tools; to irregular warfare support—all for various interagency customers.

The committee is concerned that a significant portion of these activities appear to overlap or exist in a non-coordinated fashion with activities under the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), the military departments, and other Department of Defense (DOD) agencies. Furthermore, it is not clear what transition mechanisms are in place to ensure technologies developed under these activities have an enduring impact on the capabilities of the special operations or general purpose forces.

The committee also notes that the new defense strategic guidance highlights Counter Terrorism and Irregular Warfare (CT & IW) as the first of 10 mission areas for the Joint Force. The committee feels that of all the activities in these two budget lines, the CT & IW area does not have significant funding in other DOD organizations and hence is most appropriate for funding in the CTTS and SO/LIC budget lines.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander of USSOCOM and the Director of JIEDDO, to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, a report that: (1) describes and assesses the effectiveness of the coordination mechanisms in place to avoid duplication of efforts funded by these two budget lines and other relevant defense entities, including JIEDDO and USSOCOM; (2) outlines the differences between technologies funded by the CTTS and SO/LIC budget lines and other relevant defense entities, including JIEDDO and SOCOM; (3) provides a listing of which technologies have successfully transitioned to the services and USSOCOM; and (4) describes how the CT & IW programs funded by SO/LIC fit within the Department's broader CT & IW strategy.

Furthermore the committee recommends a decrease of $11.3 million from PE 603122D8Z for activities relating to counter-IED activities, given that they appear to be duplicative of activities conducted by JIEDDO.

Industrial base innovation fund

The budget request included $22.0 million in PE 603680D8Z for defense-wide manufacturing science and technology. The committee, along with other congressional defense committees, has been a strong supporter of programs that sustain and advance targeted sectors and capabilities of the defense industrial base. A February 2006 report by the Defense Science Board regarding the Department of Defense's Manufacturing Technology Program points out that manufacturing technology plays a critical role in addressing development, acquisition, and sustainment problems associated with advanced weapons programs and recommended increased funding in this area.

Furthermore, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review explicitly stressed the importance of the defense industrial base and the Department of Defense's new strategic guidance released in January 2012, stated that the Department "will make every effort to maintain an adequate industrial base and our investment in science and technology." In addition, the administration recently announced the formation of a national network of institutes for manufacturing innovation, which in part, are planned to address Department of Defense mission requirements.

The committee recommends an additional $30.0 million to continue the Industrial Base Innovation Fund (IBIF) program in the above program element line. The committee directs the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to continue to make competitive, merit-based investments in manufacturing research and development that address defense industrial base shortfalls, especially those related to more urgent production requirements and diminishing defense manufacturing sources and material shortages, and a sustainable defense design team base. Other areas of emphasis encouraged are those related to the emerging fields of model-based engineering and integrated computational materials engineering, as highlighted in a recent National Research Council report, and new innovative technologies being developed through public-private partnerships such as the National Advanced Manufacturing Partnership, Connecting American Manufacturing, and the National Digital Engineering and Manufacturing Consortium.

Furthermore, if the Department of Defense believes that the IBIF is important to the sustainment of the industrial base, then the Department should institutionalize this program with adequate resources in future years and consider it as an important component of its wider manufacturing and industrial base strategy, in part, informed by its on-going "Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier" analyses.

Defense microelectronics strategy and Next Generation Foundry

The Senate report accompanying S. 1235 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 directed the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to brief the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2011, on a microelectronics strategy that would address components including resilient advanced microprocessors, application specific in-

tegrated circuits, field programmable gate arrays, printed circuit boards, photonics devices, and other related electronics components for the next-generation of military and intelligence systems. The committee notes that the promising field of photonics includes research on devices, for example, lasers that are fully monolithically integrated as interconnects on integrated circuits. If successful, such devices could significantly reduce the power consumption, weight, and cooling requirements of networks for both terrestrial applications, as well as for weapon systems. In addition, the committee understood this strategy would also address the full spectrum of the supply chain including design, mask development and inspection, fabrication, packaging and assembly, and testing. However, the committee has not received this strategy yet and is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) is requesting $10.0 million in fiscal year 2013 for the development of a 90 nanometer (nm) Next Generation Foundry for the Defense Microelectronics Activity without the context of this broader strategy.

The committee fully appreciates the DOD's need to upgrade its fabrication capabilities for microelectronics devices that are obsolete and no longer produced by the commercial sector, but are still required by its weapon systems. In addition, the committee understands that developing this capability is at least a 5 year endeavor and that if the Department delays, there may be detrimental consequences in the out-years to the warfighting readiness and capabilities of weapon systems that rely upon outdated microelectronics devices.

However, the committee is not satisfied that a complete life cycle cost estimate has been conducted that accounts for the full costs of this upgrade, including whether workforce training and/or expansion is required. The committee believes that this comprehensive planning must be completed before spending the full $10.0 million the initial year. Hence, the committee recommends a decrease of $3.0 million to PE 603720S for the 90 nm Next Generation Foundry budget request. In addition, the committee recommends a fence on this funding that is described elsewhere in this report.

Lastly, due to its ongoing oversight and concerns regarding the security of the electronics supply chain, the committee expects the defense microelectronics strategy to address linkages to the broader policy guidance and regulations that DOD is developing for two areas. One is related to "Trusted Systems and Networks" that addresses both the needs for procuring DOD-unique components for well-defined mission critical systems from suppliers that are certified under Defense Microelectronics Activity's Trusted Integrated Circuit Suppliers program and the management of risk in the supply chain for other integrated circuit-related products. The other is related to combating counterfeit components and the need for "Trustworthy Suppliers" that adhere to DOD requirements and established industry standards. The committee is expecting that these new policies and regulations, under the umbrella of the DOD's Program Protection process, will identify the steps that the DOD will take to ensure that it will procure microelectronic systems through trusted contractors and subcontractors and that potential vulnerabilities due to non-domestic foundries will be addressed. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for

Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status of these policies no later than December 31, 2012.

Advanced sensor applications program

The budget request included $16.9 million for the Advanced Sensor Applications Program (ASAP). This represents a reduction from a level of $18.4 million in fiscal year 2012 and reflects a general reduction applied to a number of budget line items in an across-the-board manner. The committee believes that this reduction, while modest by other program standards, will cause the program to postpone important testing and experiments. The committee believes that these efforts are too important to postpone or cancel, and therefore, recommends an additional $2.0 million for ASAP.

U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs

The budget request included $99.8 million in PE 63913C for the Missile Defense Agency for United States-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, including: $10.7 million to improve the existing Arrow Weapon System; $50.9 million for continued development of the Arrow–3 upper-tier interceptor missile, and $38.3 million for co-development of a short-range missile defense system called "David's Sling." These systems are part of Israel's layered defenses against missiles and rockets of different ranges, from longer-range missiles from Iran or Syria, to short-range missiles and large caliber rockets fired from Lebanese territory in the summer of 2006, to the very short-range rockets fired recently from Gaza. The United States is co-managing and jointly developing these systems to ensure that they are compatible and interoperable with U.S. missile defense systems.

The committee recognizes that the missile threat to Israel from ballistic missiles and rockets of varying ranges is extremely serious and increasing, and that effective missile defenses are an essential component of Israel's security and regional stability. The committee supports efforts to enhance and accelerate these systems, including technical and schedule risk reduction, in a manner that is consistent with the terms and conditions of the joint Project Agreements governing the management and execution of these cooperative projects.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in PE 63193C for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, including: $20.0 million to improve the Arrow Weapon System, $20.0 million for the Arrow–3 upper-tier interceptor program, and $60.0 million for the David's Sling weapon system. The committee expects that the Department of Defense will continue its efforts to enhance the joint management of these programs, including efforts to avoid excessive concurrency.

The budget request included no funds for the Israeli Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system. However, after the budget submission the Department of Defense stated it would seek additional funds from Congress for the United States to provide to Israel to acquire additional Iron Dome short-range rocket defense systems. The committee understands that the fiscal year 2013 funding request will be for $210.0 million, and recommends an additional in-

crease of $210.0 million in PE 63913C for the Israeli Iron Dome system. A legislative provision that would authorize this funding is described elsewhere in this report. The committee is aware of reports that the additional request for Iron Dome funding could be for as much as $680.0 million over multiple fiscal years, and looks forward to receiving the Department's request, and to continuing its support for Israeli missile defense programs.

Department of Defense Corrosion Program shortfall

The budget request included $10.1 million for the Department of Defense (DOD) Corrosion Program divided between Operation and Maintenance and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E). The DOD has consistently underfunded the DOD Corrosion Program in fiscal years 2011, 2012, and now 2013. The DOD Corrosion Program has identified to Congress a $41.5 million requirements shortfall in RDT&E funding.

The committee remains concerned that corrosion is costly and can have negative effects on military equipment in terms of cost, readiness, operator and maintenance burdens, and safety. The DOD estimates that the negative effects of corrosion cost approximately $23.0 billion in annual maintenance expenditures for weapon systems and infrastructure.

The committee has recommended a provision that would amend the DOD reporting requirements to Congress by requiring additional information on corrosion projects, including validated returns on investment for completed corrosion projects, activities, and information on how corrosion funding is used for military projects, the Technical Corrosion Collaboration pilot program, and other corrosion-related activities. Additionally, the Government Accountability Office has stated that the Corrosion Policy and Oversight Office within the DOD Corrosion Program delivers at least a 14 to 1 ratio return on investment to the taxpayer through corrosion project opportunities and activity requirements. Ensuring proper corrosion prevention and control plays a major role in the sustainment costs and life cycle range of many current and future weapon systems including the F–22, F–35, and various ground vehicles, ships, and aircraft.

The committee continues to urge the Secretary of Defense to fully fund the corrosion control requirements in the fiscal year 2014 base budget request.

In light of the committee requesting additional information from the DOD Corrosion Program, the committee recommends an increase of $20.8 million in RDT&E, line 099, Program Element 64016D8Z for the DOD Corrosion Program to address the identified shortfall.

Defense research and development Rapid Innovation Program science and technology thrust areas

The Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program (RIP) is a competitive, merit-based program established by section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) that is designed to fund innovative technologies, reduce acquisition or life cycle costs, address technical risks, improve the timeliness of test and evaluation

outcomes, and rapidly insert technologies needed to meet critical national security needs. The committee notes that $200.0 million was appropriated for the RIP in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74); however, no funds were requested in fiscal year 2013. While the RIP is still new and the committee has yet to see the results of the first round of projects funded by fiscal year 2011 funds, there is clearly strong service support because of the overwhelming response from industry—especially small businesses—providing new innovative technologies and opening up more collaborative opportunities with a broader base of small businesses and non-traditional suppliers to the DOD.

The committee understands that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering will soon be conducting a review of the fiscal year 2011 projects to assess the value of continuing the RIP. If the review validates the program, then the Department should integrate it into its future annual budget requests.

The committee recommends an increase of $200.0 million in funding for the RIP to PE 604775D8Z, and suggests an emphasis on the following areas:

1. Enhancing energy security and independence. For increased investment in technologies that will improve energy efficiency, enhance energy security, and reduce the Department's dependence on fossil fuels through advances in traditional and alternative energy storage, power systems, renewable energy production and more energy efficient ground, air, and naval systems. The committee notes that the Department of Defense remains critically dependent upon energy for both its far-flung infrastructure, and for its global military operations. The Department currently consumes as much energy as two-thirds of all the world's nations. Improved energy efficiency in remote areas such as Afghanistan can reduce the dependence of our armed forces on fragile fuel supply lines that are vulnerable to enemy attack, and thus can help save lives;

2. Developing, utilizing, and maintaining advanced materials. For increased investment in a broad range of materials technologies that can provide: enhanced performance in extreme environments; improved strength and reduced weight for the spectrum of applications ranging from aerospace to lighter soldier loads; greater survivability of ground, air, and naval systems; and reduced life cycle costs through better maintainability for a wide variety of the challenging environments and unique properties demanded of military systems. Such materials could include advanced composites and metals, nanomaterials, and rare-earth alternatives. Whether increasing survivability, improving fuel efficiency for greater performance, or decreasing maintenance costs, advanced materials are a foundational enabling component of military systems across all services and all warfighting domains;

3. Improving manufacturing technologies and capabilities. For increased investment in advanced and innovative manufacturing technologies across the spectrum of applications to significantly compress design to production time cycles, reduce cost, minimize waste and energy consumption, and improve

product quality and reliability. Historically, the Department has heavily invested in the technologies to improve the performance of military systems, but not in the processes to reduce the costs of the production of those military systems. Numerous high-level studies have stressed the benefits of advancing the state of manufacturing technologies—whether for a ship hull or a radiation-hardened chip—for long-term savings and the need to capitalize on the latest innovations in manufacturing processes for defense systems. Projects in this area should be coordinated with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to ensure that investments are guided, in part, by shortfalls identified in industrial base analyses such as the ongoing "Sector by Sector, Tier by Tier" study effort;

4. Advancing microelectronics. For increased investment in the development of resilient advanced microprocessors, application-specific integrated circuits, field programmable gate arrays, printed circuit boards, photonics devices, and other related electronics components for the next-generation of military and intelligence systems. Similar to advanced materials, advanced microelectronics are a cross-cutting enabler across all military systems. Given that the majority of costs of most advanced weapons platforms are in electronics and supporting software, investments in this area to improve processing capacity, decrease weight and power requirements, and increase resiliency should have high payoff; and

5. Developing cybersecurity tools. For increased investment in areas such as internet and network mapping capabilities, software reverse engineering and vulnerability analysis, network data collection and analysis, new innovative defensive techniques against cyber attacks—especially in virtual environments, and integrated cloud security capabilities. The security of DOD's war fighting and business networks, as well as the networks of the defense industrial base is a serious concern. DOD needs access to the latest innovative technologies in this field in order to stay ahead of rapidly growing and evolving threats in cyberspace.

Funding authorized for the RIP may be used to augment existing research and development efforts or initiate new projects. As provided in section 1073, the Secretary of Defense may transfer funds available for the RIP to the research, development, test, and evaluation accounts of a military department, defense agency, or the unified combatant command for special operations forces pursuant to a proposal, or any part of a proposal, that the Secretary determines would directly support the purposes of the program. All such funding is required by law to be allocated on the basis of a merit-based selection, pursuant to a broad agency announcement or similar competitive process.

General fund enterprise business systems realignment

The budget request included $9.9 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E), for General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS).

The committee has received a request from the Army to realign $17.2 million into GFEBS to support the engineering development effort necessary to process classified and sensitive transactions and to mitigate the risk of exposing classified information.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $17.2 million in RDT&E for GFEBS realignment.

Developmental test and evaluation

The budget request included $15.1 million in PE 605804D8Z for developmental test and evaluation, which was a decrease of about $0.7 million from the fiscal year 2012 budget request, and about $4.2 million below the fiscal year 2012 appropriation of $19.3 million.

The committee notes the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) required the Department of Defense to rebuild its systems engineering and developmental testing organizations to ensure that design problems are understood and addressed early in the acquisition process.

While the Department has taken great strides in improving its acquisition process, the committee notes that the Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Report by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation—dated December 2011—provided a list of 17 major defense acquisition programs that had discoveries of significant problems during operational test and evaluation that should have been detected and corrected during developmental test and evaluation.

Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department's defense-wide systems engineering budget request is almost three times greater than the developmental test and evaluation budget request. In fiscal year 2012, the committee recommended an increase of $5.0 million to developmental test and evaluation. The committee believes the Department is continuing to underfund its developmental test and evaluation activities, as evidenced by the unacceptable number of problems being discovered in operational test and evaluation. Hence, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in the above program element line.

Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program

The budget request includes $8.9 million in PE 1160483BB for the continued development of the Shallow Water Combat Submersible. The committee understands that the contractor's failure to meet systems engineering requirements will result in an overall program delay of several months and require at least an additional $8.0 million to complete research and development activities. According to U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), "extreme schedule variations from the baseline resulted in the inability to accurately track progress and cost." At the request of USSOCOM, the committee recommends a transfer of $8.0 million from Procurement, Defense-wide, to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for cost growth in the engineering and manufacturing development phase of the program.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs

The budget request included $2.8 billion for the research and management activities of the Defense Advanced Research Projects

Agency (DARPA). While DARPA's fiscal performance has notably improved, the committee is still concerned about the timeliness of sustained funding execution. The committee recommends a reduction of $100.0 million from DARPA's overall budget to reflect continuing concerns about timely and effective execution of funds by the agency, as well as concerns about specific programs.

DARPA is pursuing a broad range of manufacturing-related programs with over $500.0 million planned over the future-years defense program. The committee continues to support DARPA's efforts to revolutionize manufacturing technologies and methods. However, DARPA's transition plans for these programs are not clear. One of the metrics of success to DARPA's efforts in this area will be when the defense industrial base (as well as the broader national industrial base) incorporates new innovative manufacturing technologies and methods that will focus on increasing affordability and decreasing timelines. In order to accomplish this goal, DARPA needs to work more closely with the Services' Manufacturing Technology programs and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy and its research and development activities tied to new national manufacturing initiatives such as the Advanced Manufacturing Program. In addition, DARPA needs to work with the appropriate entities within the Department in considering the legal and policy implications to open-source manufacturing such as trusted supply chains, export controls and intellectual property issues.

The Fast, Adaptable, Next-Generation Ground Combat Vehicle is a program where model-based design tools and highly adaptable foundry-style manufacturing techniques are being explored with respect to combat vehicle design and production. The committee continues to be concerned that force protection and related armor technologies, which are an integral component of any ground combat vehicle, are not adequately being addressed in conjunction with the Army.

Hence, the committee directs DARPA to commission a review of its Adaptive Vehicle Make (AVM) umbrella program by an external review panel and submit the results of this review to the congressional defense committees 90 days after the enactment of this Act. The review should assess DARPA's transition plans for the AVM program and how well potential policy and legal issues are being addressed.

The committee is strongly disappointed in DARPA's report to the congressional defense committees requested in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) on the transition plan for the National Cyber Range (NCR) that identified U.S. Cyber Command as the transition partner. Given that U.S. Cyber Command has not agreed to be the transition partner, and given that this facility and technology represents at least a $116.0 million investment through fiscal year 2011, the committee recommends increasing PE 605118OTE by $4.0 million and directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to continue testing the NCR with the broad cyber community in fiscal year 2013 until a final plan is developed for the NCR by the Department of Defense.

Items of Special Interest

Adaptive engine technology development program

The committee notes the Air Force budget request for fiscal year 2013 includes $214.0 million for the Adaptive Engine Technology Development (AETD) program. The Air Force has explained that this engine technology program has the potential to achieve a 25 percent reduction in cruise specific fuel consumption compared to existing state-of-the art engines such as the F135 engine. This fuel efficiency goal was set by the National Aeronautics Research and Development Plan of 2010 that provides overarching research goals and objectives to the interagency aeronautics research and development community, of which the Department of Defense is a key member. Such aggressive fuel consumption reduction goals are driven by the need to reduce overall fuel costs in military operations, as well as to make significant improvements to unrefueled aircraft range and time-on-station.

The committee supports the Air Force Research Lab's (AFRL) efforts to pursue increased fuel efficiency and support the military aircraft engine industrial base through science and technology (S&T) programs including AETD. The committee's support for AETD is based on two understandings. First, the committee understands that AFRL will award up to two contracts for the AETD program through a fully open and competitive process that will not unduly advantage competitors who performed for the predecessor Adaptive Versatile Engine Technology program, nor disadvantage competitors performing for other military aircraft engine research or production programs.

Second, the committee has received assurances in testimony from the Air Force that AETD is purely a technology maturation program and is not a new "alternate engine" program for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter. The committee notes that further development of the alternate engine for the F–35 is prohibited under current law, and expects the Air Force to abide by the letter and the spirit of this law.

The committee notes that it will review annually the progress of the AETD program during the course of its annual reviews of the Air Force's S&T programs.

Air Force cyber and information technology research

The fiscal year 2013 Air Force budget request included $136.0 million for research and development in PE 602788F (Dominant Information Technology) and PE 603788F (Global Information Dev/Demo) for a broad spectrum of activities in cyber science and technology (S&T); autonomy, command and control, and decision support; connectivity and dissemination; and processing and exploitation technologies. The committee notes that these investment areas are consistent with the Air Force's Technology Horizons S&T plans, as well as with elements of the Department of Defense's overarching S&T priority areas. However, the committee notes that this investment level is a reduction of almost 20 percent compared to the fiscal year 2012 funding levels, and that funding is projected to increase again in the fiscal year 2014–2017 time frame. The committee understands that the fiscal year 2013 decrease in fund-

ing in these areas is due to a "strategic pause" that the Air Force is taking to develop an investment plan for its activities. However, given the strategic importance of these technology areas—as identified in the new defense strategic guidance issued in January 2012, the committee is concerned about this significant drop in funding that would impact cyber-related research and development (R&D).

Hence, the committee directs the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees detailing its investment strategy for these technology areas outlined above within 180 days after the enactment of this Act. The report should, at a minimum: 1) identify the Air Force's near-, mid-, and far-term S&T priorities for cyber and information-related technologies and the resources—both in funding and personnel—projected to address these priorities; 2) lay out a transition strategy for the results of these S&T efforts into weapon systems, including cyber tools; 3) address how the Air Force will recruit, train, and retain a highly skilled workforce in these areas; and 4) address laboratory infrastructure and research facilities necessary for the accomplishment of this R&D.

Air Force space developmental test and evaluation

In the Developmental Test and Evaluation and Systems Engineering FY 2011 Annual Report to Congress, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for Developmental Test and Evaluation (DT&E) stated that the Air Force Space Community should "grow their Developmental Test and Evaluation workforce and training in order for it to provide a robust government DT&E capability."

The committee notes that while the Air Force has an operational test and evaluation organization, it does not have a developmental test and evaluation organization for space systems similar to what it has for its aeronautical systems.

Hence the committee directs the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 31, 2012, on how it currently accomplishes its developmental test and evaluation activities for its space systems, the effectiveness of the current construct, and a plan for how they are responding to the above observation made by the DASD for DT&E.

Applied mathematics and computational science

The committee recognizes the important role that applied mathematics and computational science play in support of current Department of Defense (DOD) activities, including modeling and simulation, high performance computing, and large-scale data analysis. In addition, the committee acknowledges the foundational impact of applied mathematics and computational science on some of the DOD's science and technology (S&T) emphasis areas, such as autonomy, cyber sciences, and data-to-decisions.

However, the committee is aware of some concerns about the lack of a robust interaction between DOD laboratories and weapons centers and the academic research community in the fields of applied mathematics and computational science. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (ASDR&E) held a workshop on mathematics in January 2012, and a workshop on computer science in May 2011, that addressed leading areas of

mathematics and computer science research from a disciplinary perspective. However, what is needed is a better understanding on how advances in the applied mathematics and computational sciences communities can assist in addressing the fundamental mathematical challenges underpinning some of the DOD S&T emphasis areas referenced above. For instance, DOD needs to ensure that advances and challenges identified in these workshops in areas of information science, mathematical modeling, human-machine interactions, and robotics will enable advances in the DOD's S&T emphasis area of autonomy.

Hence, the committee urges the ASDR&E and the service S&T executives to ensure that the DOD robustly engages with the academic mathematics and computational science communities to leverage their expertise. The committee believes that more active engagement will enable the contributions of these communities to assist progress in the DOD's S&T emphasis areas that will ultimately lead to the next-generation of warfighting capabilities and technologies.

Army manned airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms

The budget request included $47.4 million in PE 65626A to complete four Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) phase Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System (EMARSS) aircraft. The committee understands that the Army plans to take delivery of these EMD phase EMARSS aircraft, conduct a utility assessment of them and then field them into the U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) Aerial Exploitation Battalions (AEB). Once these EMARSS aircraft reach the INSCOM AEBs, they will join a vastly heterogeneous fleet of aging programs of records—such as the Guardrail and Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft—and various quick-reaction capability (QRC) platforms.

The Army requested the funding for these aircraft despite the fact that there is no procurement funding in the future-years defense program to purchase any more EMARSS aircraft. Moreover, the Army asked to complete and retain these aircraft despite the fact that this committee signaled its clear intent—both through cuts to the EMARSS program and through report language on the MC–12W Project Liberty program in the Senate report accompanying S. 1235 (S. Rept. 112–26), the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012—that the committee would not support procuring a second, separate fleet of C–12-based manned airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) platforms.

The committee does not recommend denying the requested funds, in part because the Air Force was allowed to send the Liberty fleet to Air National Guard units and to man those units to support the deployment of enough aircraft to sustain only two combat air patrols, which are expected to be allocated to Special Operations Command support. The committee also believes that the new Army G–2 needs time to assess all of the airborne ISR programs and assets that the Army has accumulated and to chart a course looking ahead to the drawdown in Afghanistan.

At the same time, the committee emphasizes its growing concerns about the state of the Army's manned airborne ISR portfolio. The wide mixture of manned airborne ISR platforms and sensors described above reflects the adaptation of Army Military Intelligence to the dynamic demands of the battlefield after 11 years of war. With soldiers gradually returning from the battlefield and with mounting pressure to decrease defense spending, now is the time for the Army to rationalize this fleet rather than to keep adding to it with low numbers of diverse aircraft.

The committee directs the Army G–2, the Army G–8, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to develop a plan for Army manned airborne ISR platforms. This plan should address the following questions:

- What requirements for manned airborne ISR support to Army general purpose forces can be met with shared assets from other services;
- What requirements for manned airborne ISR support to Army general purpose forces need to be met organically;
- Given the set of requirements that need to be met organically, what existing QRC systems need to become programs of record;
- Which current programs of record need to be modernized or eliminated; and
- How will the Army resource these platform choices?

The committee directs the Army to provide this plan to the congressional defense and intelligence committees in conjunction with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2014. The committee expects the Army to consult with the committee as this plan is crafted. If requirements change or if assumptions about the level of support available from other services change, the committee would like to be kept apprised.

Army robotics

The committee notes that ground robotic vehicles have saved many lives in the fight against improvised explosive devices (IED) and other efforts are underway to use ground robotics to accomplish "dirty, dull, and dangerous" tasks, including the transport of equipment and supplies, that will make our troops more safe and effective. Leading the research effort in ground robotics and autonomous control systems is the Army's Tank and Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center working collaboratively with industry and academia, as well as the Army Research Laboratory with the Robotics Collaborative Technology Alliance. The Army also works closely with the Robotic Systems Joint Project Office that is dedicated to continuous improvement of unmanned system capabilities to meet current and future joint military requirements.

The committee believes that Army investments in the development of new ground robotics technologies to date are inadequate and lack focus. The Senate report accompanying S. 1235 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 highlighted the importance of robotic ground vehicle technologies and acknowledged that the Army leadership was in the process of determining operational and technical requirements for

ground robotics vehicles that will guide the development of a long-term research, development, and acquisition strategy. The committee understood that this strategy would be developed by the end of 2011 and used to guide Army research and development investments in robotic ground vehicles in fiscal year 2013 and beyond. However, the Army has not yet produced this strategy.

The committee understands that recent Army strategic planning efforts on ground robotic vehicles have resulted in the development of an Unmanned Systems (Air, Ground, Maritime) Initial Capabilities Document that is approved by both the Army and Marine Corps, and is awaiting approval by the Joint Staff. Furthermore, the committee understands that the multi-service Joint Ground Robotics Integration Team, established by the Army's Maneuver Center of Excellence, is developing an Unmanned Ground Systems (UGS) Campaign Plan for the Army. It is expected that this campaign plan will provide the Army with the unity of effort across the unmanned enterprise including science and technology; experimentation, test and evaluation, and safety; development and fielding; training and sustainment; and deployment and employment. The committee believes this integrated effort is crucial to address not only technical challenges, but the more important policy and operational concepts issues that will ultimately inform the Army's investment plans in this area. Ultimately, the goal of this UGS Campaign Plan should be an affordably modernized force that fully integrates manned and unmanned teaming capabilities with improved persistence, protection, endurance, and autonomy.

The committee expects the Army to complete and approve this UGS Campaign Plan in 2012, and to be briefed no later than December 31, 2012.

Ballistic missile defense overview

The budget request included $9.7 billion for missile defense, including $7.8 billion for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and $1.9 billion for Army and related missile defense programs.

In the area of homeland defense, 30 Ground-Based Interceptors (GBI) have been deployed in Alaska and California as part of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, and are providing protection of the United States from the possible future threat of limited ballistic missile attack from nations such as North Korea and Iran. As outlined in the February 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, the Department of Defense has a program to improve the reliability and performance of the GMD system. The GBI reliability program is intended to double the number of threat intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) that the current GMD system could defeat, without adding any GBIs—thus effectively doubling the capability of the existing GMD system.

In December 2011, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) awarded the GMD development and sustainment contract. Its cost was roughly $1.0 billion below the government cost estimate. This cost reduction resulted from competition, and permitted a reduction in the negotiated price of GBIs from about $75.0 million to about $53.0 million each. One benefit of the new GMD contract is the inclusion of a defects clause that holds the contractor accountable for quality failures, and would require the contractor—not the tax-

payer—to pay the costs of defective work. The committee commends MDA for achieving such substantial cost reduction and contractor accountability, and encourages MDA to pursue similar benefits in future contracts through competition.

In the budget request, the Missile Defense Agency is requesting an additional five GBIs as test and spare missiles. These additional interceptors would provide several benefits that would: 1) allow a more robust test and evaluation program; 2) allow the operational deployment of eight additional GBIs in spare silos at Missile Field–2 at Fort Greely, Alaska, if needed to meet a potential expansion of future threats from North Korea or Iran; and 3) keep the GBI production line warm into fiscal year 2018, thus permitting future procurement of additional GBIs, if needed.

As a result of a GMD flight test failure in December 2010, MDA's highest priority is to correct the problem that caused the failure and to demonstrate the correction in two flight tests prior to resuming production or refurbishment of the newest model of exo-atmospheric kill vehicle (EKV) that failed—the Capability Enhancement-II model. This plan is consistent with the committee's position, and the committee commends MDA for its rigorous and disciplined approach to demonstrating that the new kill vehicle will work as intended before resuming production. As part of this approach, MDA is requiring the EKV contractors to meet more rigorous manufacturing and production quality standards, which has delayed the two planned flight tests several months. The committee believes it is important to take such prudent steps to improve quality and increase confidence in the system.

The committee notes that the Integrated Master Test Plan for missile defense includes a series of planned GMD tests through 2022, including salvo testing, multiple simultaneous engagement testing, and operational testing. These tests are planned at a rate of roughly one test per year, which the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation testified is the best rate that has been achievable over the last decade. The Director of MDA testified that "conducting flight tests at a pace greater than once a year prohibits thorough analysis of pre-mission and post-mission flight test data and causes greater risk of further failure and setbacks to developing our homeland defense capability as rapidly as possible."

In addition to its plans and programs to improve the reliability and performance of the GMD system, the Department is also pursuing a strategy to hedge against the possibility that the future ICBM threat from North Korea or Iran could emerge faster or in greater numbers than anticipated. Under this homeland defense hedging strategy, the Department has already made or implemented a number of decisions to improve the missile defense posture of the United States. For example, the Department has completed the construction of eight extra GBI silos at Missile Field 2 at Fort Greely, Alaska, which would permit the deployment of eight additional GBIs if needed to cope with a future emerging threat. The Department is evaluating the evolving threat and considering other potential hedging options, such as the advisability, feasibility, and affordability of deploying additional GBIs in the future, either in Alaska or possibly on the East Coast. The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department to report

on these homeland defense activities, as described elsewhere in this report. The committee notes that section 233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) required a report on the homeland defense hedging policy and strategy that was due in March, but which the Department has not yet submitted. The committee understands that the review process has taken much longer than originally planned, and is still continuing. However, the committee still expects the Department to provide the report as soon as it is finished, and to provide an interim report in case of any significant anticipated delay.

The committee notes that the threat of regional missiles, particularly short- and medium-range missiles from Iran and North Korea, is serious and growing. These missiles pose a significant risk to forward-deployed U.S. forces, allies, and partners in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. The Department has an obligation to provide force protection to U.S. forces against ballistic missiles deployed in these regions, as well as to meet our security commitments to our allies. To meet these needs, the Department is pursuing a Phased Adaptive Approach (PAA) to regional missile defense, tailored to each region.

In 2011, the Department completed the deployment of Phase 1 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) to missile defense, which is intended to defend our deployed forces and allies against Iranian missiles. This included: the deployment of an Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) ship in the eastern Mediterranean Sea, equipped with Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) Block IA interceptors; the deployment of an AN/TPY–2 X-band missile defense radar in Turkey; and establishment of a command and control facility in Germany.

During 2011, the administration also completed negotiations on all the bilateral agreements required to implement all four phases of the EPAA, including: agreements with Romania and Poland for the deployment of Aegis Ashore systems on their territory; an agreement with Turkey to deploy the AN/TPY–2 radar on its territory; and an agreement with Spain to permit the forward stationing of four Aegis BMD ships at Rota.

The core capability of the EPAA will be the Aegis BMD system, both at sea and on land, with four increasingly capable variants of the SM–3 interceptor missile, the SM–3 Blocks IA, IB, IIA and IIB. As indicated previously, the committee strongly supports the development, testing, production, and deployment of operationally effective Aegis BMD and SM–3 capabilities in sufficient numbers to support the needs of the regional combatant commanders to implement the PAA in Europe and other regions, and to help protect the Homeland.

In April 2011, an Aegis BMD ship with an SM–3 IA interceptor, using sensor information from a forward-deployed AN/TPY–2 radar like the one now deployed in Turkey, successfully intercepted an intermediate-range ballistic missile target during a flight test. This was a demonstration of the EPAA Phase 1 capability.

In September 2011, the first flight test of the SM–3 Block IB interceptor failed to intercept the target. The MDA has analyzed the problem, and conducted a repeat test on May 10, 2012, which successfully intercepted the target, to demonstrate the problem has

been resolved. The September flight test failure caused a delay in the planned initial procurement of SM–3 IB missiles, and MDA plans to procure additional SM–3 IA missiles to meet the needs of combatant commanders for additional interceptor inventory. Prior to a full production decision for SM–3 IB, MDA would need to demonstrate success in five planned flight tests, three in 2012 and two more in 2013. The SM–3 IB is intended for deployment in Phase 2 of the EPAA in the 2015 timeframe, both at sea and at an Aegis Ashore site in Romania.

Phase 3 of the EPAA is planned for deployment in the 2018 timeframe, and will include the SM–3 IIA interceptor at sea and at Aegis Ashore sites in Poland and Romania. The SM–3 IIA is being co-developed with Japan, which will also deploy the missile on its Kongo-class Aegis BMD ships. During 2011, MDA completed the preliminary design review and extended the development phase of the SM–3 IIA with Japan to reduce technical and schedule risk. The first flight test (non-intercept) of the SM–3 IIA is planned for fiscal year 2014, and nine more tests are planned before the Phase 3 deployment. Phase 3 is designed to provide a robust defense against Iranian intermediate-range missiles.

The last planned variant of the SM–3 missile is the Block IIB, which is intended for deployment in Phase 4 of the EPAA in the 2021 timeframe. The SM–3 IIB is intended to defend against possible future long-range Iranian missiles that could reach the United States. This system would augment the GMD system for homeland defense and would provide an early intercept capability that could permit a "shoot-look-shoot" option to permit GBIs being held in reserve. The committee believes it is important to develop a second type of interceptor system to defend the Homeland, in addition to the GBI system. By pursuing a competitive approach to the concept development phase, MDA has engaged the significant engineering and design talent of the industrial base. The committee believes it is important to maintain this competitive approach, particularly since it could produce the most innovative, cost-effective, and operationally effective results.

The budget request for the Missile Defense Agency would reduce the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system from a planned procurement of nine batteries to six batteries in the future-years defense program (FYDP), and the number of THAAD interceptors was reduced correspondingly by 122 compared to the plan presented in the fiscal year 2012 budget request. Given that the combatant commander interest in THAAD remains undiminished, the committee is disappointed to see these planned reductions to the THAAD system. In testimony to the committee, LTG Richard Formica, the Commander of U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, and Commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense, explained that the choice of how many THAAD batteries to procure in the FYDP came down to considering the missile defense "priority between investing in the Homeland and investing in the region." However, the committee understands that the Department plans to continue THAAD production beyond the FYDP, including plans to maintain a procurement objective of 503 missiles.

Previous difficulties with the THAAD production line have delayed the program, and resulted in slower production than planned. These production rate issues appear to be close to resolution. The committee notes that the THAAD production line will remain open through fiscal year 2017, including the production of two THAAD batteries for the United Arab Emirates, and will be capable of producing additional THAAD systems in the future. The committee encourages the Department to explore options to restore THAAD production to higher levels in the future. Furthermore, the committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million for additional procurement of THAAD interceptors, as described elsewhere in this report.

In October 2011, the THAAD system conducted a successful initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E) flight test, intercepting two targets nearly simultaneously. This test, using the operational THAAD soldiers, represented operationally realistic conditions with fielded equipment. Based on lessons learned from this test, MDA decided to add a new flight test in 2012 to gain experience with THAAD and debris mitigation in a flight test to integrate THAAD with Aegis BMD, and Patriot all operating simultaneously. This will take place prior to the first operational test involving THAAD, Aegis BMD, and Patriot PAC–3 defending against five separate targets in flight. The committee believes this integration flight test, described by the Director of MDA as the "largest, most complex missile defense ever attempted," is a useful risk mitigation step before the first multi-system operational test in 2013.

In testimony to the committee in April 2012, the Director of MDA stated that the "greatest future enhancement for both homeland and regional missile defense in the next 10 years is the development of the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS) satellites, which will provide fire control quality track data of raids of hostile ballistic missiles over their entire flight trajectories. . .". He also noted that "the need for persistent, full trajectory, tracking of ballistic missiles is one of the war-fighter's highest development priorities as stated in the 2012 STRATCOM PCL [U.S. Strategic Command's Prioritized Capabilities List]."

In 2011, the Missile Defense Executive Board, the Department's acquisition oversight body for missile defense, directed U.S. Strategic Command to conduct an assessment of the cost and performance of the three alternative remote missile defense sensor systems—including PTSS, the Airborne Infrared system, and forward-based AN/TPY–2 radars—to make recommendations for the fiscal year 2013 budget request. Strategic Command's recommendations are reflected in the budget request, which includes $276.3 million to continue development of PTSS, ends the Airborne Infrared program as a program of record (Congress appropriated no funds for it in fiscal year 2012), and would stop procurement of forward-based AN/TPY–2 radars at five, rather than nine. This assessment, based on operational considerations, had participation from the geographic combatant commands, the Joint Staff, Air Force Space Command, the Joint Functional Component Commands under U.S. Strategic Command, the DOD Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation (CAPE) office, and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. In addition, the

DOD CAPE is currently performing an Independent Cost Estimate and technical evaluation of PTSS that is due in October 2012.

In June 2011, the Acting Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff wrote to the committee that, "the Joint Staff supports PTSS as the most cost effective future sensor providing assured access and persistent tracking coverage in an integrated Ballistic Missile Defense Architecture." He also noted that he fully concurred with the assessment of the Joint Functional Component Commander for Integrated Missile Defense for U.S. Strategic command that "PTSS would provide a capability that increases our forces' ability to defend against larger raids and would reduce our reliance on terrestrial based radar systems and airborne sensor platforms that require overseas basing agreements."

Given the strong military support for PTSS as the most cost-effective means of providing persistent tracking and targeting of ballistic missiles for homeland and regional missile defense, and its expected operational benefits, the committee supports continuing with development of PTSS as a high priority program.

Cyber research, development, test, and evaluation, and training infrastructure

The Department of Defense's new strategic guidance emphasizes the importance of operating effectively in cyberspace and states that the United States will "invest in advanced capabilities to defend its networks, operational capability, and resiliency in cyberspace". To the Department's credit, cyber was one of the few areas where the DOD increased its investments in both defensive and offensive capabilities.

Developing and testing these cyber capabilities and training personnel effectively for cyber operations requires a cyber infrastructure that can be used by the research community, the acquisition community for development and testing (both developmental and operational), and the operational community for training, exercises, and rehearsals. While this infrastructure is necessary for all these missions, it is typically referred to as "cyber test and evaluation (T&E) infrastructure", or simply "cyber ranges".

Despite the importance of this cyber T&E infrastructure, comprehensive oversight and strategic planning for long-term funding, personnel plans, and modernization investments do not exist. There is a significant disconnect between the DOD's policy statements to increase cyber operations and security, and its lack of attention to its cyber ranges. The last few years have seen a decline in the funding and the personnel attached to a number of key DOD-wide cyber ranges—while the demand for more rigorous testing and training has increased.

Currently, there are a number of cyber ranges either in operation or still undergoing development that could be considered "national assets" due to their scope and capabilities, and that could be components of a broader federated cyber range infrastructure for the DOD.

The National Cyber Range (NCR) was developed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) with the goal of creating a secure, self-contained facility that could rapidly emulate complex defense and commercial networks, allowing for the cost-ef-

fective and timely validation of cyber technologies. The NCR is currently in a 1 year beta operation phase and is in the process of securing Sensitive Compartmented Information security accreditation. In a letter to the committee in June 2011, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics stated that the NCR would transition to U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), but CYBERCOM has not agreed to this plan, and there are no funds requested for CYBERCOM to operate and support the range. Hence the future of the NCR, an investment of $116.0 million through fiscal year 2011, is unknown. The fiscal year 2013 budget request contains only $1.8 million for DARPA to close out the contract.

The Joint Information Operations Range (JIOR) is a nation-wide network of 68 nodes for live, virtual, and constructive operations across the full spectrum of security classifications. Originally operated by the Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), it was transferred to the Joint Staff in fiscal year 2011. However, funding and personnel are being reduced. Only 39 research, development, test, and evaluation and training events are planned for fiscal year 2012 compared to 60 events that were conducted in fiscal year 2011.

The DOD Cyber/Defense Information Systems Agency Information Assurance Range is an operationally realistic environment for emulating the Global Information Grid Information Assurance/Computer Network Defense capabilities that is used for research and development, test and evaluation, and training. Funding and personnel are relatively constant over the out-years, but the number of RDT&E and training events planned at this range is also declining.

In addition, U.S. Cyber Command has developed a virtual training environment for the DOD annual Cyber Flag exercise that has the potential to be integrated with other environments and ranges. This range supports training operations involving friendly, neutral, and adversarial participants, and is instrumented for situational awareness and training assessments.

Lastly, there is the potential to broaden the scope of uses of the Joint Systems Integration Center/Joint System Integration and Interoperability Lab that was formerly under JFCOM and now under the Joint Staff. While the current focus of this range is to replicate operational command and control networks and assess system interoperability, its capabilities could be used for broader information assurance assessments and activities, including direct linkage to the JIOR.

Recently, through prompting, the Department has recognized the need to take a more strategic view of its cyber ranges. In a report to Congress requested in section 933 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), Report on Acquisition and Oversight of Department of Defense Cyberspace Operations Capabilities, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics stated that the Department's Cyber Investment Management Board has directed the Director of the Test Resources Management Center and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to develop an enterprise roadmap for cyber T&E infrastructure capabilities. Furthermore, the committee is awaiting a brief on the Department's analysis of T&E resources

needed to address the capability gaps outlined by the "2010 Test and Evaluation Strategic Plan"—a reporting requirement from the House report accompanying H.R. 1540 (H. Rpt. 112–78) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

However, these activities have not yet addressed the key issue of centralized oversight and management of these or potentially new cyber ranges. While the committee sees the management of cyber ranges as a natural extension of the Department's oversight of the Major Range and Test Facilities Base through the Test Resources Management Center, the committee believes that the Department should conduct its own evaluation. Hence, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, working with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, and the Director of the Test Resources Management Center to submit a report to the congressional defense committees 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the determination of an entity within the Department that will have oversight of the cyber T&E range infrastructure, funding and personnel.

In addition to identifying the management structure for the cyber ranges, this report shall identify the entities (e.g., such as executive agents) that will provide funding and resources for the operation and modernization of the ranges, as well as the mechanisms for the allocation of range resources to range users. The committee expects that future budget requests will not simply arrest but reverse the decline in funding and activities at the Department's cyber ranges, commensurate with the importance that the Department attaches to the cyber mission.

Department of Defense labs workforce and infrastructure

As a key element of the Department of Defense's (DOD's) roughly $12.0 billion per year science and technology portfolio, its laboratories contribute to a broad range of science and technology activities, ranging from conducting Nobel-prize winning basic research to rapidly developing and fielding capabilities for the warfighter. The lab enterprise includes 62 organizations spread across 22 states with a total workforce of about 60,000 employees, more than half of whom are degreed scientists and engineers. In certain critical national security-related areas, these organizations—and more importantly, the highly skilled scientists, engineers and technicians in them—are national assets.

The committee understands that among the numerous challenges facing the DOD lab enterprise, two key issues require focused and sustained attention:

(a) recruiting and retaining the best and brightest scientists, engineers, and technicians; and

(b) modernizing aging infrastructure.

Congress has provided a number of authorities to the labs over the years, including direct hiring authority of scientists and engineers with advanced degrees. However, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services on April 17, 2012, it appears that there may be a need for the labs to have a similar authority for scientists, engineers, and technicians with un-

dergraduate technical degrees with unique skills, expertise, and experience. Hence, the committee directs each service science and technology executive, consulting with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act that will describe whether direct hiring authority of undergraduate scientists and engineers is required, and provide an explanation why existing authorities under the laboratory personnel demonstration program authorized by section 342 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337), as amended, are not sufficient to meet this need for direct hiring authority.

Concerning aging laboratory infrastructure, the committee is pleased that the Army has initiated a survey of its laboratory infrastructure and directs the Navy and Air Force to undertake similar surveys of its laboratory infrastructure. In addition, the committee understands the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering is also conducting a survey of the DOD's laboratories. The committee directs the services to brief the congressional defense committees on the results of their surveys no later than March 1, 2013.

Dry Combat Submersible

The committee notes that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has deferred plans for the foreseeable future to procure Dry Combat Submersible-Light and associated Future Dry Deck Shelter Extension Modifications in light of higher priority requirements and budget constraints. The committee also notes USSOCOM intends to continue forward with modified plans to field a single Dry Combat Submersible variant. The committee expects, consistent with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics will make a determination, prior to a milestone B decision, on whether to treat the Dry Combat Submersible program as a Major Defense Acquisition Program.

Energy efficiency research and development coordination and transition

The committee is encouraged by the Defense Department's efforts to coordinate with the Department of Energy in pursuing and evaluating energy efficient technologies. The wide variety of investments made by the Defense Department towards reducing energy usage has already illustrated savings; however, the numerous organizations pursuing these initiatives within the Defense Department and other federal agencies also presents increasing potential for duplicative research and development as well as successful technologies not identified and effectively transitioned. The continued cooperation and combination of technical expertise as coordinated in the July 2010, memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Departments of Defense and Energy is important in maximizing the return on these investments. The committee encourages the Defense Department to continue both internal efforts and co-

ordination with other agencies to manage ongoing and planned energy efficiency research and development as well as continuing to establish processes for effectively transitioning technologies for broader application across the Department of Defense.

Hexavalent chromium

The committee is encouraged by the Defense Department's efforts to reduce and eliminate materials identified by the Department of Defense Chemical and Material Risk Management Directorate. In particular, the Department outlined aggressive plans to reduce the use of hexavalent chromium. The committee supports the Department's efforts to continue to pursue research, development, testing, and evaluation of substitute solutions as well as effective transition into existing and future programs of record.

Human bone collections for Department of Defense research

The committee understands the importance of the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct research and study collections of human bones. This research has contributed to the development of personal protective equipment, improved medical procedures, as well as medical devices for wounded service members. Furthermore, the committee understands that collections currently utilized by DOD may require a significant wait-time to conduct the necessary research and the collections may lack the demographic diversity in size and other characteristics needed to represent the U.S. armed services today.

The committee encourages the DOD to utilize as broad of a spectrum of publicly available bone collections as possible and relevant when conducting research requiring the use of human bones.

Hypersonics ground test and evaluation capabilities and workforce

Crucial to advancing the field of hypersonics that will support the development of advanced weapons systems, is a robust ground test and evaluation infrastructure that enables a broad range of research and development capabilities. Whether for vehicle aerodynamics, thermal design, or propulsion system development, ground test facilities are crucial to not only reducing risk in development, but for the research community to expand foundational knowledge in this area of aeronautics, as well as to increase confidence in computational design tools.

Much of the U.S. hypersonics test and evaluation infrastructure—primarily shared between the Department of Defense (DOD) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), but also including some capabilities in other parts of the government and the private sector—is dated; existing facilities have limits in either test duration, or in accurately replicating the physics of hypersonic flows, or in the size of the models that can be tested. Furthermore, the development of hypersonic air vehicles—including gliders or those with air breathing propulsion—has experienced periods of increasing and decreasing demand in the past few decades. This situation has led to a large degree of uncertainty in the demand for hypersonic test and evaluation facilities and hence they

have been a target for cost savings in the current fiscal environment.

However, the DOD's new defense strategic guidance emphasizes the importance of projecting power despite anti-access/area denial challenges. In addition to rebalancing focus towards the Asia-Pacific region, the guidance states that the U.S. military "will invest as required to ensure its ability to operate effectively in anti-access and area denial (A2/AD) environments."

The committee notes that the wide expanses of distances in the Asia-Pacific region, the growing A2/AD threat which requires greater stand-off distances, and the increasing need in modern warfare for fast response times for time-critical targeting all point to the need for the Department to invest in high-speed weapon and platform technologies, including hypersonics.

The committee notes that the state of the Nation's hypersonics ground test and evaluation facilities and workforce have not received adequate attention over the years facing both threats of divesture as well as gradual decay, and is concerned that the broad developmental hypersonics community needs renewed attention.

Hence, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a study on the ability of the Air Force air and ground test and evaluation infrastructure facilities, including wind tunnels and air test ranges, as well as associated instrumentation, to support defense hypersonic test and evaluation activities for the near and far term. The study should consider the needs of research and technology development as well as potential future DOD weapons programs. The Secretary shall incorporate the results of the study into a master plan for requirements and proposed investments to meet the DOD needs through 2025. The Secretary of the Air Force shall consult with the secretaries of the other military departments, the Directors of the appropriate defense agencies, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (who oversees the Joint Technology Office on Hypersonics), and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to assess the requirements needed to support hypersonic research, development, test, and evaluation throughout the DOD and to include all DOD requirements in the master plan. In addition, the Secretary shall consult with NASA and leverage current studies under the National Partnership for Aeronautical Testing.

The study shall contain the following:

(a) Document the current condition and adequacy of the Air Force test and evaluation infrastructure required to support hypersonic research and development within DOD;

(b) Identify test and evaluation infrastructure that could be used to support DOD hypersonic research and development outside the Department of the Air Force and assess means to ensure the availability of such capabilities to the DOD now and in the future; and

(c) Include a time phased plan to acquire required hypersonic research and development test and evaluation capabilities including identification of the resources necessary to acquire any needed capabilities that are currently not available.

The Secretary shall submit a report of the findings of this study not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act.

According to section 139d(a)(5)(D) of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act (WSARA) of 2009 (Public Law 111–23), the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for Developmental Test and Evaluation (DT&E) shall provide advocacy, oversight, and guidance to elements of the acquisition workforce responsible for developmental test and evaluation. In addition, section 139d(b)(1)(A) of WSARA mandates that the service acquisition executive of each military department develops plans to ensure the military department concerned has provided appropriate resources for developmental test organizations with adequate numbers of trained personnel.

Hence, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation, dual-hatted as the Director of the Test Resource Management Center, shall work with the Air Force acquisition executive, as well as the Commanders of the Air Force Materiel Command and the Air Force Research Laboratory, to ensure that the following objectives are met:

(a) Develop and sustain the expertise of the hypersonics test and evaluation workforce; and

(b) Develop the next generation of hypersonics T&E experts via Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics efforts.

The DASD for DT&E, along with the two Air Force officials identified, shall brief the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on what specific steps are being taken to meet these objectives.

Internet cartography

One of the foundations of military operations are up-to-date maps that vary in scale and detail to enable commanders to visualize the terrain, understand the operational situation, plan courses of action, and create a common understanding with subordinates and peers. The Department of Defense (DOD) for decades has supported a combat support defense agency whose mission has solely or largely been focused on mapping, charting and geodesy.

In the cyber domain, the need to understand the operational "terrain" is no less important. Yet, DOD has never established a telecommunications and computer network mapping program to address Department-wide requirements for intelligence, network defense, campaign planning, exercises and wargames, support to military operations, targeting, and establishing a common operational picture. The National Security Agency (NSA) certainly collects and analyzes a wealth of data on foreign networks, but it does so only to support its mission set, and not on a comprehensive or consistent basis. Other DOD components map the cyber terrain in even more sporadic and limited ways.

In part, this basic need has not been met because it has been considered to be too hard—the Internet appears to be too complex, too large in scale, and experiencing too rapid changes. In addition, collecting the necessary detail accurately at the necessary volume and speed was considered technically too difficult.

This appears to be changing. Commercial capabilities exist that hold promise for meeting the needs of U.S. Cyber Command and the intelligence community.

The committee encourages the Cyber Command J–3, the NSA Threat Operations Center, and the Defense Information Systems Agency-managed Community Data Center to collaborate on a pilot program to demonstrate a capability to produce detailed, accurate Internet maps, update them rapidly, display them interactively, and overlay enriching information. The committee believes that an effective pilot demonstration program could be conducted inexpensively, and encourages the Department to pursue such efforts with available resources.

The committee also directs the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in conjunction with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, to undertake a study of DOD's broad needs for cyberspace mapping and make a recommendation on whether DOD needs to create a focused program and assign the mission to one or more organizations to manage. The Vice Chairman shall brief the congressional defense committees on this assessment by March 1, 2013.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology—Lincoln Laboratory improvement project

As a designated Department of Defense Federally Funded Research and Development Center, Lincoln Laboratory conducts research and development pertinent to national security on behalf of the military services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the intelligence community, and other government agencies. The committee understands that the Air Force and Lincoln Laboratory are considering modernizing and improving some of the Laboratory's research facilities required for the development of certain systems and technology for national security needs.

The committee strongly urges the Department of Defense to expedite its deliberations with the Office of Management and Budget to develop a path forward to permit the Air Force to conclude an arrangement with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for improving and modernizing the Lincoln Laboratory complex at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts.

Medical Countermeasures Initiative

The budget request included $98.9 million in a variety of defense-wide research and development budget lines for the Medical Countermeasures Initiative (MCMI). This initiative is intended to advance significantly the development and manufacturing of biodefense medical countermeasures, including vaccines and therapeutics. Such advances are important to meet the growing risks of biological threats, including genetically engineered threats, potential terrorist threats, and naturally occurring disease outbreaks like pandemic influenza.

The committee notes that this initiative is a coordinated and collaborative interagency effort, guided by updated national strategy and guidance documents, and involves particularly close cooperation between the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services. Congress has previously encouraged such interagency collaboration and coordination, and the committee commends the administration for placing a priority on improving the medical countermeasures capability of the nation, particularly

countermeasures to protect military forces against biological threats.

The MCMI program is intended to establish an advanced development and manufacturing facility on a cost-shared basis with industry and academia. The Department will not own the facility, which will ensure this approach is more cost-effective and efficient than would otherwise be the case.

The committee notes that section 1601 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), directed the Secretary of Defense to "carry out a program to accelerate the research, development and procurement of biomedical countermeasures, including but not limited to therapeutics and vaccines, for the protection of the Armed Forces . . .". The committee believes the MCMI program is an important effort to meet this requirement.

Naval electromagnetic railgun projectiles

The Navy is developing an electromagnetic rail gun for engagements of surface and air threats at ranges up to 200 nautical miles. The committee expressed concerns with the program last year, but now feels that the Navy is making progress in overcoming the various technical challenges on the launcher. However, much remains to be done on the development of suitable projectiles.

The committee is aware that in the past, the Navy and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) discussed collaborating on projectile development, but no serious joint efforts emerged. The committee now understands that the Navy and DARPA are planning to work together on projectile development, including hardening and guidance/navigation systems. The technologies may include low cost sensors tolerant of high accelerations and temperatures, advanced materials, modeling and simulation, and exo-atmospheric control systems. Given the investments made to date in the launcher, the committee fully supports this collaboration. The committee also encourages the Navy and the Air Force to collaborate on this project given the Air Force's expertise in hypersonics, as well as high-speed, high acceleration fusing and warhead technologies.

Naval Engineering Education Center

The committee notes that the Navy faces significant challenges in training and hiring the next-generation of naval engineers. As former Secretary of the Navy Donald Winter said in 2007, "Hiring top-quality people who have experience with large shipbuilding programs is essential. The ability to assign an experienced and capable team must be a precondition to a program's initiation. Finding and developing the people we need is easier said than done, and it will take time to rectify this problem, but we cannot ignore the leverage that can be obtained by putting the right, experienced and prepared people, in the right positions." The Naval Engineering Education Center (NEEC) was established in 2010 to help address the issues identified by then-Secretary Winter and now supports research and educational opportunities for more than 100 students at member universities with the goal of attracting and retaining qualified naval engineering talent. The committee commends the

Navy for proactively working to address its naval engineering workforce issues and has been impressed with the success of the program in meeting its goals to date.

However, the committee is concerned that the Navy has not identified a long-term, stable funding source for the NEEC. The committee understands that, to date, the NEEC has been substantially funded by Operation and Maintenance funds provided to Navy laboratories to pay for overhead expenses. The committee believes this is an unsustainable funding arrangement and is concerned that continuing in such a way will hinder the growth and effectiveness of the NEEC over time. The committee believes robust and predictable funding is important to sustaining meaningful research activities, recruiting students to participate in the program, and ensuring professors and Navy personnel remain fully engaged.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report, not later than December 31, 2012, outlining: (1) the Navy's plan to ensure the sustainability of the NEEC; (2) the potential funding sources to provide robust and predictable support to the program; (3) the projected funding levels for the NEEC across the future-years defense program; (4) a value assessment of the NEEC to date in meeting the goals of the program; and (5) the metrics the Navy will use to measure the success of the program in future years.

Support for the Minerva Research Initiative

The budget request included $19.4 million in PE 61110D8Z for Department of Defense Basic Research Initiatives. Of this amount, $16.5 million was requested for the Minerva Research Initiative.

The Minerva program was established by then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates in 2008 as a way to improve the Department's understanding of social, cultural, and political forces that shape regions of the world of strategic importance to U.S. national security policy. The current Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, has since expressed his support for the initiative.

The committee supports the Department's fiscal year 2013 funding request for Minerva, despite a significant cut in the program's fiscal year 2012 appropriations that unfortunately impacted the number of new research grants. The committee believes that the research supported by Minerva is more important than ever in today's uncertain geopolitical environment. It is important to develop a deeper understanding for responses to significant events and issues such as the Arab awakening, the continuing—and growing in some regions—threat of violent Islamic extremism, and the dynamics of resource-driven conflicts in many parts of the world. In addition, it is vital to gain a better understanding of, and respond to, the trends and developments in China's military growth and modernization, strategic interests, and technological advances, particularly as they relate to the People's Liberation Army's role in setting priorities and influencing China's national security, economic, and foreign policy agenda.

To this end, the committee encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to ensure that fiscal year 2013 funds for the Initiative properly reflect the new strategic defense guidance, pub-

lished by the Department of Defense in 2012. The committee also urges the Initiative to invest in nationally recognized academic experts for the chairs at the professional military education institutes. Lastly, the committee encourages the Department to ensure that funding for Minerva-type research increases in the individual services.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Operation and maintenance funding (sec. 301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions

Department of Defense guidance on environmental exposures at military installations (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance relating to how the military departments and other defense agencies deal with the possible exposure of individuals to environmental contamination at military installations.

Section 314 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) directed the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of possible exposures to environmental hazards on military installations and examine related policies and processes of the Department of Defense (DOD) and other aspects of how environmental exposures are handled. On May 1, 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued its final report entitled, *DOD Can Improve Its Response to Environmental Exposures on Military Installations (GAO–12–412).* As this title implies, the GAO found various limitations in existing DOD policies and processes that impact adversely on the Department's ability to address environmental exposures of people living and working at military installations. To address these deficiencies, GAO made a number of recommendations, to include:

1. Establishing procedures to track and document status and nature of DOD responses to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) recommendations and findings of significant risk, and to update the Memorandum of Understanding between DOD and ATSDR to reflect these new procedures;
2. Establishing a policy that identifies when installations should consider requesting public health assessments in addition to the initial assessments at National Priorities List sites; and
3. Provide guidance on what actions, if any, DOD should take to identify and address possible health risks faced by individuals from past exposures at military installations.

DOD, in its comments on the GAO recommendations, concurred with part of the first recommendation, but did not concur with part

of the first recommendation or with the second or third recommendation.

The committee agrees that these recommendations would help improve the policies and procedures within the DOD regarding the handling of possible environmental exposures at military installations, would result in more consistent responses to these issues throughout Department, and would advance the goal of providing safe and environmentally sound living and working conditions on military installations.

Funding of agreements under the Sikes Act (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670 et seq.) to allow funds committed by the Department of Defense in a cooperative agreement to be made in a lump sum and to be placed in an interest bearing account with the interest available to be applied for the same purposes as the principal.

Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of alternative fuel (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2013 from being obligated or expended for the production or sole purchase of an alternative fuel if the cost exceeds the cost of traditional fossil fuels used for the same purpose, except for continued testing purposes.

The committee notes that in December 2011, the Defense Logistics Agency, on behalf of the Department of the Navy, purchased 450,000 gallons of biofuels for $12.0 million, which equates to $26.66 a gallon. According to the Department of the Navy it was the single largest purchase of biofuel in government history and was carried out in order to "demonstrate the capability of a Carrier Strike Group and its air wing to burn alternative fuels." The Department of the Navy noted that, despite the use of operation and maintenance funds for the purchase, the demonstration is deemed a research, development, test, and evaluation (RDTE) initiative as justification for the higher cost per gallon.

The committee also notes that the Vice Chief of Naval Operations testified before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support on May 10, 2012, regarding pressure on readiness accounts from increased fuel prices that "every $1 increase in the price per barrel of fuel results in approximately $31M of additional cost annually above our budgeted level." Therefore, the high cost of fuel has direct and detrimental impact on other readiness accounts.

The committee strongly supports initiatives undertaken by the Department of Defense to reduce the fuel demand of the operational forces through affordable new technologies that increase fuel efficiency and offer alternative sources of power. But given the pressure placed on current and future defense budgets, the committee is concerned about the use of operation and maintenance funds to pay significantly higher costs for biofuels being used for RDTE efforts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and promulgate guidance to the military services

and defense agencies on the difference between the operational use of alternative fuels versus continued RDTE initiatives.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Repeal of certain provisions relating to depot-level maintenance (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the amendments to provisions relating to depot-level maintenance made by sections 321 and 327 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Sections 321 and 327 were intended to make the existing requirements more "visible and readily understood" without making any substantive change. However, the new language included changes that could significantly impact the balance of work between the public and private sectors. For example:

- Before the enactment of the new provisions, section 2460 of title 10, United States Code, excluded major modifications and upgrades from the definition of depot-level maintenance. The amendments made by section 321 eliminated this exclusion.
- Before the enactment of the new provisions, section 2460 and section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, excluded nuclear aircraft carrier refueling availabilities from the definition of depot-level maintenance and from the requirement for core logistics capabilities. The amendments made by sections 321 and 327 eliminated these exclusions.
- Before the enactment of the new provisions, section 2464 excluded special access programs. The amendments made by section 327 eliminated this exclusion.
- Before the enactment of the new provisions, section 2464 applied only to programs of record. The amendments made by section 327 extended the applicability of the provision to any military equipment that "is fielded in support of operations."

Moreover, even language changes that the Department of Defense has assessed to have no substantive impact—such as the change in terminology from "core logistics capabilities" to "core depot-level maintenance and repair capabilities"—may have unintended consequences.

The Department of Defense has indicated that it will attempt to address problems caused by the new language through creative interpretation of the statutory language and the issuance of multiple waivers (including categorical waivers) to the core logistics requirements in section 2464 and the so-called "50–50" requirements in section 2466 of title 10, United States Code. While it appears that this approach will enable the department to get through fiscal year 2012 without major disruption of public sector or private sector depot activities, extensive reliance on questionable statutory interpretations and waivers to comply with a statute that is otherwise unworkable is not good precedent or good policy.

While it might be possible to fix specific problems in the new statute through targeted amendments, the committee is concerned that such targeted amendments could themselves raise difficult issues of interpretation. The previous balance between public and private sectors was achieved not only by statutory language, but

also by longstanding policies and practices, some of which differed from military department to military department. The new legislation, in its effort to make the statutory language more visible and readily understood, has placed many of these longstanding policies and practices in question.

For this reason, the committee concluded that the best alternative is to repeal sections 321 and 327 and restore the former statutory language in its entirety. By making this repeal retroactive to the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee intends to ensure that waivers issued during the period when the amendments made by sections 321 and 327 were in effect have no precedential value.

The committee directs the military departments to interpret the restored statute in accordance with longstanding policies and practices that were in place before the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

Subtitle D—Reports

Annual report on Department of Defense long-term corrosion strategy (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110–181, 10 U.S.C. 2228) to require the Department of Defense to provide additional information on corrosion projects in reports to Congress, including validated returns on investment for completed corrosion projects, activities, and information on how corrosion funding is used for military projects, the Technical Corrosion Collaboration pilot program, and other corrosion-related activities.

Modified deadline for Comptroller General review of annual report on prepositioned materiel and equipment (sec. 332)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the deadline for the annual report on prepositioned materiel and equipment conducted by the Government Accountability Office.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Savings to be achieved in civilian workforce and contractor employee workforce of the Department of Defense (sec. 341)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and begin implementation of a plan to achieve savings in funding for the civilian workforce and the service contractor workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD) that are not less, as a percentage of such funding, than the savings in funding for military personnel achieved by the planned reduction in military end strength contained in the budget request for fiscal year 2012. Current DOD plans call for a reduction in military end strength in excess of 5 percent through fiscal year 2017. The committee estimates that a comparable level of savings in the civilian and service contractor workforces will total in excess of $5.0 billion

over 5 years, over and above any savings that the Department may already plan or expect to achieve as a result of initiatives already in place.

The provision would exempt expenses for civilian employees in mission critical occupations, personnel employed at military depots, and the offices of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and for contractor employees performing maintenance and repair of military equipment, medical services, and financial audit services. It would authorize the Secretary to establish additional exemptions, if he determines that they are necessary for the performance of critical functions in the interest of national defense. The committee concludes that these exceptions provide the Department with ample flexibility to ensure that the Department has the capacity it needs to perform its critical missions. The committee expects the Secretary to continue to seek savings with regard to critical functions, such as maintenance and repair of military equipment, even though they are exempt from the reductions under this provision.

The committee acknowledges that the DOD efficiencies initiatives will result in an overall reduction in civilian personnel of almost 2 percent, and additional savings through the freeze on civilian pay increases. The committee is also aware that the efficiencies initiatives, coupled with the requirements of section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), have resulted in significant savings in the service contractor workforce.

However, these policies were established before the administration's decision to reduce military end strength by 123,900 over the next 5 years—a 6.8 percent reduction for the Army, 3.9 percent reduction for the Navy, 8.3 percent reduction for the Marine Corps and 2.3 percent reduction for the Air Force. This provision will ensure that savings achieved in the civilian personnel workforce and the contractor employee workforce are brought in line with savings from the newer, deeper cuts to military end strength.

The committee notes that the Comptroller General, in the "2012 Annual Report: Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue," concluded that DOD should continue to consolidate or eliminate defense headquarters to achieve additional efficiencies. In the development of plans to reduce federal civilian personnel expenses, particular attention should be paid to reduction of management headquarters. The committee expects the Secretary to take into account the strategic workforce plan, and critical capabilities included therein, in the development of plans to reduce expenditures for federal civilian personnel of the Department.

NATO Special Operations Headquarters (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense to provide up to $50.0 million in fiscal year 2013 and subsequent years to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ) for the purposes of: (1) improving coordination and cooperation between the special operations forces of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nations; (2) facilitating joint operations by special operations forces of

NATO nations; (3) supporting command, control, and communications capabilities peculiar to special operations forces of NATO nations; (4) promoting special operations forces intelligence and informational requirements within the NATO structure; and (5) promoting interoperability through the development of common equipment standards, tactics, techniques, and procedures, and through execution of multinational education and training programs. Additionally, the recommended provision requires an annual report summarizing Department of Defense support to the NSHQ.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense designated the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) as the "Lead Component with Executive Agent Responsibilities" for the NSHQ on November 5, 2010. The committee also notes that the U.S. Army continues to retain funding responsibilities for the NSHQ as the designated administrative agent for NATO. The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense has directed USSOCOM and the Army to complete a Memorandum of Agreement detailing their respective roles and responsibilities as they relate to the NSHQ. The committee expects funding of the NSHQ will be executed in accordance with the specified Memorandum of Agreement.

Repeal of redundant authority to ensure interoperability of law enforcement and emergency responder training (sec. 343)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 372 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure that Department of Defense support to a federal, state, or local law enforcement or emergency response agency to prepare for or respond to an emergency involving chemical or biological agents is consistent with the national preparedness system and other statutory changes made since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security.

Budget Items

General Fund Enterprise Business System Realignment

The budget request included $556.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for administration.

The committee has received a request from the Army to realign $17.2 million into General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) to support the engineering development effort necessary to process classified and sensitive transactions and to mitigate the risk of exposing classified information.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $17.2 million in OMA for GFEBS realignment.

Museum funding decrease for ahead of need request

The budget request included $1.1 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), for Other Service Support, of which $8.1 million was for the National Museum of the United States Army.

The Army's budget growth justification cited, "exhibits planning, fabrication, installation, storage and conversation for the initial opening of the museum". However, given the museum has yet to be built, the committee is concerned that the increase of funding requested for museum exhibits is ahead of need. Accordingly, the

committee recommends a decrease of $8.1 million in OMA for the National Museum of the United States Army.

Unobligated Operation and Maintenance balances

The budget request included $36.6 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), $41.6 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), $5.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, $35.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), and $31.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW).

The committee notes that the sustained challenges associated with combat operations in Afghanistan have created a difficult fiscal management situation, especially for the Army and Marine Corps. However, the Department of Defense continues to underexecute its Operation and Maintenance (O&M) appropriations. The Government Accountability Office has informed the committee that the average annual O&M unobligated balances for fiscal years 2007–2011 were $1.4 billion for the Army, $286.1 million for the Navy, $386.5 million for the Air Force, $91.8 million for the Marine Corps, and $340.8 million for Defense-wide. These continued excessive unobligated balances are not consistent with sound stewardship of taxpayer dollars. In light of the fiscal management challenges, the committee concludes that certain reductions are appropriate.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $120.0 million to OMA, a decrease of $23.0 million to OMN, a decrease of $32.0 million to OMAF, and a decrease of $25.0 million to OMDW.

U.S. Special Operations Command Operation and Maintenance

The budget request included no funding in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). A clerical error placed USSOCOM's base request of $5,091.0 million for Operation and Maintenance incorrectly in the "classified programs" budget line. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $5,091.0 million from the Classified Programs Operation and Maintenance budget line to the USSOCOM Operation and Maintenance budget line, reflecting the amounts shown in the budget justification documents.

Defense Security Cooperation Agency

The budget request included $557.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA). Of this amount, the request included $365.0 million for the Global Train and Equip program to build the capacity of foreign military forces to meet emerging security threats. The requested amount for the Global Train and Equip program would be $15.0 million in excess of the program's currently authorized level for fiscal year 2012 of $350.0 million under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as most recently amended by section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Further, the budget request included $2.6 million for the DSCA'S Security Cooperation Assessment Office (SCAO). The SCAO is an initiative by DSCA to gather, analyze, and assess the impact of the Department's security cooperation programs and initiatives. The committee continues to believe such an assessment of DSCA's programs is necessary. That is why in the Senate report accompanying S. 1235 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct such an audit of DSCA's programs and develop recommendations on how to improve DSCA's current activities. The committee looks forward to reviewing the Comptroller General's findings and in a separate section of this report directs the Comptroller General to undertake additional work to address the Department's needs in this area.

Therefore the committee recommends a decrease of $17.6 million to OMDW for DSCA, consisting of a decrease of $15.0 million to the Global Train and Equip program and a decrease of $2.6 million to the SCAO.

Defense-wide funding decrease for ahead of need request

The budget request included $253.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), of which $139.4 million was for socioeconomic and water/wastewater infrastructure improvements related to the relocation of Marines to Guam.

Given the reevaluation of the relocation of Marines to Guam, the committee is concerned that the funds requested for the OEA are ahead of need. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $139.4 million in OMDW for the OEA.

Enhanced intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to Operation Observant Compass

The budget request included classified amounts for United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) intelligence activities, including support to Operation Observant Compass (OOC). The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million, in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, line 280, to expand and enhance the intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support to AFRICOM's OOC—the ongoing operation to support the efforts of Ugandan and other regional militaries to remove senior leaders of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) from the battlefield in Central Africa.

The committee supports AFRICOM's ongoing operation in Central Africa in support of partner nation militaries, and the committee is eager to ensure U.S. service members deployed to advise and assist these regional efforts are provided with the resources and unique enabling support required to ensure mission success. That is why—pursuant to the policy established by the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–172)—in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), the committee recommended and Congress approved a provision permitting the Secretary of Defense to provide not more than $35.0 million in logistics support, services, and supplies to the national militaries in the re-

gion conducting operations to disarm and remove senior elements of the LRA.

The committee notes that AFRICOM has only limited contractor-owned and -operated ISR platforms deployed in support of OOC. These capabilities are inadequate in multiple respects, most notably their inability to loiter over areas of interest for extended periods of time and to collect and disseminate various forms of intelligence promptly. While the committee is aware of a number of temporary and rotational efforts underway to enhance ISR support to OOC, the committee believes that without additional resourcing the current operation is likely to remain constrained by poor intelligence support. Without adequate ISR resourcing and support the committee is concerned that OOC will suffer from a lack of critical tipping-and-cueing intelligence capability to find and locate LRA forces.

The committee is concerned that AFRICOM's current resourcing of this mission through the Air Force Big Safari program office and its contractors is unnecessarily costly and is not meeting the needs of the supported forces. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) and AFRICOM to evaluate alternative capability providers and contracting arrangements, both for existing and enhanced intelligence support.

The committee also notes that there is enduring high demand for additional airborne ISR support for AFRICOM and U.S. special operations forces in this region beyond the requirements of the OOC mission. The committee directs USDI and AFRICOM to consider these needs when making decisions about platforms, sensors, basing, and manning.

Operation and Maintenance funding for impact aid

The amount authorized to be appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, includes the following changes from the budget request. The provisions underlying these changes in funding levels are discussed in greater detail in title V of this committee report.

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Impact aid for schools with military dependent students	25.0
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities	5.0
Total	30.0

Items of Special Interest

Advanced predictive modeling and simulation methodologies

The committee recognizes that early integration of advanced predictive modeling and simulation methodologies into program acquisition and life cycle planning can help to avoid cost, reduce cost, and increase operational readiness by reducing unscheduled maintenance. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the appropriate applications of advanced predictive modeling and simulation technologies in the acquisition process of major weapon system programs, including prior to Milestone B, and provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2013.

Air Force strategic basing process

In Senate report accompanying S. 1253 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, the committee directed the Air Force to consider the evaluation of relative flying operation costs for each candidate base during its strategic basing process. The committee commends recent efforts made by the Air Force to do so through the creation of the Air Refueling Received Demand Model. The model accounts for refueling demand from lower priority missions, such as the movement of air show assets, during recent years.

The committee is concerned, however, that the new model excludes evaluation of the demand for the highest priority activities as determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including events where the aircraft departs from and returns to its home station. The air refueling demand for Priority 1 and Priority 2 sorties includes wartime and counterdrug missions, missions directed by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or combatant commanders, Coronet missions, and the deployment of assets in support of homeland defense. In total, these events account for 16 percent of the total operational demand for air refueling platforms.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report to Congress no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act, on how the demand for all refueling events in which the aircraft departs from and returns to home station, regardless of the events' relative Joint Chiefs of Staff Mission Priority, will be accounted for in the Air Refueling Receiver Demand Model in the strategic basing process and future basing decisions. The committee further encourages the Air Force to assign greater value to the demand for high-priority missions, as established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the model.

Canines in support of members of the armed forces

The committee recognizes the outstanding contribution of military working dogs in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and other military contingency operations. These courageous and talented canines have saved lives, including those of service members, through their work in detecting intruders, drugs, and improvised explosive devices. The committee recognizes the value of these highly trained animals in performing critical and varied roles to support both service members and civilians. In particular, the committee acknowledges the sacrifices of those military working dogs killed, wounded, or missing in action. The committee therefore encourages the Secretary of Defense to honor the service of all military working dogs, and especially those who perform exceptionally meritorious service, through appropriate recognition of their service.

Comptroller General of the United States assessment of Department of Defense security cooperation activities

Over the past decade, the Department of Defense (DOD) has expanded significantly its security cooperation activities. According to the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, more than $5.0 billion is spent on the DOD security cooperation program annually. DOD acknowledges openly its current inability to assess the impact of

these activities in the medium- and long-term. The committee, however, recognizes that the impact of security cooperation programs, many of which are the cornerstone of our military-to-military relations with our key allies and partners around the globe, is difficult to measure. As such, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of DOD's security cooperation programs to examine the effectiveness, efficiency, and medium- and long-term results of DOD's programs in this area to consider the return on investment for these programs, and to make recommendations to optimize future security cooperation investments and policies targeted at achieving foreign policy objectives.

The committee hopes the Comptroller General's review will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of DOD's security cooperation programs over time, maximize their value to the geographic combatant command commanders and U.S. foreign partners, and allow DOD to design and implement security cooperation programs optimized to meet requirements established by the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The committee encourages the Comptroller General to consult with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict to identify priority security cooperation programs of mutual concern. The Comptroller General shall provide routine briefings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Consideration of fuel cell systems

The committee is encouraged by many of the findings and recommendations included in the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) sponsored report, "Beyond Demonstration: The Role of Fuel Cells in DoD's Energy Strategy," published on October 19, 2011. Among other things, this report recommended that Department of Defense (DOD) headquarters organizations and the military services: (1) develop and implement procurement models that enable more efficient acquisition of fuel cell systems; (2) consider fuel cell systems for meeting electric power, heating, and cooling demands whenever new facilities and major renovations are planned and designed; (3) consider fuel cell systems when planning and designing backup power capability for DOD sites; and (4) consider fuel cell power for material handling equipment. The committee directs the DOD to report back to the congressional defense committees no later than June 1, 2013, on the steps being taken to implement the recommendations of the DLA report, or if the DOD does not intend to implement any of the recommendations, to explain the reasons behind those decisions.

Corrosion prevention

Corrosion prevention at the Department of Defense (DOD) has been a priority for the committee because of its potential to increase readiness, improve operational safety, and reduce costs.

One tactic that has been used to prevent or reduce corrosion is the application of protective coatings and paints that are applied to DOD weapon systems, military equipment, and infrastructure. The committee understands that several DOD components cur-

rently require that such coatings be applied by certified contractors using personnel who have been qualified through approved training programs.

The committee directs the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to review the use of such certification requirements and determine whether the broader application of qualification standards would be in the best interest of the Department. The Director shall notify the congressional defense committees on the findings and recommendations of this review no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Corrosion projects' return on investment and funding for corrosion-related activities

While the committee supports efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) to adequately address the problem of corrosion and resulting materiel degradation in the design, development and testing of new major weapon systems, the committee is concerned about the accuracy of the return on investment (ROI) that the DOD has reported on its corrosion projects. In the DOD's March 2012 Report to Congress on DOD Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials, it projected an average ROI for projects approved to date as in excess of 50:1. The corrosion program ROI is primarily calculated on those projects that are funded, after they are nominated by the military departments and reviewed for approval by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff, and to a lesser degree on the activities funded.

In December 2010, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), however, reported that the military departments are late in validating ROIs for some completed projects. The DOD's Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation Strategic Plan suggests that follow-on reviews with validated ROIs are required for completed projects within 3 years after full project implementation. In 2012, the GAO identified that some validated ROIs have been completed, but that the DOD did not update the projected ROI in its Report to Congress on DOD Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials to account for a validated ROI. As long as the DOD continues to report only the average projected ROIs and does not include information about the validated ROIs, Congress will lack full visibility into the results of the DOD's efforts to prevent and mitigate corrosion.

Therefore, the committee directs the DOD Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to account for validated ROIs, when available, in its annual corrosion budget materials report to Congress so that it will have the best information on which to base funding-decisions and the DOD has more factual data to determine how to best invest corrosion prevention funds.

The committee is also concerned about the lack of transparency about how the DOD is spending the additional funds provided to support unfunded requirements. The DOD has consistently identified in its annual Report to Congress on DOD Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials the lack of funding for projects as comprising the majority of its unfunded Corrosion Prevention and Control (CPC) requirement. For the past several years, the DOD has also received funding over its CPC budget request and in most years DOD has not used the funds to undertake all acceptable mili-

tary corrosion projects. The DOD has used the funding for corrosion projects as well as other activities such as research through the Technical Corrosion Collaboration (TCC) pilot program. The DOD is required to report the amount of funds requested in the budget for each project and activity. But, while the DOD's annual report mentions the TCC as an activity, it has not included specific information on the funding amounts for this pilot program.

Therefore, the committee directs the DOD Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to include in its Report to Congress on DOD Corrosion Policy and Oversight Budget Materials the amount of funds used for military corrosion projects, the TCC pilot program, and other corrosion-related activities for the preceding fiscal year.

Critical manufacturing capabilities and capacities

The committee maintains the view that expanded authority for all military industrial facilities to designate Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence significantly improves the Department of Defense's core competencies, repair capabilities, and manufacturing functions. As operational tempo declines from drawdowns associated with combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the committee is concerned that sufficient workload is necessary to ensure cost efficiency and technical competence in peacetime, while preserving the ability to provide an effective and timely response to a mobilization, national defense contingency situations, and other emergency requirements.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to identify critical manufacturing capabilities and capacities that should be government owned and government operated, identify the level of work needed to sustain capabilities, and report to the congressional defense committees on these matters no later than February 28, 2013.

Department of Defense inventory management

Section 328 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop a comprehensive plan for improving DOD inventory management systems, with an objective of reducing the acquisition and storage of secondary inventory that is excess to requirements.

In January 2011, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that DOD's Comprehensive Inventory Management Improvement Plan addressed each of the eight elements required by section 328, but would be challenged to meet the aggressive timelines and benchmarks in the Plan.

In May 2012, GAO reported that DOD has made progress in implementing the plan, but that significant challenges remain—particularly in the areas of improving demand forecasting, multi-echelon modeling, and implementing revised guidance on retention management. GAO recommended that DOD: (1) periodically reexamine and update targets and timelines for reducing excess on-order and on-hand inventory; (2) incorporate comprehensive, standardized metrics into inventory management guidance; and (3) employ these metrics for monitoring the effectiveness of improved inventory management practices.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness to report to the congressional defense committees, no later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, on the steps that DOD has taken to implement the GAO recommendations.

Energy performance savings contracts

The committee understands that the Department of Defense (DOD) spends billions of dollars on energy costs each year and that financing large-scale energy projects can be cost-prohibitive for the DOD. Energy Performance Savings Contracts (ESPC) enable the DOD to finance energy efficiency upgrades on military installations by funding various Energy Conservation Measures, through private investments, and receive a guarantee that the energy savings will pay for the project.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the potential applicability of ESPC authority to construct power generating plants, and to acquire mobile sources, including electric and natural gas-powered vehicles and their associated charging stations on military installations, and to make recommendations to the congressional defense committees if changes in law or regulation are needed for the Department to pursue efficient and effective initiatives using ESPC authorities.

Essential role of rare earth materials

Rare earth materials play an essential role in several critical weapons components and systems such as precision-guided munitions, electric ship drives, command and control centers, and aircraft, tanks, and missile systems. The committee notes the predominance of unreliable foreign sources for rare earth materials, including China, which provides roughly 94 percent of the world's rare earth oxides and nearly all rare earth metal within the defense-related supply chain and which has repeatedly decreased export quotas and imposed embargoes of these critical materials. Even with the development of the domestic-supply chain there may be continued reliance on production of certain heavy rare earth elements from China. The importance of rare earth materials for national defense applications necessitates a thorough understanding of vulnerabilities in the rare earth supply chain and the development of pragmatic, actionable risk mitigation plans to reduce the likelihood of supply interruptions. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to carefully consider the role of U.S. producers and potential means to develop reliable domestic sources to meet Department rare earth materials requirements.

Funding shortfalls for minimum capital investment program, facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization, and base operations support

The committee remains concerned that the failure of the Department of Defense (DOD) to fully fund several critical readiness accounts over the last decade poses a continuing risk to the readiness, training and operational capability of military forces. Base operations support, capital investment program (CIP), and Facility Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (FSRM) funding are

all critical to maintaining durable facilities for the readiness, training, and operations of military forces. Underinvestment in these facilities can lead to increased military construction needs, which could otherwise be avoided.

The Navy was the only military department to fail to fund the minimum 6 percent CIP in the Fiscal Year 2013 budget request. The committee continues to believe that investment funds included in the capital budget of an industrial facility should go to modernize or improve efficiency of facilities equipment, work environment, or processes in direct support of the facility's mission. The committee urges the military departments to allocate adequate resources to meet the congressionally-directed minimum 6 percent for CIP requirement.

The committee is concerned that the level of FSRM funding for military installations is not sufficient to meet infrastructure needs. Recognizing in this tight budgeting environment that the DOD must weigh risks to infrastructure against equipping, training, and personnel demands, the cost to repair or replace facilities that have not received adequate investments is far greater than preventative or restorative maintenance. The committee strongly believes that the military departments should fund at least 90 percent of the amounts determined by the Facility Sustainment Model, while providing additional funding to support restoration and modernization requirements.

The problem of inadequate funding is compounded in the case of joint bases where services calculate FSRM needs differently and the services owning the installation does not factor the alternative service's formula into the process leading to insufficient funding to address installation needs. The committee is also concerned that the adjustment of the allocation of FSRM funds provided to each military installation to address the unique and more costly requirements for facilities that are listed or eligible for the National Registry of Historic Places as required by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 may not accurately reflect the actual requirements imposed by the NHPA.

The committee directs the DOD to review the allocation system for FSRM funding to ensure parity in the distribution of funds among the military departments and adequate adjustments for unique facility requirements, including joint bases and historical preservation. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on the findings of the review no later than March 1, 2013.

Ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms

Section 352 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) established that the design and fielding of all future ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms of the armed forces may uniquely reflect the identity of the individual military services, provided that the ground combat and utility uniforms, to the maximum extent practicable, provide members of every service an equivalent level of performance, functionality, and protection commensurate with their respective assigned combat missions, minimize the risk to the individual, and provide interoperability with other components of individual

warfighter systems. Section 352 also required the secretaries of the military departments to establish joint criteria for future combat uniforms in coordination with the results of a review conducted by the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

In a report to the committee, the Department of Defense (DOD) acknowledged that the Department "can do more and is taking the necessary steps to further promote and enhance both ongoing interservice collaboration and life-cycle coordination with the Defense Logistics Agency."

However, the committee is concerned that the joint criteria required by section 352 has not yet been issued and the DOD-established Joint Clothing and Textile Governance Board (JCTGB) has not yet established "a common set of parameters for basic performance characteristics such as protection, concealment, reliability, durability, sensor mitigation, survivability, and network readiness."

This delay is problematic because the Army is currently in the final stages of developing a "family" of camouflage patterns for its next ground combat uniform. The committee understands that the Army currently plans to make its final selection for this uniform in 2013, before the JCTGB is expected to finalize the common parameters for uniform performance characteristics.

The committee also understands that the Department of the Navy has chosen to equip its sailors and marines with different varieties of ground combat uniforms, providing significantly different levels of protection. Specifically, while marines and naval special warfare have been issued digital camouflage patterns, all other Navy units continue to wear an inferior camouflage pattern that was developed in the early 1980s possibly leaving sailors in a combat environment at an increased tactical risk.

The committee concludes that uniforms incorporating the most advanced levels of protection should be available to all men and women in uniform, regardless of the military service in which they serve. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to take steps to ensure that: (1) common parameters established by the JCTGB are reflected in the Army's next ground combat uniform prior to fielding; and (2) uniforms providing an appropriate level of protection are available to all Navy units serving in areas of combat operation. The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of the steps taken to address these issues no later than 60 days after enactment of this Act.

Lack of competition in Air Force C–17 engine maintenance contracting

The committee remains concerned that the Air Force has failed to maximize competition in planned maintenance of the C–17's F117 engine, losing the benefit of the most effective mechanism to reduce costs, manage risk, and maximize efficiency in supply chain management (SCM). Because the F117 engine is 91 percent similar to the commercial family of engines in the PW2000, multiple competitors should be available to provide support, maintenance, and sustainment for these engines. However, the F117 sustainment strategy timeline briefed to the committee would phase in competition slowly and would not commit the Air Force to competition in all areas of SCM and sustaining engineering.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to exercise competitive approaches to the support, maintenance, and sustainment of F117 engines to the maximum extent practicable. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the congressional defense committees on steps that will be taken to enhance competition in this area and to notify the congressional defense committees of: (1) any deviation from the F117 sustainment strategy timeline; and (2) any significant change in projected yearly savings with respect to SCM or sustaining engineering.

Marine Corps depot maintenance activity group

Recent analysis of the Marine Corps depot maintenance activity group (DMAG) conducted by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) revealed that there is room for improvement with respect to the budgeting and management of carryover. The committee commends the Marine Corps for properly managing carryover amounts below the allowable limits, especially when compared to the other services' working capital funds. However, the committee is concerned that the Marine Corps underestimated the DMAG's new orders every year during the 6-year period of review by the GAO, from a low of 51 percent to a high of 175 percent. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Marine Corps DMAG to improve the budgeting and management of carryover by comparing budgeted to actual information on carryover and orders and making adjustments to budget estimates as appropriate.

Modernizing the aging fleet

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's new strategic guidance, and future-years defense program, place increased demand on legacy Air Force platforms to counter contemporary threats and meet global mission requirements. These aging aircraft fleets, many of which were procured decades ago, are extremely expensive to maintain and lack dedicated technology insertion programs to replace outdated materials, product forms, and parts that dramatically increase operation and maintenance (O&M) costs and limit mission availability.

The committee is aware that commercial aircraft fleets have employed structural aluminum alloys, advanced manufacturing processes, and joining technologies. The committee believes that the low-risk transition of these proven commercial technologies, products, and best practices could help the Air Force to increase mission availability and reduce O&M costs for the aging fleet. The committee encourages the Air Force to leverage commercially developed and proven technologies and products within its modernization and sustainment activities in order to increase mission availability, reduce total ownership costs, and resolve supply chain issues.

Rapid equipping and fielding initiatives

The committee recognizes that combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have resulted in substantial improvements and compression in the processes used to develop and field urgent needs for combatant commanders, including organizational clothing and individual equipment. Following the drawdown of Afghanistan, the

committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider maintaining key elements of the Army Rapid Fielding Initiative, the Rapid Equipping Force, and combatant commander level purchasing authority to enable agile responses to future threats.

Readiness support for unfunded requirements

The committee remains concerned that in an era of fiscal constraints coupled with high operational tempo, the services have chosen to fund readiness accounts below their requirements and heavily rely upon Overseas Contingency Operations funding to temporarily maintain operational readiness. Furthermore, as a result of almost a decade of combat operations, backlogs of deferred ship and aircraft depot maintenance remain unexecuted by the services. The committee notes that a failure to address this backlog for active and reserve ships and aircraft will continue to jeopardize and erode materiel readiness, further reduce the service life of the fleet, increase long-term sustainment costs, and further increase strategic risk for the Nation.

Despite these backlogs, the services continue to underfund critical readiness accounts and fail to request any unfunded requirements by the service chiefs in support of the fiscal year 2013 budget request. The committee acknowledges the Department of the Navy's budget request to fully fund their ship depot maintenance account to meet 100 percent of their known requirements, and encourages the Department to ensure those funds are carried out for their budgeted purpose in fiscal year 2013.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine and quantify the existing deferred depot maintenance backlogs of the services and provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2013, with a plan to address the existing deferred maintenance backlogs of the services with proposed completion timelines and specific funding amounts.

Report on Defense Science Board climate change recommendations

In October 2011, the Defense Science Board issued its report on *Trends and Implications of Climate Change for National and International Security* ("DSB report"). The DSB report, prepared at the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, describes observable consequences of climate change and offers recommendations on the role of the Department of Defense, and other agencies, in adapting and responding to the effects on U.S. national security interests.

The committee is interested in the disposition of the recommendations contained in the DSB report and directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, by November 1, 2012, a report addressing the recommendations contained in the DSB report. Specifically, the Secretary's report shall:

1. address the recommendations of the DSB report with regard to the roles of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the combatant commands in addressing the matters that the DSB report identified as having adverse implications for national and international security;

2. describe the actions taken on each of the DSB recommendations on the role of the Department of Defense; and

3. identify such changes in law, if any, that would be required to fully implement the recommendations of the DSB report.

In preparing the report, the Secretary should consider the Intelligence Community Assessment number ICA 2012–08, "Global Water Security", and any other reports or information he deems appropriate, and shall consult with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and such other officials, agencies, or organizations as he deems appropriate. The report shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if warranted.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2013, as shown below:

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Army	562,000	552,100	552,100	0	−9,900
Navy	325,700	322,700	322,700	0	−3,000
Marine Corps	202,100	197,300	197,300	0	−4,800
Air Force	332,800	328,900	329,597	697	−3,203
DOD Total	1,422,600	1,401,000	1,401,697	697	−20,903

The committee supports the Department of Defense fiscal year 2013 request for active-duty end strengths, with the exception of additional Air Force end strength to support force structure changes adopted by the committee. The funding to support this end strength is contained in title XVII of this Act.

The committee remains concerned about the impact of the drawdown while the Army and Marine Corps in particular remain engaged in ground combat operations. Adequate dwell time to deployment ratios remain key to ensuring that service members receive sufficient time at home to rejuvenate and recover physically and mentally from arduous and repeated combat deployments. In addition, sufficient time between deployments allows units to repair equipment, train for the full spectrum of future potential missions, and build the Nation's strategic depth to respond to unforeseen contingencies. For these reasons, insufficient dwell time undermines readiness and increases risk.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include with the budget submission in each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017 a statement of estimated deployment to dwell ratios for both active and reserve component personnel for that fiscal year based on expected operational demand and requested end strength levels. The statement shall include the average unit and individual deployed to dwell ratios, as of the end of the fiscal year preceding the budget submission, for the active and reserve components of the Army and Marine Corps. The statement shall also identify the Army and Marine Corps military occupational specialties and types of units which did not achieve the respective service's dwell time goals. For each of these specialties and units, the Army and Marine Corps shall identify the average deployed to dwell ratios.

Additionally, for each of fiscal years 2014 through 2017, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include with the budget submission an assessment of whether requested reductions in active-duty end strength are reversible within 1 year, including through increased use of the reserve components, if demand assumptions prove incorrect and additional active forces are needed during that fiscal year.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2013, as shown below:

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Army National Guard	358,200	358,200	358,200	0	0
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	66,200	62,500	62,500	0	−3,700
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	106,700	101,600	106,435	4,835	−265
Air Force Reserve	71,400	70,500	72,428	1,928	1,028
DOD Total	847,100	837,400	844,163	6,763	−2,937
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	9,000	9,000	0	−1,000

The committee supports the Department of Defense fiscal year 2013 request for reserve component end strengths, with the exception of additional Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve end strength to support force structure changes adopted by the committee. The funding to support this end strength is contained in title XVII of this Act.

End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2013, as shown below:

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	32,060	32,060	0	0
Army Reserve	16,261	16,277	16,277	0	16
Navy Reserve	10,337	10,114	10,114	0	−223
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,833	14,305	14,871	566	38
Air Force Reserve	2,662	2,888	2,888	0	226
DOD Total	78,414	77,905	78,471	566	57

The committee supports the Department of Defense fiscal year 2013 request for full-time support end strengths, with the exception of additional Air National Guard full-time end strength to support force structure changes adopted by the committee. The fund-

ing to support this end strength is contained in title XVII of this Act.

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the minimum number of military technicians (dual status) for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force as of the last day of fiscal year 2013, as shown below:

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Army Reserve	8,395	8,445	8,445	0	50
Army National Guard	27,210	28,380	28,380	0	1,170
Air Force Reserve	10,777	10,283	10,716	433	−61
Air National Guard	22,509	21,101	22,313	1,212	−196
DOD Total	68,891	68,209	69,854	1,645	963

The committee supports the Department of Defense fiscal year 2013 request for dual status technicians, with the exception of additional Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard technicians to support force structure changes adopted by the committee. The funding to support this end strength is contained in title XVII of this Act.

Fiscal year 2013 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2013, as shown below:

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of Reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, as of September 30, 2013, as shown below:

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0

Service	FY 2012 authorized	FY 2013		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2013 request	FY 2012 authorized
Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

Military personnel (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

Budget Item

Military personnel funding changes

The amount authorized to be appropriated for military personnel programs in section 421 of this Act includes the following changes from the budget request:

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Basic allowance for housing for full-time National Guard transition	6.0
Total	6.0

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in Military Personnel funding, pursuant to a legislative provision regarding the payment of the basic allowance for housing for Army and Air National Guard members transitioning between active-duty service under title 10, United States Code, and full-time National Guard service under title 32, United States Code. The provision appears in title VI of this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Policy

Extension of relaxation of limitation on selective early discharges (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 638a(d)(2) of title 10 to extend until December 31, 2018, the authority to convene selection boards to consider the discharge of regular officers below the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander who have served on active duty for at least 1 year in their current grade, are not on a promotion list, and are not eligible for retirement.

Exception to 30-year retirement for regular Navy warrant officers in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–5 (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 1305(a) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the total active military service a Navy warrant officer in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–5, may serve from 30 to 33 years before being statutorily retired for length of service.

Modification of definition of joint duty assignment to include all instructor assignments for joint training and education (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 668(b)(1)(B) of title 10, United States Code, to remove the limitations on the types of instructors included in the definition of "joint duty assignment". The current law excludes instructor positions that may provide an officer significant experience in joint matters from inclusion on the joint duty assignment list and provides undue deference to Joint Professional Military Education Phase II (JPME II) positions. This change would allow the Department of Defense to judge all positions based on the significant experience the position provides an officer in joint matters.

The committee believes that instructor duty assignments at the three service academies should be structured to the maximum extent possible to allow officers who serve in these capacities to accrue joint experience and credit. Completion of joint professional military requirements while assigned to the faculties or officer assignments at the academies should be encouraged, and exchange tours and temporary assignments during tours of duty at the service academies should be made available in order to enhance the ca-

reer progression of officers who volunteer for instructor duty at the service academies.

Sense of Senate on inclusion of assignments as academic instructor at the military service academies as joint duty assignments (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should include assignments in which military officers are assigned as instructors responsible for preparing and presenting academic courses on the faculty of the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Air Force Academy as joint duty assignments.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

Authority for appointment of persons who are lawful permanent residents as officers of the National Guard (sec. 511)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 313(b)(1) of title 32, United States Code, to allow a lawful permanent resident to be eligible for appointment as an officer into the National Guard. Section 12201(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, currently makes lawful permanent residents eligible for appointment as officers in the Reserves.

Reserve component suicide prevention and resilience program (sec. 512)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 1007 of title 10, United States Code, to codify the Suicide Prevention and Community Healing and Response Program for National Guard and reserve component members, and to move it from within the Office for Reintegration Programs to the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

Diversity in the armed forces and related reporting requirements (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to accurately measure the efforts of the Department of Defense to achieve the goal of having a sustainable and dynamic pipeline that yields a diverse officer and enlisted corps for the armed forces that reflects the population of the United States eligible for military service. The provision would require the service secretaries, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to develop a definition of diversity for their respective military services that reflects the culture, mission, and core values of each military service. Finally, the provision would require biennial reports to the congressional defense committees beginning July 1, 2013, through July 1, 2017, on the Department's progress in achieving its diversity goals.

Modification of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the armed forces (sec. 522)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to include full-time active guard and reserve members in the population eligible for the career intermission pilot program, to clarify that accrued leave may be carried forward through the period of inactive service, and to clarify that participants in the program who become ill or injured during their period of inactive service may be processed for retirement or separation under chapters 55 and 61 of title 10, United States Code.

Authority for additional behavioral health professionals to conduct pre-separation medical examinations for post-traumatic stress disorder (sec. 523)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1177(a) of title 10, United States Code, to expand the scope of providers that may conduct pre-administrative separation medical examinations for post-traumatic stress disorder to include licensed clinical social workers and psychiatric nurse practitioners. Under current law, only physicians, clinical psychologists, or psychiatrists may perform these examinations. This language was requested by the Department of Defense, and does not affect the statutory requirement that these examinations be reviewed by appropriate authorities responsible for reviewing and approving separation cases.

Quarterly reports on involuntary separation of members of the armed forces (sec. 524)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the service secretaries to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter of the calendar year in 2013 and 2014, a report on members of the regular components who were involuntarily separated from active duty. The report would include the total number of service members involuntarily separated; the number of members separated set forth by grade, by total years of service, and by occupational specialty or rating; the number separated who received involuntary separation pay or temporary retired pay; the number who completed transition assistance programs relating to future employment; and the average number of months deployed to overseas contingencies by grade.

Review of eligibility of victims of domestic terrorism for award of the Purple Heart and the Defense Medal of Freedom (sec. 525)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the service secretaries, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2013, a report on the advisability of modifying the criteria for the award of the Purple Heart to military personnel, and the Defense Medal of Freedom to civilian personnel, who are killed or wounded in a ter-

rorist attack within the United States that is determined to be inspired by ideological, political, or religious beliefs that give rise to terrorism.

Subtitle D—Military Justice and Legal Matters Generally

Clarification and enhancement of the role of the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend sections 806(a) (article 6(a) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), 5041, and 5046(a) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify and enhance the role of the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps. The provision would require that an officer appointed as Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps be appointed in the grade of major general and authorize the Staff Judge Advocate to supervise the administration of military justice and delivery of legal assistance services in the Marine Corps, and provide professional supervision over all Marine Corps judge advocates.

The committee notes that this provision reflects the recommendations contained in the Final Report of the Independent Review Panel to Study the Judge Advocate Requirements of the Department of the Navy, dated February 22, 2011. The Independent Panel was established, in part, to address concerns about the administration of military justice in the Navy and Marine Corps. The committee is grateful for the work of the Independent Panel and expects that the clarification and enhancement of the role of the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant will result in greater accountability at every level for ensuring that the procedural requirements of the Uniform Code of Military Justice are complied with.

Additional information in reports on annual surveys of the Committee on the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsection (c)(2) of section 946 of title 10, United States Code (article 146 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to require the Code Committee to address the following additional matters in its annual report: compliance with processing time goals; cases in which court-martial convictions are reversed as a result of command influence or denial of the right to a speedy review; any provision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is held unconstitutional; developments in appellate case law relating to courts-martial involving allegations of sexual misconduct; issues associated with implementing legislatively directed changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice or the Manual for Courts-Martial; measures implemented to ensure the ability of judge advocates to competently participate as trial and defense counsel in, and preside as military judges over, capital cases, national security cases, sexual assault cases, and proceedings of military commissions; and the independent views of the Judge Advocates General and the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps on the sufficiency of resources within their service to perform military justice functions.

Subtitle E—Sexual Assault, Hazing, and Related Matters

Authority to retain or recall to active duty reserve component members who are victims of sexual assault while on active duty (sec. 541)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries, upon the request of the member concerned, to retain on active duty or return to active duty for completion of a line of duty determination reserve component members who are alleged victims of sexual assault while on active duty.

Additional elements in comprehensive Department of Defense policy on sexual assault prevention and response (sec. 542)

The committee recommends a provision that reflects the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense and that would require the Secretary of Defense to modify the revised comprehensive policy for the Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program required by section 1602 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2011 (Public Law 111–183). The provision would direct the following additions to existing policies: (1) a requirement to establish within each military department an enhanced capability for the investigation, prosecution, and defense of designated special victim offenses, (2) a requirement that each military department initiate and retain for a period prescribed by the Secretary of Defense a record of the disposition of allegations of sexual assault using forms and procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, (3) a requirement that all commanders and commanding officers receive training on sexual assault prevention, response, and policies before, or shortly after, assuming command, (4) a requirement that all new members of the armed forces receive training during initial entry training on sexual assault prevention and response, (5) a requirement for specified military commands and units to conduct periodic climate assessments, (6) a requirement to post and widely disseminate information about resources available to report and respond to sexual assaults, and (7) a requirement to assign responsibility to receive and investigate complaints of a violation of or failure to provide the rights of a crime victim.

The committee believes that the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense for changes to the Department's sexual assault prevention and response program can and preferably should be implemented through changes to existing regulations. The complexity of the various matters addressed in this provision, including, for example, the investigation and adjudication of serious offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice; the collection, retention, and use of sensitive, and in some cases restricted access and personal information; and the obligation to establish, enforce, and hold military leaders accountable for compliance with training and education requirements while operating under wartime conditions, demand adequate time and flexibility for the Department and the services to develop legally sufficient policies. The Secretary of Defense and service leaders have reiterated their commitment to the

stated goals of preventing and responding appropriately to sexual assaults; this is demonstrated in the information provided in the Department's recent Comprehensive Policy Report Update required pursuant to section 1602(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). This provision is fully consistent with the expectation they will fulfill that commitment.

The committee is pleased that the Secretary of Defense has exercised his authority to ensure that initial disposition authority over specified sexual offenses is elevated to senior commanders who are required to consult with a judge advocate. This action will make certain that these serious offenses are addressed by an appropriate level of command. The committee looks forward to receiving regular briefings on the impact this policy change has on the disposition of sexual assault cases.

Hazing in the armed forces (sec. 543)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the service secretaries, in consultation with their respective service chiefs, to submit a report not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on hazing in their service.

The committee believes that preventing and responding to incidents of hazing is a leadership issue and that the service secretaries, assisted by their service chiefs, should be looked to for policies and procedures that will appropriately respond to hazing incidents.

Subtitle F—Education and Training

Inclusion of the School of Advanced Military Studies Senior Level Course as a senior level service school (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 2151(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Senior Level Course of the School of Advanced Military Studies of the Army Command and General Staff College to offer Joint Professional Military Education Phase II instruction and credit.

Modification of eligibility for associate degree programs under the Community College of the Air Force (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 9315(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize enlisted members of the armed forces other than the Air Force participating in joint-service medical training and education or serving as instructors in such training and education to participate in associate degree programs of the Community College of the Air Force.

Support of Naval Academy Athletic Programs (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 603 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and leases with the Naval Academy Athletic Association (Association) for the purpose of supporting the athletic and physical fitness pro-

grams of the Naval Academy. The provision would authorize the Association to use Navy property; the Navy to accept funds, supplies, and services from the Association, and funds from the National Collegiate Athletic Association; and the Association to enter into certain licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and service marks identifying the Naval Academy.

Grade of commissioned officers in uniformed medical accession programs (sec. 554)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2114(b) and 2121(c) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that officers serve in the grade of O–1 throughout their medical education. The provision would authorize medical students attending the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) and students participating in the armed forces Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Programs (HPSP), while on active duty, to serve in pay grade O–1, or in pay grade O–2 if they meet specified promotion criteria prescribed by the service secretary. The provision would also amend section 2004a of title 10, United States Code, to provide that an officer detailed as a student at a medical school would serve on active duty in the same grade with the same entitlement to pay as specified in section 2114(b) of title 10, United States Code.

The Academic Review Subcommittee of the Board of Regents of the USUHS issued a report in June 2011, that found that the current policy of requiring medical students at USUHS to serve in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign until graduation "fosters the misperception that medical officers are different from their nonmedical peers in matters of officership." This Subcommittee recommended that medical students be promoted to the rank of first lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade) at the end of the second year of their training "if their performance indicates they are ready to assume the duties of the higher rank."

The committee believes that requiring medical students who are commissioned officers to remain in the rank of ensign or second lieutenant throughout their medical education undermines the goal of producing medical officers who are motivated and dedicated to a career in the uniformed services and is inconsistent with virtually every other military officer development program. The service secretaries, in consultation with the Surgeons General and the President of USUHS, should establish criteria for promotion of medical students to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) and first lieutenant and assign greater leadership responsibilities to those officers who earn promotions while assigned to USUHS or the HPSP.

Authority for service commitment for Reservists who accept fellowships, scholarships, or grants to be performed in the Selected Reserve (sec. 555)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 2603(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize members of the Selected Reserve

to fulfill a service obligation incurred for acceptance of a fellowship, scholarship, or grant by serving on active duty for a period of at least three times the length of the period of the education or training, or in the Selected Reserve for a period of at least five times the length of the period of the education or training.

Repeal of requirement for eligibility for in-state tuition of at least 50 percent of participants in Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program (sec. 556)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 2107(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that at least 50 percent of midshipmen and cadets appointed under section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, qualify for and receive in-state tuition rates at their respective institutions. This provision would provide greater latitude to assign Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps participants to institutions with educational programs that meet military service needs.

Modification of requirements on plan to increase the number of units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (sec. 557)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 548 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to modify the requirement that the Secretary of Defense develop and implement a plan to establish and support not less than 3,700 units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps (JROTC) not later than September 20, 2020, to a requirement for not less than 3,000 and not more than 3,700 units by September 20, 2020; to authorize service secretaries to determine that all support provided to youth development programs in the armed forces is consistent with funding limitations and the achievement of the objectives of such programs; and to change the annual reporting requirement after 2012 to require reports not later than March 31, 2015, 2018, and 2020.

The committee recognizes the value of the JROTC program but believes that the services require greater flexibility and discretion in supporting not only JROTC but also various other youth-oriented programs using appropriated funds. Meritorious programs such as National Guard Youth Challenge, Naval Sea Cadets Corps, Young Marines, Civil Air Patrol, STARBASE, and others have received substantial amounts of appropriated funds or in-kind support and the services should have great latitude in deciding how best to use operations and maintenance funds available to them in the current fiscal environment.

Information received from the Department of Defense in the JROTC annual reports for 2009 and 2010 shows that the current congressional mandate to establish over 250 new units by 2020 is not realistic and should be repealed. In this regard, the committee applauds the initiative of the Department of the Navy in establishing the National Defense Cadet Corps, an alternative to JROTC, that has identical citizenship goals and can be supported by many high schools that cannot meet the requirements for establishing a JROTC unit. All of these units and efforts should be con-

sidered in assessing the contribution of the Department of Defense and the services to youth development.

Consolidation of military department authority to issue arms, tentage, and equipment to educational institutions not maintaining units of the Junior ROTC (sec. 558)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend chapter 152 of title 10, United States Code, to consolidate under one section of law all military department authority to issue arms, tentage, and equipment to educational institutions not maintaining units of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps. This provision would require the educational institution to offer a course in military instruction and to have a student body of at least 50 students in a grade above the eighth grade.

Modification of requirement for reports in Federal Register on institutions of higher education ineligible for contracts and grants for denial of ROTC or military recruiter access to campus (sec. 559)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 983 of title 10, United States Code, to delete the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to publish in the Federal Register once every 6 months a list of each institution of higher education that is ineligible for contracts and grants because the Secretary has determined that the institution has a policy or practice that prohibits or prevents the establishment of a Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (SROTC) unit or a student at that institution from enrolling in a SROTC unit at another institution of higher education. The Secretary would still be required to publish a notice in the Federal Register whenever the Secretary makes a determination that an institution should be denied federal funds because the institution has a policy or practice that prohibits or prevents the establishment of a SROTC unit or a student at that institution from enrolling in a SROTC unit at another institution of higher education.

Comptroller General of the United States report on the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (sec. 560)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act a report on (1) whether the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) programs of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are effectively meeting current and projected requirements for newly commissioned officers in the armed forces, and (2) the cost-effectiveness and productivity of current ROTC programs.

The committee believes that the significant proposed reductions in active-duty end strength require an objective assessment of the Services' planning for reduced requirements for newly commissioned officers. The United States General Accounting Office completed such an assessment in May 1991, and its report ("Less Need

for Officers Provides Opportunity for Significant Savings") should be used as a model.

Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of Department of Defense assistance to local educational agencies that benefit eligible dependents with severe disabilities.

Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 572)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $25.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for continuation of the Department of Defense assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and civilian employees of the Department of Defense.

Amendments to the impact aid program (sec. 573)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) to: simplify the calculation to determine the payment owed to federal property districts; clarify how to calculate eligible children displaced from housing located on federal property; and accelerate the deadline for the Department of Education to make final payments to districts.

Military spouses (sec. 574)

The committee recommends a provision that would codify and expand authority for non-competitive hiring in the civilian workforce of certain military spouses.

Modification of authority to allow Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools to enroll certain students (sec. 575)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2164 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the enrollment in Department of Defense (DOD) elementary and secondary schools (DDESS) of dependents who have left a school overseas pursuant to an authorized departure or evacuation order, and whose safe haven location is within commuting distance of a DDESS school. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to allow enrollment of dependents of active-duty service members located in the United States that are transitioning from

a DOD overseas school to be able to take courses in the Department of Defense Education Activity Virtual School.

Sense of Congress regarding support for Yellow Ribbon Day (sec. 576)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the Sense of Congress in support of Yellow Ribbon Day.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Family briefings concerning accountings for members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision requested by the Department of Defense that would amend section 1501 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Affairs to conduct periodic briefings for families of missing persons on Department activities to account for those persons.

Enhancement of authority to accept gifts and services (sec. 582)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2601(i)(2), 1588(a), and chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the acceptance of voluntary services to facilitate accounting for missing persons and to authorize military museums and military education programs to enter into cooperative agreements with certain nonprofit entities.

Service secretaries currently have authority to accept voluntary services for military museums and military education programs under section 1588 of title 10, United States Code, and to accept gifts for the benefit of schools and museums under section 2601 of title 10, United States Code. The committee believes that the authority under section 1588 of title 10, United States Code, to accept voluntary services from any person includes authority to accept services from nonprofit entities and academic institutions.

Clarification of authorized Fisher House residents at the Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware (sec. 583)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend subsection (a) of section 2493 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that primary next of kin, other family members, and escorts of family members of service members who die while located or serving overseas are authorized users of the Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware.

Report on accuracy of data in the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (sec. 584)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than

90 days after the date of enactment of this Act a plan to improve the completeness and accuracy of the data contained in the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS).

The committee is concerned by the findings of the Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector General (IG) in its April 2012 report titled, "Action is Needed to Improve the Completeness and Accuracy of DEERS Beneficiary Data." The IG found that the Defense Manpower Data Center, the organization responsible for management of DEERS, lacked critical supporting documentation needed to verify the eligibility of users of DOD benefits, including health care, government facilities, and other privileges. For example, the report states that "DEERS supporting documentation was not adequate to verify the identity of 2.1 million beneficiaries in DEERS." The IG found that discrepancies exist in the date of birth, gender, name, or relationship of nearly 200,000 beneficiaries. The TRICARE Management Activity identified 2,495 instances in which ineligible users received health care benefits totaling $11.2 million.

Accuracy of the DEERS database is essential to ensure that eligible users have timely access to health care and other DOD benefits. Accuracy of eligibility data is equally necessary to prevent fraud and abuse of critical Department of Defense programs. The committee urges the Secretary to act promptly to address the Inspector General's findings and recommendations.

Items of Special Interest

American Bar Association Military Pro Bono Project

The committee is grateful for the support provided to military members by the American Bar Association's (ABA) Military Pro Bono Project. Established in 2008, this initiative of the ABA's Standing Committee on Legal Assistance for Military Personnel has provided legal services in civil law matters to over 1,000 service members, many of whom were deployed overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Military Pro Bono Project has provided military legal assistance attorneys with a centralized referral point for pro bono counsel and overseen an efficient complement to existing military legal assistance programs. The Judge Advocates General of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps have formally expressed their thanks and appreciation for the ABA's role in developing a network of legal support for service members where representation is essential by civilian practitioners.

The committee believes that the General Counsel of the Department of Defense should lead an effort to identify ways in which the Department and the services can expand the support they provide to the Military Pro Bono Project in a budget-neutral manner. More can and should be done to supplement the ongoing efforts of the ABA to consolidate state and local programs aimed at expanding the availability of highly qualified civilian attorneys with service members who are most in need of pro bono assistance. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study this issue and, in coordination with the services, submit a letter report no later than March 1, 2013, discussing issues that should be considered and rec-

ommended methods through which additional resources and support can be given to the Military Pro Bono Project.

Army's sexual assault and special investigation training

The committee is aware of the efforts that the Department of Defense has made to reduce sexual assaults across our military services. The committee applauds these steps. However, the committee recognizes that more work needs to be done to reduce the occurrence of sexual assaults in the military. The committee is particularly interested in how sexual assault crimes are investigated, prosecuted, and defended.

The committee notes that the Army has established special investigation courses at the Army's Military Police School at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, that are dedicated to new investigative and interviewing techniques, such as Forensic Experiential Trauma Interviews. These new techniques can possibly assist in prosecuting these often difficult cases. The committee also notes that the Army has established a robust career-spanning sexual assault training program for Army trial lawyers and military justice practitioners. The steps the Army has taken are commendable.

The committee encourages the Department and the military services to adopt the best practices of the Army model and immediately implement any and all lessons learned that are viable to the Department as a whole or to a particular service.

Assessment of skills and abilities to enhance transition from military service

The committee recognizes the value of using varied approaches to prepare departing service members for transition from military service to the classroom or civilian employment. Members eligible for retirement, for example, may need different tools than younger veterans who volunteered for service after completing high school or after a few semesters of college. For all new veterans, however, providing accurate assessments of skills, aptitudes, and interests and matching them with educational options or with the requirements of potential employers can assist new veterans in choosing successful career options. The committee encourages the Department of Defense, as part of its ongoing effort to improve existing transition assistance programs, to identify and develop methods to assess the inventory of talents and abilities of departing service members to match them with viable career opportunities. Members should have available to them, well before separation or retirement, testing vehicles comparable in purpose to the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery, to align their interests and abilities with the needs of public and private sector employers and appropriate educational pursuits.

Crime Victims' Rights Act

The Crime Victims' Rights Act (18 U.S.C 3771) affords victims of crimes specific enumerated rights, most of which are afforded by Department of Defense Directive 1030.01, April 13, 2004, to victims involved in cases tried by military courts-martial. However, this Directive does not include the victim's rights to be heard during public proceedings and the right to proceedings free from unreasonable

delay. In addition, there is no specified procedure for victims to seek redress for failure to be afforded these rights.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 7, 2013, on the practicability and advisability of extending these additional rights to victims involved in cases tried by courts-martial and a means for seeking redress for failure to be afforded their rights.

Department of Defense Inspector General oversight of investigations of sexual assault

In June, 2011, the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report entitled: MILITARY JUSTICE: Oversight and Better Collaboration Needed for Sexual Assault Investigations and Adjudications (GAO–11–579) in which the GAO recommended that the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) develop and implement a policy that specifies procedures for conducting sexual assault investigations and establish clear goals, objectives, and performance data for monitoring and evaluating the services' sexual assault investigations and related training. The committee directs that, not later than December 3, 2012, the Secretary of Defense provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the DOD IG's implementation of the GAO's recommendations, including an implementation timeline.

Inclusion of synthetic drug compounds in the Uniform Code of Military Justice

The committee recognizes the harmful impact that synthetic-drug abuse poses on good order and discipline in the military. Since 2008, there has been a rise in reported incidents of military personnel disciplined due to the use, distribution, and possession of synthetic-drugs, specifically synthetic cannabinoids, synthetic cathinones, and synthetic psychedelic hallucinogens. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Attorney General and specifically the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on issues that exist in prosecuting synthetic drug offenses including the utility and impact of listing synthetic-drug compounds as controlled substances in the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The report should, at a minimum, assess all compounds that have been found in DEA domestic investigations. This report is required no later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act.

Joint Professional Military Education special areas of emphasis

The committee is aware that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff provides annual guidance to the Joint Professional Military Education (JPME) institutions regarding special areas of emphasis for curriculum development and teaching that span a broad range of topics that are of current and longer-term strategic importance. In 2010, the guidance recommended nine topical areas including Countering Violent Extremism, Net-Centric Information Sharing,

Strategic Communication, Psychological Health Awareness, and Space as a Contested Environment. However, it is not clear what feedback and assessment mechanisms exist to ensure that the guidance is being followed and to monitor the quality of the instruction. The committee directs the Chairman to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act an assessment of the JPME institutions' implementation of the Chairman's annual guidance.

Recruiting for cyber-related career fields

The committee believes that every effort must be made to successfully recruit, train, and motivate for military service young people with computer skills to operate and defend the Department of Defense's computer networks and infrastructure. The committee believes that innovative measures and incentives should be taken to reach out to highly capable young men and women to encourage them to volunteer for military service in career fields specializing in cyber warfare and defense.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a letter report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 180 days of enactment of this Act that describes current programs for identifying, recruiting, training, and retaining young people with outstanding computer skills for military service; reports any human capital or specialty shortfalls in cyber defense career fields; and describes bonuses or any non-traditional or non-standard recruiting practices that are employed by the military services to locate and recruit young people for cyber-related career fields.

Report on assignment policies concerning women in the armed forces and the characterization of certain combat-related service

The committee notes that in February 2012 the Department of Defense released a report to Congress, required by section 535 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), reviewing the laws and policies restricting the service of female members of the armed forces, and provided notice to Congress that the Department would open positions in ground combat units at the battalion level to women in occupational specialties for which they are already qualified to serve, and would eliminate the so-called co-location policy. According to the report, the changes will result in over 14,000 positions being opened to women that were previously denied. The committee believes this is a small step in the right direction, but that more work must be done.

The committee understands that the Department and the services continue to evaluate additional options that would increase service opportunities by women, and that the services must report to the Secretary of Defense later this year on the viability of these options.

The committee strongly encourages the services to continue these efforts. More than 75 percent of the Nation's youth do not qualify for enlistment in the military. Maintaining unnecessary barriers to

service of those who are qualified and motivated to serve magnifies the challenge in recruiting the most qualified individuals for service in the All-Volunteer Force. By limiting their use of the talents of female service members, the Department and the services are handicapping efforts to field the highest quality force possible.

Finally, the committee remains concerned that assignment policies restricting service by women may continue to result in inaccurate characterizations of their service in combat, denying them earned benefits and in some cases needed care and services. According to the Department of Defense, over 284,000 female service members have deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan in the past decade. Of those women, 881 have been wounded and 144 have died.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2013, on its implementation of the policy changes announced in the February 2012 report, its assessment and evaluation of additional options to increase service and career opportunities for women, and the current practice of the Department and the services in recognizing, recording, and characterizing combat-related service by female service members. The report should make recommendations for regulatory and statutory change that the Secretary considers appropriate to increase service opportunities for women in the armed forces.

Report on specialized graduate programs

The committee recognizes the important role the Department of Defense specialized graduate programs in engineering, applied sciences, and management have in preparing military and civilian personnel to perform and manage its technology programs. With current and potentially continued budget pressures, the committee encourages the Department to thoroughly evaluate the requirement for and sufficiency of these graduate programs. At a minimum, this review should include the current and projected demand within the Department for military and civilian personnel with advanced degrees in engineering, applied sciences, and management; an analysis of the sources by which the Department and the military services' and civilian personnel obtain such advanced degrees; the need for educational institutions under the Department to meet its demands; the costs and benefits of maintaining such educational institutions, including costs relating to directed research; the ability of private institutions or distance-learning programs to meet the Department's needs; existing organizational structures, including reporting chains within the services to manage the specialized graduate programs; and recommendations for improving the ability of the Department to identify, mange, and source its specialized graduate education needs.

Requirement for Council of Governors views on legislative proposals addressing child custody litigation involving members of the armed forces

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to request the views and recommendations of the Council of Governors regarding legislative proposals to amend title II of the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 521 et seq.) (SCRA), or otherwise to es-

tablish federal law that would prohibit State courts from considering the absence of a service member by reason of deployment, or the possibility of deployment, in determining the best interest of the child in cases involving child custody.

As the Supreme Court noted in *Ex parte Burrus,* 136 U.S. 586 (1890), over a century ago, "the whole subject of the domestic relations of husband and wife, parent and child, belongs to the laws of the states and not to the law of the United States."

The committee is concerned that the implications of preemptive legislation that would extend beyond existing procedural protections in the SCRA and that would create a standard for adjudicating child custody disputes are not warranted either by case law or the proactive legislation enacted by more than 40 States. A federal legal standard would preempt the efforts of the States over a matter traditionally left to State courts. State Governors should be afforded the opportunity to formally express their views prior to congressional action being taken.

In presenting the request for views, the Secretary shall provide the Council of Governors with the report required by section 572 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) on child custody litigation involving service of members of the armed forces and current views of interested organizations and associations including the Adjutants General Association of the United States, the National Governors Association, and the Uniform Law Commission of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, among others. The Secretary shall take necessary steps to ensure that the views and recommendations of the Council of Governors are submitted to the Committees on Armed Services and Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 1, 2013.

Social media and operational security

The committee recognizes the increasing integration of social media into the daily lives of Americans, to include the military community. According to a recent survey, more than 90 percent of military families use social media with over three-quarters of military families using social media to stay connected to a deployed service member. If used judiciously, social media platforms have the potential to reap positive benefits.

Service members who use social media to communicate must practice and maintain operational security. This is of particular importance during deployments, as location, mission and other sensitive information must be safeguarded, and not shared via social media.

The committee applauds the Department of Defense (DOD) for developing and releasing "Social Media and the Uniform Code of Military Justice" and other guidance documents aimed to inform and instruct service members, DOD civilians, and military families as to the safe use of social media.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to devise enterprise standards of best practice and procedures for: 1) the use of social media by DOD employees and contractors; 2) the development of secure DOD applications using social media platforms; 3)

the monitoring and enforcement of current DOD rules and regulations; 4) a periodic review and revision of current standards and procedures; and 5) the ability to educate and disseminate these policies across DOD and the broader military community.

The Secretary of Defense should deliver a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the development of such standards no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Special Operations Force Generation

The committee notes that the previous Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) initiated a Pressure on the Force and Families study to examine the effects of high operational tempo on special operations personnel and their families and provide recommendations on mitigating the stress caused by repeated deployments. According to the current Commander of USSOCOM, "the lack of predictability resulting from a demanding operational tempo" was identified as a primary source of stress on special operations personnel and their families.

The committee supports the efforts of USSOCOM to develop a Special Operations Force Generation (SOFORGEN) system to track the operational tempo down to the level of the individual special operator and provide for more predictable deployments. The committee also supports USSOCOM's efforts to more accurately account for training and other events that interrupt time at home for special operations personnel. The committee believes addressing these issues will improve USSOCOM's ability to internally manage the readiness of its force and reduce the stress on special operations personnel and their families.

The committee also understands the SOFORGEN system is designed to provide USSOCOM with a tool to better forecast and alert the services of enabling capabilities that will be needed from the general purpose forces to support the training and deployment of special operations personnel. This issue remains of concern to the committee, especially in light of current budget constraints and the potentially negative impact on the maintenance of such capabilities by the services. The committee reiterates the requirement in section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) that the services and USSOCOM reach written agreement, not later than 180 days after enactment, on the procedures by which the availability of the enabling capabilities of the general purpose forces will be synchronized with the training and deployment cycle of special operations forces.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Rates of basic allowance for housing for Army National Guard and Air National Guard members on full-time National Guard duty (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 403(g) of title 37, United States Code, to clarify that the basic allowance for housing for members of the Army and Air National Guards on full-time duty shall be based on their duty location, and may not be modified upon the transition of the member between active duty under title 10, United States Code, and full-time National Guard duty under title 32, United States Code, so long as the transition occurs without a break in active service.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, and income replacement for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus, education loan repayment for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers, and special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions. The provision would also extend for 1 year the authority to pay hazardous duty pay, assignment or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between armed forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates.

Increase in amount of officer affiliation bonus for officers in the Selected Reserve (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would increase the maximum annual amount of the officer affiliation bonus for officers in the Selected Reserve from $10,000 to $20,000.

Increase in maximum amount of incentive bonus for reserve component members who convert military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortages (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 326 of title 37, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the incentive bonus to convert military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortages from $2,000 to $4,000 in the case of a member of a reserve component.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Permanent change of station allowances for members of Selected Reserve units filling a vacancy in another unit after being involuntarily separated (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 474 and 476 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the payment of travel and transportation allowances for certain members of the Selected Reserve, their dependents, and household effects when the member is involuntarily separated due to force structure reductions between October 1, 2012, and December 31, 2018, and fills a critical vacancy in another unit of the Selected Reserve that is at least 150 miles from the member's residence.

Authority for comprehensive program for space-available travel on Department of Defense aircraft (sec. 632)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 2641c to title 10, United States Code, that would codify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to provide transportation to active and reserve component members, retirees, and dependents on Department of Defense (DOD) aircraft on a space-available basis beginning January 1, 2014, or such earlier date as determined by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to regulation.

The committee notes that the purpose of no-cost, space-available travel on military aircraft is to assist military members and their families in responding to emergent personal circumstances and arduous duty conditions and to provide a means of respite from the rigors of active duty for military families, of both the active and reserve components. The option to seek space-available travel has also been offered, at a lower priority, to military retirees in recognition of their careers of service and to authorized members of the Selected Reserve. While the committee supports expanding the eligibility for space-available travel, doing so should not adversely affect the ability of military personnel to travel, for example, on emergency leave or on environmental and morale leave from remote duty locations. Expansion must also avoid placing additional costs and burdens on the personnel and facilities of the Air Mobility Command and the military services.

Expansion of the space-available benefit should also be preceded by the dissemination of accurate information about the hardships aspiring space-available travelers are likely to experience. The Department noted in its December 2007 report to Congress on space-available travel that "current eligible Space-A travelers often experience disillusionment because of the contrast between the perceived promises of Space-A travel as a benefit of military service and the reality of arduous conditions often encountered when using the system." The committee believes that the Department should do more to educate potential travelers on these realities and implement policies that will continue to ensure safe and acceptable conditions for eligible space-available travelers.

Subtitle D—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

Repeal of requirement for payment of Survivor Benefit Plan premiums when participant waives retired pay to provide a survivor annuity under Federal Employees Retirement System and termination of payment of Survivor Benefit Plan annuity (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend sections 1450 and 1452 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that military retirees who have elected to participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) and who subsequently elect to waive their military retired pay in favor of a survivor annuity under the Federal Employees Retirement System, do not have to continue paying premiums under SBP.

Repeal of automatic enrollment in Family Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance for members of the armed forces married to other members (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1967 of title 38, United States Code, to remove service members from automatic enrollment as a dependent under the Family Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program when they are insured on their own behalf under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program.

Subtitle E—Military Lending Matters

Enhancement of protections on consumer credit for members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 987 of title 10, United States Code, to require that vehicle title loans and payday loans, regardless of duration or whether they are open or closed end, are included within the definition of "consumer credit" contained in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to that section. The provision would also require the Secretary to develop a policy to address the harmful effects of credit offered to service members and their dependents through installment loans through improved financial literacy and a greater awareness of more beneficial sources of credit.

Additional enhancements of protections on consumer credit for members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 652)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 987 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the prohibition against charging out of state military members higher interest rates on loans than what is allowed under State law for residents of the State applies also to other forms of consumer credit regulated by the Secretary of Defense under the authority provided in section 987. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to consult with federal regulators at least once every 2 years in carrying out duties under section 987.

The provision would be effective no later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this Act, or such earlier date as determined by the Secretary of Defense in regulation.

Relief in civil actions for violations of protections on consumer credit extended to members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 653)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 987 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for civil liability in United States district court for violations of consumer protections for service members and dependents under that section.

Modification of definition of dependent for purposes of limitations on terms of consumer credit extended to members of the armed forces and their dependents (sec. 654)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 987(i) of title 10, United States Code, to conform the definition of dependent under that section with the definition of dependent contained in section 401(a) of title 37, United States Code.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Transitional compensation for dependent children who are carried during pregnancy at time of dependent-abuse offense (sec. 661)

The committee recommends a provision proposed by the Department of Defense that would amend section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, to include children who were carried during pregnancy at the time of a dependent abuse offense within the program to provide transitional compensation for spouses and dependents of service members separated for such offenses. The child would only become entitled to benefits after birth. The provision would also clarify that spouses and dependents who are not residing with the service member at the time of the abuse offense are eligible for the compensation.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE Program

Extension of TRICARE Standard coverage and TRICARE dental program for members of the Selected Reserve who are involuntarily separated (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1076d(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize coverage under TRICARE Standard for up to 180 days for members of the Selected Reserve who are involuntarily separated without cause under other than adverse conditions.

The provision would also amend section 1076a(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize these same involuntarily separated Selected Reserve members coverage under the TRICARE dental program for at least 180 days.

Inclusion of certain over-the-counter drugs in TRICARE uniform formulary (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense to place selected over-the-counter drugs on the uniform formulary and make such drugs available to eligible beneficiaries. An over-the-counter drug would only be included on the uniform formulary if the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee finds that the drug is cost-effective and clinically effective.

The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a copayment amount for these drugs, if appropriate.

Expansion of evaluation of the effectiveness of the TRICARE program (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 717(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) to update the reporting requirements of the Department of Defense report, "Evaluation of the TRICARE Program: Access, Cost, and Quality," to reflect the Department's practice of reporting on access, cost, and quality broadly for the military health care system, not solely for retirees as required by current law. The provision would also require the Department to evaluate access, cost, and quality for military dependent children under the age of 21 and for dependents of active-duty members with severe disabilities and special needs.

The committee appreciates the comprehensiveness of the Department's annual evaluation of the TRICARE program. This provision would enhance current reporting requirements to include information on access, quality, and care for young children and beneficiaries with special needs. Beneficiary advocates have informed

the committee that special needs benefits under the Department's Extended Health Care Option (ECHO) program can be difficult to access. Therefore, the committee directs the Department to assess participation in the ECHO program by eligible dependents with special needs, and to explore options to provide more flexible benefits under that program without increasing costs to the Department. The Department should consult with ECHO-eligible families and work groups created to address children's health care needs in its assessment of the program. The committee expects the Department to submit its report no later than February 1, 2013.

Subtitle B—Other Health Care Benefits

Use of Department of Defense funds for abortions in cases of rape and incest (sec. 711)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize use of Department of Defense funds for abortions in cases of rape or incest.

Availability of certain fertility preservation treatments for members of the armed forces on active duty (sec. 712)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide fertility preservation treatments for service members who have been diagnosed with a condition for which the recommended course of treatment could cause infertility.

Modification of requirements on mental health assessments for members of the armed forces deployed in connection with a contingency operation (sec. 713)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074m(a) of title 10, United States Code, to align mandatory person-to-person mental health assessments for certain deployed service members with other existing health assessments. The provision would also limit the pre-deployment mental health assessments required under this section to those service members who will be subjected or exposed to operational risk factors during deployment in a contingency operation, and for post-deployment assessments to those who were exposed to operational risk factors during deployment in a contingency operation. The committee expects that the determination of operational risk by the Secretary of Defense shall include any service member at such risk, regardless of military occupation, to include support personnel, who may be exposed to such risk in support of a contingency operation.

Subtitle C—Health Care Administration

Clarification of applicability of certain authority and requirements to subcontractors employed to provide health care services to the Department of Defense (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1089(a) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that subcontractors providing health care under personal services contracts are covered for medical malpractice purposes under the Federal

Tort Claims Act in the same manner as government employees providing the same services, as requested by the Department of Defense.

Research program to enhance Department of Defense efforts on mental health in the National Guard and reserves through community partnerships (sec. 722)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a research program with community partners to enhance Department of Defense efforts in research, treatment, education, and outreach on mental health, substance use disorders, and traumatic brain injury in National Guard and reserve members, their families, and their caregivers.

Subtitle D—Reports and Other Matters

Reports on performance data on Warriors in Transition programs (sec. 731)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and every 180 days thereafter until September 30, 2017, data on the longitudinal status of service members participating in a Warriors in Transition program. The data would document the performance of the Department of Defense in addressing the physical health, mental and behavioral health, educational and vocational aptitude and capabilities, and other appropriate matters, at specified periods during the members' participation in the program.

Independent entities such as the Department of Defense Inspector General, Government Accountability Office, and the Department of Defense Recovering Warrior Task Force continue to identify problems faced by service members and their families with access to needed medical care, including care for post-traumatic stress and traumatic brain injury, lengthy processing times for transition to civilian life, inadequate communication among care managers, and a confusing plethora of support programs that lack specific measures of effectiveness. The committee believes that the service secretaries should develop quantifiable and transparent performance goals and measures to achieve high quality, fairness and comprehensive support of service members who incur wounds, illness, or injury in service to our country.

Report on Department of Defense support of members of the armed forces who experience traumatic injury as a result of vaccinations required by the Department (sec. 732)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the secretaries of the military departments, to report on the adequacy and effectiveness of the policies, procedures, and systems of the Department of Defense in providing support to service members who experience traumatic injury as a result of a vaccination required by the Department.

Plan to eliminate gaps and redundancies in programs of the Department of Defense on psychological health and traumatic brain injury among members of the armed forces (sec. 733)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on a plan to streamline Department of Defense (DOD) programs that address psychological health and traumatic brain injury.

The committee is concerned about the effective management of programs and resources provided to the Department for psychological health, including post traumatic stress, and traumatic brain injury. In 2011, a technical report prepared for the Office of the Secretary by the RAND Corporation, "Programs Addressing Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Among U.S. Military Servicemembers and Their Families," identified more than 200 Department of Defense sponsored or funded programs to address psychological health and traumatic brain injury, and found "duplication of effort across programs, both within and across branches of service." The report concluded that although the attention given to programs to address these conditions is laudable, "the proliferation of programs creates a high risk of a poor investment of DoD resources," as a result of both duplication of effort and unproven approaches. In January 2012, the Government Accountability Office published a report (GAO–12–154) citing both a lack of quality control mechanisms and accountability for psychological health and traumatic brain injury expenditures within the Department, and the "lack of a single organization devoted to ensuring that accurate and timely data are available on DOD's psychological health and traumatic brain injury activities or coordinating these activities."

The committee recognizes that care for psychological conditions and traumatic brain injury will be an enduring requirement for years to come, and encourages the Secretary to promptly take action to ensure that service members and their families have access to programs of proven quality and effectiveness as they recover from illness and injury sustained in service to their country. In addition, the committee urges the Department to continue to make effective use of social media opportunities to improve access to Department resources, including those for psychological health and traumatic brain injury.

Report on implementation of recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States on prevention of hearing loss among members of the armed forces (sec. 734)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status of implementation of the recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States in the report "Hearing Loss Prevention: Improvements to DOD Hearing Conservation Programs Could Lead to Better Outcomes" (GAO–11–114, January 2011).

The committee notes that the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013 includes $12.6 million to support activities of the

Hearing Center of Excellence, and is encouraged that the Center's concept of operations reflects a commitment to "create efficiencies, reduce redundancies and reduce costs" within existing hearing conservation programs. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to prioritize efforts throughout the Department to enhance training, treatment, and research to reduce the incidence of preventable hearing impairments among service members.

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General study on Department of Defense health care contracting

The Department of Defense (DOD) budget for the Unified Medical Program has grown rapidly in recent years. According to the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013, health care represents 10 percent of the overall DOD top-line. In light of this growth in costs, it is imperative that DOD identify opportunities for savings and efficiencies wherever possible.

Private sector care contracts employed by DOD to deliver health care under its TRICARE program are a potential avenue for identifying savings and efficiencies. In recent years, beneficiaries have relied more on the purchased-care system of civilian providers than on DOD's direct-care system of military hospitals and clinics. In its 2012 "Report to Congress: Evaluation of the TRICARE Program", DOD reported that about 65 percent of total inpatient admissions and 57 percent of total outpatient visits were in the purchased-care system.

Although TRICARE remains primarily a benefits program, DOD utilizes contractors to manage the program, as well as to provide pharmacy and dental benefits. DOD also uses other contracts to deliver health care to its beneficiary population, including contracts mandated by section 722 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 1997 (Public Law 104–201) with designated providers under the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan.

TRICARE management contracts are of significant size within the Department. Although most of the money flows through to TRICARE providers in the form of reimbursements for medical services provided to beneficiaries, there is a major contracting component to the program. The third generation of TRICARE management contracts, which was to have been implemented in 2010, has yet to be fully implemented in all regions due to bid protests.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive review of DOD's private sector care contracts. At a minimum, the review should assess the following:

- How requirements are determined and to what extent are they consistent within and among the TRICARE regions and all categories of beneficiaries;
- How efficient DOD's health care contracting procedures are, and whether contracting personnel are adequately prepared to contract for health care services of high quality at reasonable cost;
- Whether the processes for determining requirements and entering into contracts are appropriately transparent;

- What opportunities exist for savings and efficiencies in DOD health care contracting, including but not limited to opportunities for consolidation, streamlined processes, collaboration with the Department of Veterans Affairs, and increased competition; and
- The extent to which health care contracting under TRICARE is conducted in a manner consistent with proscriptions and principles of DOD's "Better Buying Power" initiative.

The committee expects the Comptroller General's analysis to include an assessment of the planning activities that are currently taking place for the fourth generation of TRICARE management contracts and make appropriate recommendations for any improvements that should be considered for incorporation into the development of requirements and the solicitation process for these contracts. The committee further expects the Comptroller General to engage in dialogue with stakeholders, including contractors, designated providers and beneficiary organizations in the course of assessing DOD health care contracting requirements and procedures.

Cooperative health care agreements

Under current law (10 U.S.C. 1073 note), the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into cooperative health care agreements between military installations and local and regional nonmilitary health care entities. The committee understands that the implementation of this authority is delegable, including certain actions taken by the military departments.

The committee believes that, should the Secretary of Defense choose to delegate this authority to enter into cooperative health care agreements with local health care entities, such delegation should be exercised with appropriate oversight and coordination in order to ensure uniform standards for the continued provision of a quality health care benefit across each of the services.

Health care provider appointment and compensation authorities

The committee remains concerned about gaps in shortage category and critical need health care occupations in the Department of Defense (DOD), and believes that the current and projected increases of nationwide shortfalls in certain health care occupations should not preclude the delivery of timely, high-quality care to service members, including wounded warriors. Several authorities currently exist that the DOD can exercise on its own, or with the approval of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), to address the challenges in maintaining a trained, experienced workforce in critically needed health care occupations. These include the authority to appoint and pay for critical health care personnel under chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code, as authorized for DOD use by section 1599c(a) of title 10, United States Code, and the discretionary use of classification, pay, and hours of work provisions under chapter 74 of title 38. It is the committee's understanding that under the delegation agreement with OPM to exercise this authority, DOD may use the Department of Veterans Affairs' title 38 authorities to establish special rates to recruit and retain employees in a broad range of health care occupations, as well as approve

alternative work schedules and special premium payments for nurses and other health care employees, establish qualifications and a qualifications-based grade system for nurses and other types of health care occupations, and pay nurses locality pay. Utilization of this authority is not limited to physicians and dentists. Finally, OPM has the authority to establish special pay rates under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, if requested by the Department of Defense.

The committee is concerned that authorities which could improve hiring and compensation of health care personnel may be exercised inadequately or unevenly, possibly creating disparity in access to care for wounded, ill, or injured service members or resulting in unnecessary turnover of needed health care professionals. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Director of OPM to consider the use of all existing authorities for critical health care personnel shortage fields to the maximum extent necessary to attract and retain high quality providers, thereby ensuring timely access to care and treatment for service members and their families and support of the medical readiness goals of DOD.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of OPM, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, no later than 120 days after enactment of this Act that describes the use of these authorities, and to conduct an assessment of additional authorities that may be needed. The report shall include a side-by-side comparison of authorities available to and exercised by the Department of Veterans Affairs and within the Department of Defense, including each of the military services, for each health care shortage category or critical need occupation. The Secretary of Defense shall update the report annually by September 30, until such time that the Secretary can certify that no shortage category occupation has existed for at least 365 days.

Medication therapy management

The committee recognizes that the cost of providing health care to service members, retirees, and their families through the TRICARE program continues to rise, as does the cost of providing health care in the private sector, and believes that initiatives to increase the quality of patient health while reducing the cost of care should be explored. An article published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* (April 29, 2010, Vol. 362 No. 17) indicates that "as many as half of all patients do not adhere faithfully to their prescription-medication regimens," resulting in over $100.0 billion each year being spent on avoidable hospitalizations.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense currently provides a broad range of medication therapy management (MTM) services through many of its military treatment facilities, and that these services may improve patient health and clinical outcomes while lowering total health care costs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of its MTM services, to include a discussion of MTM implementation to date, cost savings realized from utilization of

MTM thus far, plans for future expansion, and an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of including this evolving standard of care into the broader TRICARE pharmacy program. The committee expects the Department to submit its report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than February 1, 2013.

Standards for production and performance of prostheses and prosthetic sockets for military amputees

The committee applauds the work of Department of Defense medical and technical personnel who, in partnership with industry, are providing superior individualized prostheses to military amputees at each Department of Defense location of the Extremity Injury and Amputation Center of Excellence established pursuant to section 723 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

According to a published report in *The Journal of Trauma Injury, Infection, and Critical Care,* Volume 68, Number 6, June 2010, "The number of amputees returning to duty has increased significantly, from 2.3% to 16.5%, due to advancements in combat casualty care and the establishment of centralized amputee centers." The committee believes that as an increasing number of service members remain on active duty and even deploy with prostheses, it is of vital importance that the Department of Defense have uniform standards of production and performance for prostheses and prosthetic sockets.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to continue clinical and technological research and development for prostheses, which are critical to enabling service members who have lost one or more limbs in service to our country to achieve their highest goals for recovery, rehabilitation, and performance.

In light of these objectives, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, outlining:

(1) The establishment or verification of consistent, acceptable standards of quality for the design and fabrication of military prostheses and prosthetic sockets;

(2) The identification of standards for human performance using limb loss and limb salvage prostheses and prosthetic socket performance based on the individual mobility level, size, weight, functional goals, and occupational specialty of members of the armed forces;

(3) The processes in place for the demonstration and validation of prostheses and prosthetic socket manufacturing techniques that reduce weight, reduce cost, and strengthen key load-bearing areas of the socket to reduce the risk of failure and enhance mobility; and

(4) An overview of the Department's efforts to document each prosthetic, prosthetic socket, alignment, and associated fabrication settings for all military amputees in their electronic health record.

TRICARE efficiencies

The committee acknowledges efforts undertaken by the Department of Defense to achieve internal efficiencies, such as decreasing administrative overhead, provider payment reform, purchasing pharmaceuticals, supplies and equipment at lower prices, and providing incentives for beneficiaries to obtain prescriptions from the Department's mail order pharmaceutical program. These have already resulted in significant savings to the Department.

The committee notes with concern the Comptroller General report of April 2012, "Defense Health Care: Applying Key Management Practices Should Help Achieve Efficiencies within the Military Health System," (GAO–12–224) which faulted the Department for developing specific plans, goals and accountability for only 1 of 11 health care initiatives aimed at slowing the growth of health care costs.

The committee acknowledges that the Department's efforts to streamline the military health system governance and consolidate common functions, as described in its March 2012 "Report on the Governance of the Military Health System", were delayed by section 716 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) which prohibited the Secretary from reorganizing the military health system until 120 days after the Comptroller General of the United States submits a report to Congress evaluating options considered and potential costs or cost savings. However, the committee expects the Secretary to continue to work toward increased efficiencies to assure that Department goals to reduce health care cost growth are achieved. Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Comptroller General to undertake an assessment of Department health care contracting requirements and processes in order to identify additional efficiencies.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Limitation on use of cost-type contracts (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from using cost-type contracts for the production of major defense acquisition programs, unless the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, after consultation with the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, certifies to Congress that a cost-type contract is needed to provide a required capability in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Section 818 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) already limits the circumstances under which DOD may enter a cost-type contract for the development of major defense acquisition programs. However, no comparable limitation currently exists for the production of such programs.

The committee takes the position that DOD should select the contract type for a production program that is consistent with the level of program risk for the program. Consistent with sound acquisition practice, however, very few major defense acquisition programs should be in production unless program risk has already been reduced to a manageable level. The committee expects the Department to ensure that the authority to waive this requirement is exercised only in exceptional circumstances.

Acquisition strategies for major subsystems and subassemblies on major defense acquisition programs (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the acquisition strategy for each major defense acquisition program (MDAP) provides for robust competition at the subsystem and subassembly level by breaking out major subsystems and subassemblies, where appropriate, for separate competition.

Section 202(c) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) requires that the Department of Defense (DOD) to ensure competition, or the option of competition, at both the prime contract level and the subcontract level of MDAPs, but does not specifically address the break-out of subsystems and subassemblies. In some cases, the government's interest in competition is likely to be best served if DOD runs its own competition for a

subsystem or subassembly and provides it to the prime contractor as government-furnished equipment.

Management structure for developmental test and evaluation (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the oversight and supervisory responsibilities of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation (DASD–DT&E) over the chief developmental testers and lead developmental test evaluation organizations of the military departments.

The DASD–DT&E is responsible for establishing policies and guidance for, and monitoring and reviewing the performance of, all developmental test components of the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee expects the components to adhere to relevant guidance established by the DASD–DT&E and to promptly transmit any records or data (including but not limited to quick-look assessments and other internal reports and supporting data prepared by the program offices, chief developmental testers, and lead developmental test evaluation organizations of the military departments) directly to the DASD–DT&E upon request.

The Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (WSARA) (Public Law 111–23) established the position of DASD–DT&E because of a recognition that developmental testing and evaluation plays a critical role in identifying and correcting problems in major weapon systems early, before they lead to excessive cost overruns and schedule delays. For this reason, the committee is troubled that DOD does not appear to have given adequate attention to shortcomings identified by DASD–DT&E in developmental testing.

Since the enactment of WSARA, the DASD–DT&E has concluded on the basis of assessments of operational test readiness (AOTR) that four major weapons programs were not ready to proceed to initial operational testing and evaluation (IOT&E). In each case, the program was allowed to proceed to IOT&E despite the findings of the AOTR, and in each case, IOT&E identified significant problems that could and should have been corrected at an earlier stage of the program.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to report to the congressional defense committees on each case in fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 in which a major defense acquisition program proceeds to IOT&E despite an AOTR finding that it is not ready to proceed to this stage. For each such case, the report should explain why the program proceeded to IOT&E despite the findings of the AOTR; what aspects of the approved testing and evaluation master plan had to be set aside to enable the program to proceed to IOT&E under these circumstances; how the program addressed the specific areas of concern raised in the AOTR; and whether IOT&E identified any significant shortcomings in the program. The required report should be provided to the congressional defense committees by not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2013.

Assessments of potential termination liability of contracts for the development or production of major defense acquisition programs (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD–AT&L) to provide the congressional defense committees with an assessment of potential termination liability for each contract entered by the Department of Defense (DOD) for the development or production of a major defense acquisition program for which the USD–AT&L is the milestone decision authority.

In recent years, DOD decisions to terminate contracts for the development or production of major defense acquisition programs—such as the VH–71 Presidential helicopter replacement program, the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program, and the Medium Extended Air Defense System program—have raised questions about the relative costs and benefits of program termination and program completion. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reviewed this issue in 2008 and concluded that it cost more to complete programs than to terminate them and that contract termination costs were generally not a major factor in DOD decisions to terminate weapons programs.

GAO concluded that program terminations could be a valuable tool to "create trade space" in limited budgets and respond to to long-term fiscal imbalances and unexpected events. To make the most effective use of this tool, GAO stated, decision-makers "need to be able to anticipate and plan for possible terminations and have a sound understanding of costs, benefits, and legal requirements." For this reason, GAO recommended that DOD review, and as needed amend, guidance on terminations across all the military departments and defense agencies to ensure that the guidance identifies the conditions under which it would be appropriate to end programs or contracts, and provides knowledge needed to use terminations as an investment portfolio tool.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to update the 2008 GAO report with an assessment of: (1) the extent to which DOD has implemented the recommendations of the 2008 report; (2) the actual costs and savings resulting from the termination of programs reviewed in the 2008 report and the extent to which technologies and facilities from these programs were effectively leveraged or transferred to other programs; and (3) the estimated costs and benefits of the termination of the VH–71 and FCS programs.

Technical change regarding programs experiencing critical cost growth due to change in quantity purchased (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct a paragraph reference in section 2433a of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to clarify that the Secretary of Defense is not required to conduct continuing reviews of programs that exceed thresholds for critical cost growth due only to a change in the quantity of items to be purchased.

Repeal of requirement to review ongoing programs initiated before enactment of Milestone B certification and approval process (sec. 806)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 205(b) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (WSARA) (Public Law 111–23), as recommended by the Department of Defense (DOD). Section 205(b) requires the annual review of programs initiated before the enactment of the certification requirements in section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, in 2006, to determine whether or not they meet certification requirements under that section.

The committee notes that section 819(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) repealed section 204(c) of WSARA, which established the requirement for so-called "catch-up" certifications for programs initiated prior to the enactment of WSARA. As DOD points out, however, the repeal of section 204(c) does not reduce the burden on the Department unless the "essentially redundant obligation under section 205(b)" is also repealed.

Subtitle B—Acquisition Policy and Management

One-year extension of temporary limitation on aggregate annual amount available for contract services (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the goals and objectives established in section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), including: (1) a cap on spending for contract services at the fiscal year 2010 level; (2) a cap on contractor labor rates and overhead rates at fiscal year 2010 levels; (3) an approval requirement for contracts and task orders exceeding fiscal year 2010 levels; and (4) a reduction in funding for staff augmentation contracts and contracts for functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions.

The committee is encouraged by measures that the military departments have taken to achieve efficiencies in the area of contract services.

Last year the committee noted that the Air Force, which has been more aggressive than the other military departments in implementing required management structures for contract services, conducted a disciplined review of $5.6 billion of service contracts over the last year and identified $1.4 billion of expected savings over an 8-year period. This year, the Air Force informed the committee that it has achieved an additional $3.8 billion in savings over the future years defense program in the area of Weapon System Sustainment alone.

The Army has now established portfolio managers for functional categories of services and instituted a management review process through which it has identified potential cost savings of $4.6 billion in the base budget.

The committee is also aware that in October 2011, the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) instituted a Services Requirements Review Board—commonly referred to as a "services court" or "contractor court"—pursuant to which senior officials of the command

have assumed personal responsibility for reviewing all significant services contracts in the command to identify opportunities for service acquisition efficiencies, process improvements, and cost savings. The process also includes "tripwires" to trigger more in depth review of particular contracts. The committee understands that this new process has enabled NAVSEA to achieve savings of as much as 20 percent on its service contracts in the first year alone and that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition has directed that the process be institutionalized across the Navy.

The committee concludes that the Navy process is a "best practice" and urges all of the military departments and defense agencies to undertake similar initiatives to achieve greater efficiencies in the area of services contracting.

Prohibition of excessive pass-through contracts and charges in the acquisition of services (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from awarding a contract for the performance of services (other than a firm, fixed price contract that is either competitively awarded or for commercial services) unless the contractor agrees that at least 50 percent of the direct labor on the contract will be performed by the contractor or by a subcontractor that is specifically identified in the contract.

Section 852 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) was intended to address the problem of excessive "pass-through" charges—charges for profit and overhead from a contractor who provides little or no value added on work performed by a lower-tier contractor or subcontractor. Despite the enactment of this legislation, DOD continues to pay profit and overhead for multiple layers of contractors in cases where work is performed by lower-tier contractors and subcontractors—in some cases, because prime contractor overhead is considered "value added," in other cases, because prime contractor overhead and profits are built directly into labor rates included in the contract.

The committee notes that section 15(o) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. section 644(o)) already requires that small businesses agree to perform at least 50 percent of the work under their DOD contracts. The committee concludes that a similar standard applicable to contractors of all sizes would serve to protect DOD from paying multiple layers of contractors for profit and overhead on work performed by subcontractors.

Availability of amounts in Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund for temporary members of workforce (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the extent to which the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (DAWDF) may be used to support temporary members of the acquisition workforce. Under the amendment, DAWDF funds could be used for temporary personnel only for the limited purpose of providing training for such personnel in the performance of acquisi-

tion-related functions and duties. The provision would also amend section 1705 to extend direct hiring authority for the acquisition workforce for an additional 2 years.

The committee notes that senior acquisition officials of the Department of Defense (DOD) have uniformly cited DAWDF as an essential tool to strengthen the acquisition workforce and help the Department overcome significant shortcomings in the management and oversight of its contracts. The committee continues to believe that robust funding of the DAWDF will result in improved DOD acquisition practices and substantial long-term savings.

At the same time, however, the committee notes that the funding levels in section 1705(d)(2)(C) were established in section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), to reflect the requirements of the hiring plan announced by the Secretary of Defense in 2009, and do not take into account the substantial changes in DOD funding and force structure that have taken place since that time.

The committee notes that the Statement of Managers accompanying H.R. 2055, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74), directed the Secretary of Defense to reassess the annual funding floors for the DAWDF and provide recommendations for appropriate funding levels to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of enactment. The committee endorses this review and concludes that while DOD has a continued need for DAWDF funding, funding levels should be established on the basis of a 2012 hiring plan, not a 2009 hiring plan.

Department of Defense policy on contractor profits (sec. 824)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to review the profit guidelines for Department of Defense (DOD) contracts to ensure an appropriate link between contractor profit and contractor performance.

The committee understands that contractor profit levels play an important role in attracting and sustaining investment in the defense industry. In a time of constrained budgets, however, DOD cannot afford to pay excessive profits to contractors who perform poorly. Rather, the Department must use all available tools—including profit policy—to incentivize the timely and cost-effective delivery of quality products and services by DOD contractors.

Section 814 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Secretary to ensure that award and incentive fees are linked to acquisition outcomes (defined in terms of program cost, schedule, and performance) in DOD acquisition programs. The committee concludes that a similar link is needed between contractor profits and contractor performance.

Modification of authorities on internal controls for procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense by certain non-defense agencies (sec. 825)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement for the Department of Defense Inspector General to submit additional follow-up reports on internal controls for procure-

ments made by the Department of Defense through other federal agencies. The Inspector General has indicated that previous reviews have shown a significant decrease in reported problems with regard to such procurements. The committee concludes that the Inspector General should have greater flexibility to direct audit resources to areas in which they are most needed.

Extension of pilot program on management of supply-chain risk (sec. 826)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 2 years the pilot authority for the Department of Defense (DOD) to manage supply-chain risk under section 806 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

The committee is aware that DOD has performed a number of exercises to develop effective supply-chain risk management strategies and that lessons learned from these exercises will be incorporated into implementing guidance that is expected to be issued this summer. The committee understands the complexity of these issues, but is disappointed by the projected 18–month delay in the issuance of this guidance.

The committee urges DOD to issue guidance and begin the implementation of section 806 as soon as possible, so that this authority can be used as intended, to reduce supply-chain risk in the acquisition of sensitive information technology systems that are incorporated into intelligence or cryptologic systems, are used in command and control of military forces, or form an integral part of a weapon system.

Subtitle C—Amendments Relating to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Applicability of Truth in Negotiations Act to major systems and related subsystems, components, and support services (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense (DOD) to request additional contractor data, where necessary to evaluate the price reasonableness of commercial items (other than commercially available off-the-shelf items and other items that are developed exclusively at private expense) that are procured for the support of a major weapon system.

The Administration requested legislation that would amend the definition of commercial items in section 103 of title 41, United States Code, to exclude items that are merely "offered for sale" or "of a type" offered for sale in the commercial marketplace. The committee declines to make this change. The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (FASA) (Public Law 103–355) adopted a broad definition of commercial items to ensure that federal agencies would have ready access to products that are available in the commercial marketplace—including new products and modified products that are just becoming available. Such access remains particularly critical in fast moving commercial markets, including the markets for information technology and other advanced products.

At the same time, the committee shares the Administration's concern that some contractors have abused the commercial item definition to obscure cost and price information with regard to spare parts and components for DOD weapon systems. As DOD has pointed out, the Government Accountability Office and the DOD Inspector General have both criticized the Department for using commercial item procedures to procure items that are misclassified as commercial items and are not subject to competitive price pressure in the commercial marketplace. In 2011, the DOD Inspector General found that non-competitive spare parts provided by two different contractors were significantly overpriced because of inadequate and inaccurate data supplied by the contractors.

The provision recommended by the committee would provide the Department with additional tools to collect needed data for products and services that may arguably qualify as commercial items, without undermining the widely accepted definition of commercial items.

Maximum amount of allowable costs of compensation of contractor employees (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2324(e)(1)(P) of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the limitation on allowable compensation for defense contractor employees from the median amount of compensation provided to senior executives in large United States corporations (currently 763,000) to the maximum level of compensation for federal employees, which is set at the annual salary of the Vice President of the United States (currently $230,700).

Section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 108–85) limited the amount of contractor executive compensation allowable for reimbursement under federal contracts to a benchmark based on the median amount of compensation provided to senior executives in large United States corporations, as calculated by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP). The OFPP website indicates that the benchmark amount, which was set at $432,851 on January 1, 2004, was increased to $763,029 on April 22, 2012—an increase of more than 75 percent in just 8 years.

At a time when most Americans are seeing little or no increase in their paychecks and budget constraints require the Department of Defense to find efficiencies in all areas, the committee concludes that increases of this magnitude are unsupportable. The committee notes that section 2324(e)(1)(P) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish narrowly targeted exceptions to the limitation on allowable compensation, where such exceptions are needed to ensure that the Department of Defense has continued access to scientists, engineers, and others with unique and needed skills and capabilities.

Department of Defense access to and use of contractor internal audit reports (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) access to defense contractor internal audit reports and supporting materials for the purpose of

assessing risk and evaluating the efficacy of contractor internal controls and the reliability of associated contractor business systems. Under the provision, a contractor's refusal to permit access to internal audit reports and supporting materials could be taken into account in any assessment of the adequacy of contractor business systems pursuant to section 893 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

In December 2011, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported on a review of DCAA access to and use of defense contractor internal audit reports. GAO reported that generally accepted government auditing standards require evaluation and testing of contractor internal controls, including the work of the contractor's internal audit activity. However, GAO found that DCAA access to internal audits was uneven, and that one contractor refused to provide DCAA with any access to such audits at all. The report states:

> "DCAA does not generally track its requests or denials for internal audit reports. GAO found that the number of DCAA requests for internal audit reports is small relative to the number of internal audits GAO identified as relevant to defense contract oversight. In explaining why few reports are requested, DCAA auditors noted obstacles such as not being able to identify internal audits relevant to their work and uncertainty as to how useful those reports could be. By not routinely obtaining access to relevant company internal audits, DCAA auditors are hindered in their ability to effectively plan work and meet auditing standards for evaluating internal controls."

GAO recommended that DCAA issue guidance on how and under what circumstances company internal audit reports can be accessed; establish a central point of contact for each company to coordinate issues pertaining to internal audits; and track and assess information regarding access to such audits.

On March 30, 2012, the Director of DCAA issued the Agency's first annual report to Congress. The report requests that Congress clarify DCAA's access to contractor internal controls and business systems to assess whether the systems and controls are adequate to ensure the reliability of contractor data. The report states:

> "It is essential for DCAA to have access to contractor reviews, inquiries, investigations, and internal audits in order to evaluate contractor business systems. DCAA audits contractor accounting systems before and after contract award to assess whether the systems are adequate for accumulating and billing costs that comply with contract requirements. For major contractors, DCAA audits contractor business systems as a basis for relying on those systems during other DCAA audits."

Enhancement of whistleblower protections for contractor employees (sec. 844)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2409 of title 10, United States Code, to significantly enhance

whistleblower protections for contractor employees. The provision recommended by the committee would: (1) extend coverage to employees of subcontractors; (2) extend coverage to disclosures that are made to management officials of the contractor; (3) extend coverage to abuses of authority that undermine performance of a contract; (4) extend coverage to reprisal actions that are taken in concert with the contracting agency; (5) revise the standard of proof to match the standard already applicable in federal employee cases; (6) provide that whistleblower rights under the provision may not be waived by an arbitration agreement; (7) clarify that contractor legal fees are not allowable if the contractor is determined to have engaged in a reprisal; and (8) establish statutes of limitation for complaints and appeals.

The committee understands that over a 3-year period from 2009 through 2011, 163 complaints were filed under section 2409 and only 5 of these complaints were investigated by the Department of Defense Inspector General. In December 2011, a representative of the Inspector General testified that many of these complaints were outside the scope of the statute because the alleged wrongdoing was reported by subcontractor employees or was reported to company management. The provision recommended by the committee would correct these and other shortcomings in the existing law.

Extension of contractor conflict of interest limitations (sec. 845)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to determine whether guidance developed pursuant to section 841(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) regarding personal conflicts for contractor employees performing acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions should be extended to contractor personnel engaged in: (1) functions other than acquisition functions that are closely associated with inherently governmental functions; (2) personal services contracts; or (3) contracts for staff augmentation services.

Repeal of sunset for certain protests of task and delivery order contracts (sec. 846)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the sunset date for the authority to file bid protests for task and delivery orders in excess of $5.0 million pursuant to section 2304c(e) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee notes that: (1) the expansion of bid protests to task and delivery orders in excess of $5.0 million provides an increased assurance of fairness and regularity in the award of such task and delivery orders; (2) the Government Accountability Office has not reported an excessive increase in the number of bid protests as a result of this authority; and (3) the potential expiration of a previous sunset date for this authority produced significant confusion and uncertainty in the acquisition system over the last 2 years.

Subtitle D—Provisions Relating to Wartime Contracting

Responsibility within Department of Defense for contract support for overseas contingency operations (sec. 861)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe in regulations the chain of authority and responsibility within the Department of Defense (DOD) for policy, planning, and execution of contract support for overseas contingency operations (OCO).

The Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan (CWC) established pursuant to section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) found that DOD lacks "the organizational structure needed to force important lessons learned through the system and the authority to enable resource shift to support the acquisition process." The CWC recommended the establishment of a new directorate within the Joint Staff to specifically focus on contingency contracting.

The committee recognizes that DOD has made significant improvements over the last 8 years in the way that it has organized itself to plan and manage OCO contract support. The provision recommended by the committee would require the Department to institutionalize these changes and ensure that the DOD's management structure provides clear authority and responsibility for the planning of contract support; the establishment and validation of contract requirements; the identification of resources and prioritization of funding needs; the award and execution of contracts; and the oversight and management of contractors in the field.

Annual reports on contract support for overseas contingency operations involving combat operations (sec. 862)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report on contract support for any overseas contingency operation that includes combat operations and for which annual contract obligations exceed $250.0 million. The committee notes that the reports required by this provision are identical to the reports already provided for contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan pursuant to section 863 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 835 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

Inclusion of contract support in certain requirements for Department of Defense planning, joint professional military education, and management structure (sec. 863)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the consideration of issues arising out of contract support for contingency operations in the Department of Defense (DOD) readiness reporting system, the contingency planning functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the curriculum for joint professional military education, and the DOD structure for the management of contracts for services.

Risk assessment and mitigation for contractor performance of critical functions in support of overseas contingency operations (sec. 864)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to perform a comprehensive risk assessment and develop a risk mitigation plan for operational and political risks associated with contractor performance of critical functions in support of a contingency operation that is expected to continue for more than 1 year and require the expenditure of more than $250.0 million for contract support.

The provision defines critical functions to include private security functions, training of foreign government personnel, intelligence and information operations, and other functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions. The assessment and mitigation plan would be required to address risks relating to the goals and objectives of the operation, the continuity of the operation, the safety of military and civilian personnel, DOD's managerial control over the operation, DOD's critical organic or core capabilities, and DOD's ability to control costs and minimize waste, fraud, and abuse.

The Commission on Wartime Contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan (CWC) established pursuant to section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) reported that DOD and other federal agencies have too often made acquisition decisions that are expedient in the short-term without adequate consideration of the long-term risks. The final report of the CWC states:

> "Ten years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan have seen the United States using too many contractors for too many functions with too little forethought and control. . . . Events in Iraq and Afghanistan have shown that systematic consideration of operational, political, and financial risks must be a factor in judging appropriateness. All too often, officials assume that any task deemed not inherently governmental is therefore automatically suitable for performance by contractors. . . . For functions performed in a war zone, prudent decisions on contracting include assessing the level of risk associated with contracting, and judging whether that level is or can be mitigated to an acceptable level. . . . If mitigation or control measures leave the residual risks of using contractors at a level that outweighs the expected benefits, then the government needs timely and deployable options to support the contingency mission."

The provision recommended by the committee would not preclude contractors from performing any specific functions. Rather, it would require DOD to systematically consider the potential risks associated with contractor performance of particular functions in an area of combat operations and take appropriate actions to mitigate or avoid such risks.

Extension and modification of reports on contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan (sec. 865)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 2 years the requirement for an annual report on contracting in Iraq and Afghanistan pursuant to section 863 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 835 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The provision would also repeal the requirement for the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the annual reports.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the steps that the Department of Defense has taken and plans to take to address data and system deficiencies identified in previous GAO reports required by section 863 and to ensure the accuracy and completeness of contracting data available to the Department in current and future contingency operations.

Extension of temporary authority to acquire products and services in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan (sec. 866)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through December 31, 2014, the authority for the Department of Defense (DOD) to acquire products and services on a non-competitive basis in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan. This authority was requested by DOD to help build partnerships and support in countries along critical supply routes, and to help bolster stability in the region.

Compliance with Berry amendment required for uniform components supplied to Afghanistan military or Afghanistan National Police (sec. 867)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to comply with the requirements of the Berry amendment, section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, in the case of any textile components supplied by the Department to the Afghan National Army or the Afghanistan National Police for purposes of production of uniforms.

Sense of the Senate on the contributions of Latvia and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations to the success of the Northern Distribution Network (sec. 868)

The committee recommends a provision that would commend Latvia and other North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member nations along the Northern Distribution Network (NDN) for their contributions to ensuring that U.S. and coalition forces in Afghanistan have reliable lines of supply. The provision would also encourage the Department of Defense to make significant efforts to procure goods locally from Latvia and other NATO member nations along the NDN when quality products at competitive prices are available.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Requirements and limitations for suspension and debarment officials of the Department of Defense (sec. 881)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Suspension and Debarment Officials of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, and the Defense Logistics Agency to be independent of acquisition officials, to be engaged only in suspension and debarment activities and other fraud-remedies activities, to document final decisions, and to develop written policies for the consideration of referrals.

The provision would also require automatic referral for consideration of suspension or debarment of any person who has been charged with a federal criminal offense in connection with a Department of Defense (DOD) contract; been alleged in a criminal or civil proceeding brought by the United States to have engaged in fraudulent activities in connection with a DOD contract; or is the subject of a final determination that the person has failed to pay or refund money due or owed to the Federal Government in connection with a DOD contract.

The committee understands that suspension and debarment generally apply to all divisions and other organizational elements of a contractor, unless the suspension or debarment decision is limited by its terms to specific divisions, organizational elements, or commodities. The committee further understands that in any case where the misconduct on which a suspension or debarment is based is systemic in nature, a narrow limitation would be inappropriate.

Uniform contract writing system requirements for the Department of Defense (sec. 882)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish uniform data standards, internal control requirements, independent verification and validation requirements, and business process rules for the processing of procurement requests, contracts, receipts, and invoices, and to ensure that all DOD contracts are entered through electronic contract writing systems that meet those requirements.

Comptroller General of the United States review of use by the Department of Defense of urgent and compelling exception to competition (sec. 883)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the use by the Department of Defense (DOD) of the unusual and compelling urgency exception to full and open competition provided in section 2304(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code. The GAO report would be required to determine patterns in the use of the exception, whether justifications for the use of the exception meet statutory requirements, the extent to which decisions to solicit bids or proposals from only one source have been appropriately documented and justified, and whether DOD The has complied with limitations on the duration of contracts entered pursuant to the exception.

Authority to provide fee-for-service inspection and testing by Defense Contract Management Agency for certain critical equipment in the absence of a procurement contract (sec. 884)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Contract Management Agency to accept reimbursement from a manufacturer or assembler for testing and inspection of an item when the nature of the item requires such inspection or testing as a precondition to government acceptance of the item under a future government contract. The Department of Defense requested this authority to expedite the testing and inspection of items that are determined to be critical to defense acquisition programs.

Disestablishment of Defense Materiel Readiness Board (sec. 885)

The committee recommends a provision that would disestablish the Defense Materiel Readiness Board created by section 871 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as requested by the Department of Defense.

Modification of period of wait following notice to Congress of intent to contract for leases of certain vessels and vehicles (sec. 886)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2401(h) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement of notification of Congress and then having to wait for 30 days of a continuous session of Congress to pass before a vessel lease contract may be made. The proposed change would ensure that Congress continues to receive a 30–day notice of proposed charters, but would eliminate the uncertainty that results from a congressional schedule that seldom provides a period of 30 days of continuous session.

Extension of other transaction authority (sec. 887)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160) to extend for 5 years the authority for the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program for the acquisition of certain prototypes pursuant to "other transactions."

Items of Special Interest

Competition in the development and procurement of training systems for major ground and airborne vehicle programs

Section 202(d) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) requires the Secretary of Defense to take actions to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with statutory requirements, contracts for the maintenance and sustainment of a major weapon system are awarded on a competitive basis that gives full consideration to all potential sources. This provision reflects the committee's view that competition,

where it is feasible, results in reduced costs and improved contractor performance.

The committee believes that competition can have a similar beneficial impact in the area of training systems for major ground and airborne vehicle programs. The committee is aware that original equipment manufacturers may have rights in technical data that are essential to the development of effective training systems. However, the same impediment is faced—and has been overcome—in the area of maintenance and sustainment of major weapon systems. The committee urges the military departments to actively explore the expanded use of competition as a tool to drive down costs and improve performance in the acquisition of training systems for major ground and airborne vehicle programs.

Engagement with independent experts and interested parties in implementation of counterfeit parts legislation

Section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) requires the Department of Defense (DOD) to adopt comprehensive guidance and processes for the detection and avoidance of counterfeit parts. In particular, the provision requires DOD to: (1) revise acquisition rules to ensure that the cost of replacement and rework required by the use of suspect counterfeit parts is paid for by the contractor responsible; (2) ensure that DOD and its suppliers purchase electronic parts from manufacturers and their authorized dealers or from qualified, trusted suppliers; (3) require DOD officials and contractors who become aware of counterfeit parts in the supply chain to provide appropriate written notification of the problem; and (4) ensure that DOD and its largest contractors establish effective systems and procedures to detect and avoid counterfeit parts.

The committee expects the DOD to implement these requirements quickly and aggressively. At the same time, however, the committee is aware of a number of complex issues that must be addressed. For example, which requirements of section 818 apply only to "covered contractors"—contractors who are subject to the cost accounting standards—and which requirements apply more broadly? To what extent should suppliers of commercial, off-the-shelf end items be excluded from coverage pursuant to the authority of section 1907 of title 41, United States Code? Should the provision disallowing costs of rework or corrective action that may be required to remedy the use or inclusion of counterfeit parts apply to parts that are supplied to contractors as government-furnished equipment?

The committee encourages DOD to solicit the views of both independent experts and interested parties—including representatives of original equipment manufacturers, DOD prime contractors, and lower-tier contractors in affected industries—as it works to address these and other implementation issues.

Implementation of section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010

Section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) requires a written justification and approval (J&A) for any sole-source contract awarded by a federal

agency in excess of $20.0 million. The Senate report accompanying S. 1235 (S. Rept. 112–26) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 directed the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with specific data on the implementation of section 811 by the Department of Defense (DOD). The Senate subsequently directed the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the DOD reports and provide its assessment of the effectiveness of the implementation of section 811.

Because of a long delay in the rulemaking process, section 811 was not fully implemented until more than a year after its enactment. During the period prior to full implementation, federal agencies including DOD continued to award contracts without the required J&As. The most recent reports from DOD and GAO do not segregate data on contract awards into awards that were made before, and awards that were made after, full implementation. As a result, the data provided the committee on the implementation of section 811 remains inconclusive and incomplete.

For this reason, the committee extends the reporting requirements for both the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General for 1 more year, through March 1, 2014. The Secretary's 2013 and 2014 reports should provide the Secretary's assessment of the steps taken by the military departments to implement section 811 and the efficacy of that implementation.

Inventories and reviews of contracts for services

Section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, as first enacted in section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), required the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish a data collection system to provide management information with regard to DOD purchases of contract services. In 2007, the Senate Committee on Armed Services expressed frustration that this requirement had yet to be fully implemented. The Senate report accompanying S. 1574 (S. Rept. 110–77) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (FY 2008 NDAA) stated: "Five years later, the Department's expenditures for contract services have nearly doubled, but DOD still has not conducted a comprehensive analysis of its spending on these services." Section 807 of the FY 2008 NDAA amended and strengthened section 2330a, requiring the Department to produce an annual inventory of contract services.

Since the enactment of section 807, DOD has continued to drag its feet. Of the three military departments, only the Army has developed an effective inventory system. Section 936 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) required DOD to adopt an approach similar to that already developed by the Army. The Statement of Managers on the conference report explained:

> "[T]he inventory, when fully developed in accordance with statutory requirements, will provide the Department with useful workforce information for identifying inherently governmental functions inappropriately performed under contract, informing strategic human capital planning, and facilitating an appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel. At the same time, a compli-

> ant inventory will be an important acquisition tool, enabling the Department to better leverage its buying power, rationalize its supplier base, foster competitive procurements, and ensure the best value for the taxpayers' dollar. The conferees are disappointed that the Department has yet to take the steps needed to achieve full compliance with the statutory requirements."

The Statement of Managers noted that the Department had recently developed a plan to comply with the statutory requirements. Unfortunately, this plan has been sidetracked for a number of months by DOD's decision to submit the implementing procedures for review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and by the refusal of OMB to address the matter as an expedited, "emergency" requirement. As a result, more than 10 years after section 2330a was first enacted, DOD still lacks an effective database to manage the $200.0 billion a year that it spends on contract services.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to report to the congressional defense committees by no later than July 15, 2012, on the status of the Department's efforts to implement section 2330a and the timeline for full implementation of the requirements of this provision.

Joint Urgent Operational Needs and Joint Emergent Operational Needs

Section 804(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required the Secretary of Defense to establish an expedited review process to determine whether capabilities proposed as urgent operational needs are appropriate for fielding through rapid acquisition processes. The provision requires that, subject to exceptions determined to be appropriate by the Secretary, rapid fielding of capabilities in response to urgent operational needs is appropriate only for capabilities that: (A) can be fielded within 2 years; (B) do not require substantial development effort; (C) are based on technologies that are proven and available; and (D) can appropriately be acquired under fixed price contracts. The Senate report accompanying S. 3454 (S. Rept. 111–201) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 on this provision explains:

> "In some cases, it appears that the military services have stretched the boundaries of rapid acquisition authorities to undertake large and complex acquisition programs that would be more suitable to the traditional acquisition process. . . . In view of the high development risk associated with some of these programs and the fact that a number of them appear to be redundant or duplicative of existing programs, the committee concludes that the Department needs stronger guidance on the proper application of rapid acquisition processes."

The Department of Defense has proposed legislation to repeal the requirement that the rapid fielding process be limited to capabilities that can appropriately be acquired under fixed price contracts.

The proposed change is unnecessary because section 804(b) already authorizes the Secretary of Defense to adopt such exceptions to the requirement as he determines to be necessary. The change would be unwise because capabilities that cannot appropriately be acquired under fixed price contracts are likely to include significant development risk that renders them unsuitable for rapid fielding. The committee concludes that section 804(b) already provides the Department with the flexibility to use other than fixed price contracts, and that this flexibility should be used only in unusual and compelling circumstances.

The committee also notes that Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 3170.01H, issued January 10, 2012, and the Manual for the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System, issued January 19, 2012, which implement the requirements of section 804(b) with regard to Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON), also establish a new category of requirement, known as Joint Emergent Operational Needs (JEON). Under the Instruction and the Manual, both JUONs and JEONs may be acquired through rapid fielding processes. Unlike JUONs, however, JEONs are not limited to capabilities that can be fielded within 2 years, do not require extensive development, are based on proven technologies, and can be appropriately acquired through fixed price contracts.

The committee acknowledges that it is appropriate for the Department of Defense to establish a "middle tier" of acquisition for capabilities that are not suitable for rapid fielding, but need not be subject to the full range of requirements applicable to major defense acquisition programs. However, this "middle tier" must be more than a process for avoiding the limitations established in section 804(b) and the requirements of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (WSARA) (Public Law 111–23).

The fundamental premise of WSARA is that acquisition programs must be put on sound footing from the outset through sound up-front analysis and cost-performance trade-offs; the establishment of reasonable cost, schedule, and performance expectations; an insistence on strong systems engineering; and the use of appropriately mature technologies. In the view of the committee the initiation of a significant acquisition program without such up-front work is a formula for cost overruns, schedule delays, and performance deficiencies.

As presently structured, the JEON process requires a 1-day initial review, followed by a 30-day validation period. After that, the Instruction and the Manual appear to make no distinction between JUONs and JEONs: both go through the same rapid acquisition process, both are authorized to use the same expedited alternatives to Analyses of Alternatives, both are permitted to proceed directly to procurement "without the need to develop and validate any of the other associated JCIDS [Joint Capabilities Integration Development System] documents"; and both are assessed for long-term operational utility only after they have been fielded.

The committee notes that while the JUON rapid acquisition process has been established to provide an urgent capability for ongoing contingency operations within 2 years that is unconstrained by the relatively slow pace of the defense budget process, the Depart-

ment's guidance for the JEON process allows for the emerging capability to be fielded within up to 5 years in support of an anticipated contingency operation. The committee questions how the Department will be able to firmly identify an anticipated contingency, and how the Department will assess the urgency of the emerging capability as a justification for using the JEON process as opposed to the traditional budget and acquisition process.

The committee concludes that additional protections are needed to ensure that the JEON process is not abused. Accordingly, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop additional guidance for JEONs, including:

- criteria for assessing the urgency of requirements (including a determination of the likelihood of "an anticipated or pending contingency operation");
- standards for ensuring that technologies are sufficiently mature to be suitable for rapid acquisition;
- procedures for ensuring the appropriate consideration of alternative solutions; and
- processes for ensuring appropriate cost-performance trade-offs, sound cost estimates, and robust testing and systems engineering.

In the absence of well-developed protections along these lines, the committee is likely to be skeptical of requests to fund JEONs on an expedited basis.

Recommendations by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the involvement by the service chiefs in the acquisition of major weapon systems

In April 2012, the Defense Business Board (DBB) recommended that the chiefs of the military services should be more engaged and accountable in the acquisition process. The DBB stated that just as input by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics "is critical in the requirements process in order to ensure that affordability and technological capability are considered," service chief involvement "is critical in the acquisition process in order to ensure that military needs are met." For this reason, the DBB indicated that "DOD needs to create a partnership across budget, requirements, and acquisition leaders to create a linked and streamlined" acquisition process.

The committee agrees that the engagement of the service chiefs in the overall process by which DOD acquires major weapon systems is important to ensuring that the process is responsive to the needs of the military. For example, the cost, schedule, and performance trade-offs required by the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (WSARA) (Public Law 111–23) would be impossible without continuous engagement between senior military leaders and the acquisition community. Similarly, the Configuration Steering Boards established in accordance with the requirements of section 814 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to control costs and requirements on major defense acquisition programs could not be effective without the engagement of senior military leaders.

For these reasons, section 2547 of title 10, United States Code, enacted by section 861 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), established a permanent role for the chiefs of the armed forces in the acquisition process; section 908 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required each of the military departments to appoint a three-star military deputy to the department's service acquisition executive; and section 105 of the WSARA required that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council seek and consider input from the commanders of the combatant commands in identifying joint military requirements.

Because of the continuing importance of this issue, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, any recommendations he may have to ensure the full engagement of the service chiefs in the acquisition of major weapon systems, consistent with the objectives stated in this provision.

Reverse auctions

The committee is aware that the military departments have increasingly used online reverse auctions for the procurement of commodities and simple services. When used appropriately, this approach has been effective in lowering the cost of such commodities and services by stimulating aggressive competition between vendors. It has also proved beneficial to small businesses, which receive a large majority of the purchases.

The committee encourages the military departments to expand their use of reverse auctions for appropriate types of commodities and simple services, whenever doing so would be expected to result in savings.

Strategic sourcing and spend analyses

For more than a decade, the committee has been urging the Department of Defense (DOD) to do a better job of managing its contracts for services. The Senate report accompanying S. 1438 (S. Rept. 107–62) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 stated:

> "[T]he Department has never conducted a comprehensive spending analysis of its services contracts and has made little effort to leverage its buying power, improve the performance of its services contractors, rationalize its supplier base, or otherwise ensure that its dollars are well spent. . . . The GAO has informed the committee that a number of companies in the private sector have achieved significant savings without any reduction in services by instituting best practices such as centralizing key functions, promoting strategic orientation, improving personnel skills and capabilities, conducting spending analyses, rationalizing supplier bases, and expanding the use of cross-functional, commodity-based teams."

In May 2003, DOD established a Department-wide Strategic Sourcing Program in an effort to leverage the Department's pur-

chasing power and rationalize its spending for both services and commodities. In 2005, the Office of Federal Procurement Policy followed with a government-wide strategic sourcing initiative. Over the last 5 years, the military departments have continued to perform spending analyses and develop strategic sourcing initiatives for specific service and commodity portfolios with positive results.

Nonetheless, more remains to be done. In January 2011, a task force of the Defense Science Board found that DOD could save billions of dollars if it incorporates "more robust strategic sourcing best practices" into its operations and business models. Similarly, in March 2011, the Government Accountability Office reported that the Federal Government could save billions of dollars by applying strategic sourcing best practices on a broader basis. The committee believes that there are additional commodity areas in which DOD could achieve significant savings by rationalizing its supplier base and better leveraging its buying power. The committee urges the Department to take advantage of these opportunities.

Treatment of procurements on behalf of the Department of Defense in accordance with the interagency agreement between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy

The Department of Energy (DOE) has expressed the view that section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires DOE to comply with "defense procurement requirements" and that this requirement "has the potential to hinder critical national security activities supported by the DOE." For this reason, DOE has requested an exemption from section 801.

DOE's interpretation of section 801 is incorrect. Section 801, as amended by section 817 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), requires DOE and other federal agencies that make purchases on behalf of the Department of Defense (DOD) to comply with: (1) the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR); and (2) laws and regulations that apply to DOD procurements through other federal agencies. The committee notes that in September 2010, DOD and DOE entered a Memorandum of Agreement (2010 MOA) establishing the regulatory framework for DOD work undertaken under the DOE "Work for Others" (WFO) program. These requirements were further elaborated in a September 2011 Memorandum issued by the Director of Defense Procurement Policy (2011 Memorandum).

For this reason, DOD procurements through the WFO program that are conducted in accordance with the FAR, the 2010 MOA, and the 2011 Memorandum are also in compliance with the requirements of section 801, as amended. The committee concludes that DOD and DOE can and should comply with the requirements of section 801, and that no waiver or exemption should be necessary for this purpose. The committee expects the Inspectors General of DOD and DOE to continue to audit DOD procurements through DOE for compliance with the requirements of the FAR, the 2010 MOA, and the 2011 Memorandum, as required by section 801.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

Definition and report on terms "preparation of the environment" and "operational preparation of the environment" for joint doctrine purposes (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to formally define the terms "preparation of the environment (PE)" and "operational preparation of the environment (OPE)" for the purposes of Joint Doctrine and provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report, including: the definitions of PE and OPE, examples of PE and OPE activities highlighting application of the concepts and drawing distinctions between the two types of activities, and an assessment of the respective roles of special operations and general purpose forces in conducting PE and OPE activities.

The committee is concerned that, despite their frequent use, the terms PE and OPE are not accurately or clearly understood, and are often used interchangeably to describe various activities by special operations and general purpose forces.

The term PE is currently defined in Joint Doctrine (Joint Publication 1–02) as "an umbrella term for operations and activities conducted by selectively trained special operations forces to develop an environment for potential future special operations." The committee notes that this definition is inadequate and misleading because, in practice, PE activities are not restricted to special operations forces or operations and are carried out by and in support of general purpose forces.

The committee also notes that the term OPE is not currently defined in Joint Doctrine, despite the term appearing in various department publications, directives, and orders. The committee believes the inadequate definition of these terms has resulted in confusion within the military, friction in the interagency coordination process, and reduced congressional oversight.

Expansion of duties and responsibilities of the Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the statute authorizing the Nuclear Weapons Council (10 U.S.C. 179) to require that concurrent with the President's budget submission, that the Council certify in writing that the budget for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) meets both the nuclear stockpile and the stockpile stewardship requirements. Dissenting opinions shall be provided with the written certification.

The provision also requires the Council to notify the congressional defense committees on the impacts of any authorization or appropriation bill adopted by either the Senate or the House of Representatives that in the view of the Council fails to adequately fund the nuclear stockpile and nuclear stockpile stewardship requirements.

Subtitle B—Space Activities

Operationally Responsive Space Program Office (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2273a of title 10, United States Code, authorizing the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program. This provision would require the ORS Program Office to report to the Air Force's Director of Space and Missile Systems Center and that the Office be geographically separate from the Headquarters of the Center, similar to what General Schriever required for the Space Test Program in 1965. The provision gives acquisition authority to the Program Element Office for Space. The provision would require an Executive Committee made up of the Commander of the Air Force Space Command, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, and the Executive Agent for Space, which would chair the board. The committee directs, no later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, a copy of the terms of reference of the Executive Committee. The committee grants authority to transfer up to $60.0 million from the Weather Follow On Satellite Program, to the extent provided in appropriations acts to other higher priority programs, including having the ORS Office produce a low cost follow on satellite. If funding is transferred for a low cost weather satellite, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report to Congress no later than December 31, 2012, on the total cost and launch date for the satellite. The committee expects a similar ORS–1 type payload, low cost, technologically simple, and launched within 3 years.

For fiscal year 2013, the Department of Defense proposed to eliminate the ORS Program Office. The Department proposes to transition the Program's success and knowledge into the other satellite acquisition programs. The committee finds the Department's rationale, to cancel a program because it is successful—curious. The committee rejects the proposed termination. The purpose of the Office is to lower the cost and time to launch tactically responsive satellites. Such satellites do not need perfection, they need to be responsive, the satellite ORS–1 met the challenge. It is an imaging satellite designed, built, and launched on the order of $225.0 million in less than 32 months. The satellite is tasked directly by U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), which the committee understands is pleased with the satellite's performance.

U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) on February 28, 2012, responded to a question from the Senate Committee on Armed Services regarding the utility of ORS–1 and said: "Based on CENTCOM's success with that system, we've had recent discussions with the Operational Responsive Space Program on developing an ORS–1 system for PACOM as well. These systems will be

particularly useful in enhancing PACOM's ability to collect in denied areas that we cannot reach with airborne systems." In response to another question about the ORS ability to field this class of satellites to increase the resiliency and responsiveness of PACOM's space capabilities, PACOM's response was: "The future potential for rapid reconstitution of overhead systems in the face of adversary counter-space capabilities is very important to increasing the resiliency and responsiveness of PACOM's space capabilities. PACOM is a strong proponent of ORS-class satellites."

When the venture capital community is investigating launching modified cell phones into space for a reconfigurable, low cost communications constellation, there is much to be learned from the ORS Program and much more that it can impart into the Department of Defense to lower the cost, where practicable, of access to space.

Commercial space launch cooperation (sec. 912)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for a private entity using DOD launch ranges and facilities to contribute to their maintenance.

Reports on integration of acquisition and capability delivery schedules for components for major satellite acquisition programs and funding for such programs (sec. 913)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to track concurrently the development of both the satellite and ground systems and to report to Congress corrective measures that will be taken when the satellite and ground systems are more than 1 year apart in synchronization.

The committee has found that the Department of Defense is bringing a number of large satellite systems into operation without having the ground systems to use it. Examples of systems in this category are the Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite, the Space Based Infrared System, the Mobile User Objective System, and the GPS III. Department of Defense representation in dispute resolution regarding surrender of Department of Defense bands of electromagnetic frequencies (sec. 914)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1062(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65, 47 U.S.C. 921 note) to require that the Department of Defense be adequately represented to convey its views.

Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related and Cyber Matters

Authority to provide geospatial intelligence support to security alliances and international and regional organizations (sec. 921)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency to provide imagery intelligence and geospatial information support to security alliances and international organizations of which the United States is a member, and to regional organizations with defense or

security components. This provision was requested by the administration.

Army Distributed Common Ground System (sec. 922)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Army to assign oversight of the DCGS-Army cloud acquisition effort to the Army's Chief Information Officer (CIO)/G–6. The provision would require the CIO to conduct an audit of the program and provide an assessment and recommendations to the Secretary of the Army and Chief of Staff of the Army by December 1, 2012.

In mid-2010, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence for U.S. Forces-Afghanistan (USFOR–A), signed a Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statement (JUONS) requesting the rapid fielding to all echelons in Afghanistan of a commercially available analyst toolkit, which he had evaluated, that he believed would dramatically improve intelligence analysis in theater.

The Army at the time was accelerating the development, with the National Security Agency, of a cloud-computing system for the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) that the Army G–2 believed would transform intelligence analysis capabilities. Up to this point, the Army had been seriously considering integrating the commercial toolset requested in the USFOR–A JUONS with the DCGS cloud system. The thought was that, while the Army cloud was rapidly maturing the ability to ingest, correlate, store, and distribute vast amounts of disparate data, the effort to produce new types of analyst tools for data query, manipulation, and display was lagging. Commercial analyst tools, in contrast, provided rich analyst support, but were perceived to lack the large-scale data handling ability of cloud architectures.

Ultimately, however, the Army decided not to support the USFOR–A JUONS by acquiring the requested commercial toolset, despite its ability to complement the Army cloud program. Instead, the Army asserted that its own analyst tool development program would be ready as fast as the proposed commercial product deployment, and would provide equal capabilities. This decision generated much controversy within the Department of Defense, and concern in Congress, but the Army was given the opportunity to prove that it could deliver the promised capabilities. In the 2 years that have ensued, the Army periodically re-examined the option of integrating multiple commercial front-end analyst tools (such as Analyst Notebook, Palantir, Centrifuge, Semantica, etc.) into its cloud architecture, but has always elected to stick with its internal development.

Meanwhile, the Marine Corps and even some Army units in Afghanistan proceeded to deploy commercial products. Overall, the feedback from these units and an independent assessment by the Deputy Secretary of Defense-chartered National Assessment Group has been very positive on these commercial products. Unfortunately, the Army cloud's analyst support appears to continue to lag behind promised performance. In testimony to Congress in late 2011, the Army indicated that only 115 analysts in Afghanistan are using the Army's DCGS cloud analyst tools, despite years of development and considerable expense.

The committee lacks confidence that the three groups trying to jointly manage the Army's DCGS modernization—the G–2's office, the Intelligence and Security Command, and the Intelligence and Information Warfare Directorate of the Communications-Electronics Research and Development Center—are going to deliver a fully capable, end-to-end system to support the warfighter on an acceptable schedule and cost.

Rationalization of cyber networks and cyber personnel of the Department of Defense (sec. 923)

The committee recommends a provision that would require network consolidation and re-design to free up personnel to achieve an appropriate balance between U.S. Cyber Command's mission capabilities. In the event that the rate at which personnel freed up from network consolidation is insufficient, or if the personnel available are not able to meet the requirements for supporting Cyber Command's offensive missions, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to take appropriate action to provide qualified personnel in the required timeframe.

General Alexander, the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command, in speeches, testimony to the committee, and within the Department of Defense (DOD) has declared that DOD networks are not defensible due to the proliferation of sub-networks, each with its own security barriers, which prevents visibility and control by commanders. Although the committee cannot substantiate the claim that there are "15,000" such sub-networks, there is no dispute that there are far too many such enclaves with features that today hinder rather than promote information security.

General Alexander's testimony also confirmed that the personnel assigned to Cyber Command and its components are overwhelmingly allocated to network management and defense. A small percentage of the workforce attends to the Command's offensive missions and responsibilities. General Alexander confirmed that this ratio reflects an imbalance in capabilities and must be rectified.

General Alexander and others in DOD agree that both issues could be at least partially rectified by dramatically reducing the number of separate network enclaves in the Department, which should yield significant manpower savings, and re-train and re-assign that manpower to supporting offensive missions.

In the past, DOD sought to secure information and regulate access to information by controlling access to the network itself. DOD rules encouraged or even required organizations to erect access and security barriers as a condition for connecting to the backbone network. The result is a proliferation of "virtual private networks" with firewalls and intrusion detection systems, and administrators and analysts to manage and protect them. Desktops and servers behind those barriers are hidden from view and from management. In addition to hampering the work of Cyber Command, this network balkanization makes it hard to share information, to collaborate, and to access common enterprise services.

Network rationalization and the use of identity- and attribute-based access controls should enable improved performance, better security, and more efficient use of personnel.

Next-generation host-based cyber security system for the Department of Defense (sec. 924)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) Chief Information Officer and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to develop a strategy to acquire next-generation host-based cybersecurity tools and capabilities, and provide that strategy to Congress in conjunction with the budget request for fiscal year 2015.

The DOD is now completing deployment of the Host Based Security System (HBSS) that provides cybersecurity capabilities for millions of endpoint or host computing devices across the Department. This deployment took a long time, cost significantly more than expected, and proved to be a complicated and very difficult undertaking.

This experience has instilled a "never again" attitude among DOD's cybersecurity leadership regarding enterprise-scale endpoint security solutions. Instead, DOD appears to be hoping that network-level security enhancements will not only overcome the weaknesses in the current HBSS, but enable the Department to meet future cybersecurity threats. The Commander of U.S. Cyber Command has also publicly characterized endpoint security for today's "thick-client" desktop, laptop, and mobile device computers as an exercise in futility on the grounds that it is impossible to coherently manage, monitor, and update millions of such devices distributed across the globe. In addition, the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command points out that the Command currently does not even have visibility or the ability to directly control those endpoints because (as noted elsewhere in this report) they are typically "hidden" behind enclave firewalls and other security devices. The Commander argues publicly that "endpoint security" will be viable only in a cloud environment where endpoint computing is virtualized and provisioning and control are centralized and fully automated.

The HBSS system itself is fundamentally based on anti-virus technology, which works only when the signature of an attack is already known. This requires that HBSS-protected computers store a large and ever-growing file of malware signatures. The communications load necessary to keep HBSS up-to-date in the field in some circumstances forces commanders with low communications capacity to choose between operating HBSS and performing their tactical missions, which results in HBSS being turned off.

The committee is concerned that these views are short-sighted from multiple perspectives. Constant, rapid malware morphing is a reality, and the growing use of encryption (for example, the Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure), suggest that endpoint security solutions will remain essential. Further, industry is now rapidly developing and marketing endpoint security solutions that do not rely on signatures and potentially could vastly reduce the "overhead" associated with HBSS. Some of these technologies enable "discovery" of previously unseen cyber threats at the endpoint, which could transform host computers into a much improved sensor grid for the enterprise.

Moreover, as noted elsewhere in this report, DOD must soon rationalize its networks to reduce the number of segmented enclaves, which should extend visibility and easier provisioning and control

to endpoints. Finally, although the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command is promoting a fast transition to a cloud-hosting environment, it may take a long time to replace millions and millions of desktops, laptops, mobile devices, and other distributed computers with thin-client devices served exclusively from the cloud.

This provision would require the strategy to address the limitations of the current HBSS system, and to include exploitation of emerging technologies for behavior-based threat detection, insider threat detection, data loss prevention, dynamic encryption of data-at-rest, remediation following infections, and continuous monitoring and configuration management. The provision encourages building on the integration framework featured in HBSS to enable "plug-and-play" of tools into an open architecture. This capability would permit constant insertion of new, competitively developed tools, as well as tailored or non-standard deployments.

Improvements of security, quality, and competition in computer software procured by the Department of Defense (sec. 925)

The committee recommends a provision that would mandate multiple actions to improve the security and quality of computer software code, and enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to compete software maintenance and upgrades.

The Department of Defense (DOD) suffers from constant cyber attacks. A significant route for intruders is through vulnerabilities in the software that DOD paid contractors to develop, which often includes integration of custom software code with commercial software packages.

Cybersecurity in important respects begins with secure software. DOD's software is riddled with common and easily preventable vulnerabilities. DOD spends enormous resources then trying to protect that code from being exploited, discovering when it is compromised, and dealing with the consequences of infections. If the code was written properly in the first place, defending DOD information systems would be much easier.

DOD needs to insist that the code it pays for be secure, and to implement concrete methods and means to achieve that objective. One method for improving code security is to use automated test tools to identify vulnerabilities and to remediate them in development. Most current software code vulnerability testing tools work only on source code. To ensure maximum access to source code for quality and security analysis, DOD needs to exercise its legal rights to technical data.

The government has other strong interests in exercising these data rights, including software re-use and competition for system maintenance, upgrade, and capability insertion. DOD has demonstrated dramatic savings by forcing open complex software-based systems to competition. But achieving success is difficult, and software re-use historically has not been very successful. The committee believes that modern approaches to software repositories, open architecture design, advanced tools for analyzing and understanding software code, improved software development standards and processes, and collaborative software development environ-

ments have the potential to significantly improve cybersecurity and increase competition.

This provision would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)), in coordination with the Chief Information Officer (CIO) to sponsor a major update and improvement to capability maturity models for development and acquisition. The goal of this effort would be to sharpen the best practices for software development and to provide significantly better means to measure whether organizations are actually implementing the processes and practices at the level expected for the maturity level at which they have been assessed.

The provision also would require USD(AT&L) and the CIO to solidify requirements for secure software development practices and standards. Chief among these is the need to require, rather than just "highly recommend," the use of static software analysis tools in the development process, and in evaluating the code in development and operational tests. These tools are widely available commercially, but are rarely used even though they have proven capabilities to detect a large percentage of the most commonly exploited vulnerabilities. It is true that these tools generate a large number of false positives in order to achieve the lowest possible rate of false negatives. But high false positive rates are not a significant problem in the development stage, when the developer can build and test incrementally. U.S. Transportation Command and the Military Health Service already have successful experience with this approach.

The Defense Information Systems Agency's (DISA's) Security Technical Implementation Guide (STIG) requires the use of coding standards, but not specifically including secure coding standards, and the references listed in the STIG are best characterized as style guides rather than coding standards. This provision would require that the STIG be modified accordingly, and that appropriate guidance be developed for requiring the use of secure software coding plans in statements of work.

This provision would require the USD(AT&L) and the CIO to develop appropriate guidance for program managers to require evidence that software developers are actually conforming to secure coding standards, best-practice development models, and vulnerability testing requirements, and, in so doing, make appropriate use of software code assessment centers that already exist or could be created in government organizations, federally funded research and development centers (FFRDC), and contractor facilities.

This provision would require investigation of additional means to incentivize the development of secure, high-quality software through the imposition of liabilities, warranties, and liability protections. The committee is aware of commercial software companies that are now offering defect-free warranties for software code bases up to 600,000 lines of code. The professional judgment of the Software Engineering Institute, a FFRDC funded by DOD, is that writing high-quality, secure code should not cost any more than the vulnerable code the government is buying today. It simply requires competence and diligence.

Finally, the provision would require DOD to designate software repositories and collaborative software development environments,

such as those existing today in DISA's Forge.mil and at U.S. Transportation Command. The objective is to expand the use of such facilities to store code that the government owns or to which it has use rights; to enable program offices to use common development infrastructure instead of buying new equipment for every new program; to foster collaboration and the use of proven software development practices; and to enable program managers and prospective bidders to discover code for re-use, to assess its quality and security, or to research code characteristics and functionality to compete on upgrades, capability insertions, and maintenance.

The committee considers it critically important for DOD to provide these repositories' users with access to advanced software reverse engineering and analysis tools and to static and dynamic vulnerability testing capabilities that work both on source code and code binaries. As noted previously, there are many capable commercial tools available for source code analysis. Industry is working on binary code analysis tools, but these are not yet mature or comprehensive in functionality. NSA has devoted much effort to software reverse engineering capabilities to support its signals intelligence mission that run the gamut from source code to machine code, and from functionality analysis to vulnerability detection. Depending on maturity, scalability, and ease of use, these National Security Agency (NSA) tools could be extremely useful to the DOD acquisition community to improve not only software security, but also software re-use and competition by enabling program managers and prospective bidders to better understand code.

The committee directs the USD(AT&L), the CIO, and the Director of NSA to carefully assess the tools that NSA has and is developing and determine what could be utilized in the DOD acquisition system. The Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Agency is also developing advanced machine code analysis capabilities that DOD should carefully track.

The importance of better automated code analysis to the cyber mission is clear. The Clinton administration's Critical Infrastructure Protection Plan called for the development of advanced tools for code vulnerability analysis. In 2003, the NSA Information Assurance Director testified before the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Science, and Research and Development of the Select Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that "a significant cybersecurity improvement over the next decade will be found in enhancing our ability to find and eliminate malicious code in large software applications . . . There is little coordinated effort today to develop tools and techniques to examine effectively either source or executable software. I believe that this problem is significant enough to warrant a considerable effort."

Yet DOD has never invested in tool development. The committee directs the USD(AT&L) to evaluate the state of the art in commercial and government tools for automated software code analysis and reverse engineering, and determine whether DOD should initiate a focused tool development program. The committee requests a briefing on this evaluation at the time of the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2014.

Competition in connection with Department of Defense data link systems (sec. 926)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD)(AT&L)):

(1) To develop an inventory of all data links in use and in development in the Department of Defense;

(2) To conduct a business case analysis of each data link program and make a determination whether there is adequate competition in development, maintenance, upgrade, and new procurement, and if not, whether the program should be opened up to competition;

(3) For each data link program that is identified for increased competition, to develop a plan that addresses how any policy, legal, programmatic, or technical barriers to competition will be overcome; and

(4) For each program where competition is determined to be inadvisable, to prepare a justification for that conclusion.

The committee expects the Under Secretary to develop a working definition of the term "data link systems", consistent with existing understanding, for the purpose of identifying systems to be included in the inventory required by this provision.

In conducting the business case analyses, this provision would require the USD(AT&L) to solicit the views of industry on the merits and feasibility of opening up programs to competition. This provision would require the USD(AT&L) to provide a report to Congress in conjunction with the submission of the fiscal year 2015 budget request. Finally, the provision would require the Comptroller General to provide an assessment of the report to Congress.

Integration of critical signals intelligence capabilities (sec. 927)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Task Force to develop a plan to integrate multiple technical signals intelligence (SIGINT) capabilities together to satisfy requirements to detect, identify, track, and precisely locate communications equipment from airborne platforms. Multiple program offices in multiple organizations are working on this problem, and each of them has developed technology with separate industry partners that solve a piece—but only a piece—of the overall problem.

One of the programs provides full identification but inaccurate geolocation and no tracking. Another provides partial identification and precise location, but only sporadic tracking. A third approach provides tracking and precise location but no identification. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Army are working on one approach with one vendor, another part of the Army is pursuing another with a second company, and the Air Force is exploiting technology developed by Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory.

ISR Task Force staff are aware of the need for an integrated capability, and understand that a joint technical or operational solution is needed if none of the alternatives can be readily modified to achieve the ability to detect and prosecute high-value targets.

This SIGINT capability would be able to instantly cue an imaging sensor, such as a full-motion video or wide-area motion imagery camera, to enable persistent tracking.

The provision recommended by the committee would require the separate services and organizations sponsoring the different but complementary approaches to support the ISR Task Force Director in developing the plan. Finally, the provision reiterates the mission and role played by the ISR Task Force in identifying and overseeing ISR initiatives in support of deployed forces.

Collection and analysis of network flow data (sec. 928)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) Chief Information Officer (CIO), in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI), and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to take advantage of the research and development activities and capabilities of the Community Data Center (CDC) managed by the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) to enhance DOD's capabilities to collect, analyze, and store so-called network flow data records. The purpose of the provision is to improve DOD's capabilities to handle its own voluminous flow data records, and to potentially make this technology available for the defense of the country voluntarily through the Tier 1 Internet Service Providers (ISPs).

In a report to Congress required by section 934 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), the Secretary of Defense stated that "the Department recognizes that deterring malicious actors from conducting cyber attacks is complicated by the difficulty of verifying the location from which an attack was launched and by the need to identify the attacker from among a wide variety and high number of potential actors." This attribution problem stems from lack of visibility into events and traffic taking place on the Internet.

In speeches and testimony to the committee, General Alexander, Commander of U.S. Cyber Command, has clearly stated that the government is not going to be monitoring the communications entering, leaving, or traversing the United States to detect cyber attacks. The committee concurs that such monitoring would be inappropriate and, in many cases, unlawful. However, General Alexander has also indicated clearly his conviction that, in the event of a nation-state attack on the country that Cyber Command is called upon to defeat, it is essential that Cyber Command be able to "see [the attack] in time to stop it." If Cyber Command cannot see the attack developing, "we're not going to block it." General Alexander has indicated that the government will rely on the private sector—including the ISPs—to help provide that detection capability and warning.

The problem is that the ISPs currently do not collect the data necessary to reliably perform this type of early warning and attack assessment function. In traditional telephone service, the service providers collect and retain records of every call that is made—the "to/from," the time of the call, its duration, and the like. Under Federal Communications Commission rules, such call data records are comprehensively collected and retained for a long period.

In the case of the Internet, the analogue to the call data record is network flow data—for example, the "to/from" of an email, the time it was sent, its size, and so forth. However, in contrast to telephony, the ISPs do not routinely or comprehensively collect or keep this net flow data, because there has never been a business reason for doing so. Over time, the ISPs have learned that such records are useful for cybersecurity, and have invested in dedicated equipment and specially developed analysis tools to capture and analyze them. But the amount of metadata for Internet traffic is staggering—orders of magnitude larger than telephony—and so even today the ISPs only gather records on a relatively small percentage of the traffic traversing their networks. What they do collect is immensely useful for cybersecurity, to be sure—this capability is a mainstay of ISP managed security services, used for identifying intrusions and compromised computers. But because the traffic records are only sampled, it is impossible to reliably and comprehensively detect threats, identify the origin of attacks, identify the command and control nodes controlling the operations, and provide early warning and characterization of major attacks in real time.

Providing warning and situational awareness for defending DOD networks, federal and state government networks, and those of critical infrastructure will require substantially greater net flow data collection and analysis. It is incumbent on DOD to invest in technology to make it easier and less expensive to achieve the scale required for the private sector to potentially assist the government in defending the country.

DISA's CDC is already the focus for DOD's research on the comprehensive collection and analysis of flow data records on the traffic that enters and leaves the Department. The CDC hosts technologies developed and being investigated by DISA and USDI. The committee believes that other commercial companies have additional capabilities to apply to this problem.

Department of Defense use of National Security Agency cloud computing database and intelligence community cloud computing infrastructure and services (sec. 929)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of the National Security Agency's (NSA) Accumulo cloud computing database by other Department of Defense (DOD) components after September 30, 2013, unless the Chief Information Officer certifies that there are no viable commercial open source databases that have the security features of Accumulo, or that Accumulo itself has become a successful open source database project. The provision also would require that Department of Defense and intelligence community officials coordinate fully on the use by DOD components of cloud computing infrastructure and services offered by the intelligence community for purposes other than intelligence analysis to ensure consistency with the DOD information technology efficiencies initiative, data center and server consolidation plans, and cybersecurity plans and policies.

The committee applauds NSA's decision to adopt open source architectures and software for most of its cloud computing development. However, the committee disagrees with NSA's decision to de-

velop its own cloud computing database—called Accumulo—rather than adapt an open source version of the Google BigTable product. The committee understands that NSA decided to build a government solution several years ago because the open source systems lacked security features that NSA considers essential. In hindsight, the committee believes it would have been smarter for NSA to have worked with industry and the open source community to add NSA's security features to the open source database systems. Indeed, the committee believes that NSA should pursue that course now.

The downside of using a government-unique database is that, compared to open source products, there will be far fewer developers contributing to technology advances, and all of the applications, analytic tools, and functionality that the open source community and commercial industry are developing for cloud computing will not be compatible or interoperable with the NSA database, depriving the government of valuable innovation. The committee believes it is very likely that the rapidly expanding and innovating cloud computing industry will pass NSA by in a hurry, with lagging performance and higher costs. The consequences would not be confined to NSA, since the Army intelligence community has already adopted the NSA cloud architecture, and NSA is strongly urging the entire Department of Defense to do likewise. One of NSA's arguments is that the security features of Accumulo are essential for the cybersecurity of DOD as a whole.

NSA is making an effort to heal its divergence from the open source community by proposing Accumulo as an open source project under the Apache Foundation as a competitor to existing Apache Foundation open source databases like HBase and Cassandra, which are widely used and supported in industry.

The committee believes it is important to ensure that there are options available if Accumulo does not in fact become a viable and widely supported open source project. The committee is aware of commercial interest in the cell-level data tagging security features that NSA built into Accumulo. These features should be as useful to industry clients who need to protect and control access to the data resident in cloud facilities as they are to the intelligence community and DOD.

If Accumulo is successful, or if the commercial open source community produces nothing comparable to Accumulo's security features, this provision would permit Accumulo to be used in DOD outside of NSA. But if Accumulo is not an open source success, and if industry follows NSA's security lead, the Department should use a commercial product. This provision would give NSA almost 2 years since it made the Accumulo open source proposal to Apache to succeed. The deadline in this provision is also sufficiently distant to enable DOD components and industry to plan accordingly.

Under the direction of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and NSA are planning to provide cloud infrastructure and software "as a service" to all of the intelligence community. As noted, NSA is offering a government implementation of open source standards. CIA is offering a competitively awarded commercial solution. These cloud services would cover all manner of computing needs and capabilities, not just intelligence analysis. This provision is also intended to ensure that DOD com-

ponents' use of these cloud services is consistent with DOD information technology policies and plans. The committee notes that the software services that the CIA may offer to DOD customers could include analytic databases like HBase and Cassandra, and other commercial open source products, potentially providing an alternative to Accumulo.

Electro-optical imagery (sec. 930)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to sustain through fiscal year 2013 the commercial imagery collection capacity planned under the Enhanced View program approved in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

This provision would require the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a comprehensive analysis of imagery requirements for the Department of Defense (DOD). The provision would also require a study of the potential role of commercial-class imagery in meeting the needs of the government. This provision would require the completion of these studies in time to inform decisions on the fiscal year 2014 budget and the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

This provision would require the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Director to examine whether the administration's proposed actions on commercial imagery are consistent with Presidential policy directives, the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), and statute, all of which use similar language regarding the use of commercial products and capabilities. The President's most recent National Space Policy, for example, directs the Executive Branch to "purchase and use commercial space capabilities and services to the maximum practical extent when such capabilities and services are available in the marketplace and meet United States Government requirements [and] modify commercial space capabilities and services to meet government requirements when existing commercial capabilities and services do not fully meet these requirements and the potential modification represents a more cost-effective and timely acquisition approach for the government."

Similarly, the FAR requires government agencies to "determine if commercial items or, to the extent commercial items suitable to meet the agency's needs are not available, nondevelopmental items are available that meet the agency's requirements, could be modified to meet the agency's requirements, or could meet the agency's requirements if those requirements were modified to a reasonable extent." Very similar language is contained in section 2377 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee has been unhappy with Executive Branch planning for imagery collection from space for years. A series of very expensive programmatic debacles by the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) was followed by years of chaotic lurches in policy and program planning that reflected deep conflicts among the organizations responsible for operational requirements, acquisition oversight in DOD, oversight of intelligence in DOD, the imagery functional manager in the intelligence community, the NRO, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI).

Several years ago, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council stated that DOD required a more survivable wartime capability to collect wide-area imagery at moderate resolution, and advocated a larger constellation of commercial satellites to meet this requirement.

The Vice Chairman subsequently proposed that commercial satellites, with some performance modifications, be acquired as the primary means of collecting electro-optical imagery from space for DOD and the intelligence community, based on modeling and analysis conducted through the Joint Staff.

The Director of National Intelligence (DNI) rejected that proposal in favor of evolving legacy government-developed capabilities and attempting to rapidly develop new ones. This debate was carried to the White House before it was short-circuited by an agreement struck between the DNI and the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense agreed that DOD would not challenge the NRO's plan to acquire new imaging capabilities. But the Secretary of Defense concluded that the DNI's plan presented significant risks of gaps in capability and that prudence dictated an expansion of commercial imaging capability to meet DOD wartime requirements and to mitigate the risk of collection shortfalls.

This plan was put into effect at a vigorous pace. The government appealed to the commercial data provider companies to more than double their on-orbit collection capacity in a short time with the promise that the government would consume a large proportion of that capacity over a 10-year period. The commercial data providers, on the basis of this government commitment, proceeded towards adding the equivalent of two more satellites that would be available to meet government requirements.

Meanwhile, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) continued to study the potential for commercial-class satellites to meet all of the government's needs. The committee commissioned an evaluation by its scientific advisory body, building on the previous assessments of the former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that concluded that enhanced commercial satellites could meet or exceed the overwhelming majority of electro-optical imaging requirements at less cost and risk, and that such an approach would provide greater resilience and survivability, and a broader, competitive industrial base.

The DNI then sponsored its own analysis, which concluded that a larger number of smaller commercial satellites would not be less expensive than the satellite capabilities the government planned to acquire. The Senate Committee on Armed Services directed an additional analysis by the Joint Staff and the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office to establish a new requirements baseline and the cost of meeting those requirements with alternative spacecraft designs in the classified annex to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). DOD declined to conduct this analysis.

After deciding that commercial-class imaging satellites should not replace the satellites built under NRO program management, the ODNI and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) in late 2011 took the position that the commercial augmentation program approved by former Secretary of Defense Gates

was not needed and should be terminated in order to save money. This proposal was not based on a new requirements assessment, or a risk assessment, but nonetheless was presented to Congress in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2013. The Office of Management and Budget allowed the drastic cutback to commercial imagery to be presented to Congress with the fiscal year 2013 budget, but directed ODNI, USDI, and the Joint Staff to study whether this action was warranted.

This obviously reverses the proper order of events. Appropriate reexamination of the foundation for a major program established by the Secretary of Defense and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should precede a decision to terminate it.

The need for care is underscored by the fact that the plan presented in the budget request would result in the elimination of one of the two competing commercial data provider companies from government procurement, and could result in the collapse of one of the companies or a merger or acquisition. In that eventuality, it appears that the government's impetuous actions would be the determining cause: it was the government that encouraged the two companies to dramatically expand their collection capacity, including by borrowing money to accelerate satellite acquisitions; and when the government then just as suddenly announced that it no longer wanted this additional capacity, the stock price of both companies plummeted. While the government is not legally liable, the government's wild swing in demand has exposed two healthy companies to financial risk, and, if one is forced to exit the business, will lead to a monopoly in the market and a narrowing of the government's options for future procurements.

The committee believes that the status quo ante should be restored, as far as possible, until additional studies are conducted to allow both the Executive Branch and Congress to make informed decisions.

The committee believes that there is ample evidence that commercial imaging capabilities could today satisfy a large majority of military requirements, and, if modified for enhancements, could meet all but the most stressing requirements. In the case of the most stressing requirements, the question is whether the benefit of meeting them is justified by the marginal cost of doing so. As noted above, the ODNI study concluded that meeting the government's needs for electro-optical imagery from space can be accomplished better and at somewhat less cost by a government acquisition of a different design. The committee believes that additional, independent analysis of this contention is essential.

The ODNI and USDI concluded that the government is acquiring capabilities to collect more imagery than is required, and recommended lopping off commercial acquisitions. In light of the pressures on the budget, and the policy expressed by former Secretary of Defense Gates to seek the "80 percent solution" rather than "exquisite" ones, three questions need to be addressed:

(1) Is the originally planned collection capacity actually in excess of DOD's wartime requirements?

(2) If yes, is the correct response to reduce commercial acquisitions or to scale back or eliminate the government-developed solution? and

(3) If no, should the original Enhanced View commercial imagery program be restored and sustained or should the government-developed solution be expanded?

The committee also directs the CBO Director to make use of performance modeling results and analyses already available from the Joint Staff, industry, and the SSCI; and cost modeling, existing cost estimates, and actuals from ongoing programs in government and industry. As necessary and appropriate, the Director should conduct new cost modeling and estimating to ensure that a variety of reasonable assumptions and acquisition approaches are considered to achieve confidence in cost comparisons.

This provision would authorize $125.0 million to sustain the level of commercial imagery collection at roughly the level that will be maintained throughout fiscal year 2012 and through the first quarter of fiscal year 2013 through existing Service Level Agreements.

Software licenses of the Department of Defense (sec. 931)

The Department of Defense's (DOD) $37.0 billion information technology (IT) budget request constitutes almost half of the Federal Government's overall IT budget for fiscal year 2013. Given the size of this investment, it is important that the Department rationalize current IT outlays and identify those investments that need to be integrated with other solutions or curtailed to ensure the most efficient use of resources. One area of duplication and inefficiency identified by the Government Accountability Office and by the Department is that of software licenses. In addition, the committee has recognized that application and software reduction is a key component of IT efficiencies, as referenced in section 2867 (b)(1)(A)(v) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

The committee recommends a provision that requires the DOD Chief Information Officer (CIO) to conduct, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, a Department-wide inventory of software licenses, examine license utilization rates, and assess the current and future Departmental need for software licenses. Based on the results of this assessment, the CIO shall establish a plan to align the number and type of software licenses with the needs of the Department. Upon completion of the inventory and assessment, the CIO or their designee shall brief the results to the congressional defense committees.

Immediately upon completion of the inventory and assessment, the CIO is directed to provide the data and findings to the Comptroller General of the United States. Not later than May 1, 2014, the Comptroller General will deliver to the congressional defense committees a review of the Department's assessment and performance plan.

The committee recognizes that defining the scope of software license duplication throughout the military departments, components, and major commands will be challenging, and urges the CIO to apply the utmost diligence in the undertaking of this inventory and assessment. Lastly, the committee acknowledges that the CIO may need the ability to grant exceptions to certain instances of software, depending upon individual circumstances, such as classification.

Defense Clandestine Service (sec. 932)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of appropriated Military Intelligence Program (MIP) funds in fiscal year 2013 to exceed the number of personnel conducting or supporting human intelligence within the Department of Defense (DOD) as of April 20, 2012. This provision would also require the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) to provide an estimate of the total cost of the Defense Clandestine Service (DCS) to the congressional defense and intelligence committees. This cost estimate should look at the total costs of the DCS, including whether that cost is incurred in the MIP, in the National Intelligence Program, or in other non-intelligence funding for the Department of Defense (e.g. Major Force Program 11 funding for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM)). The estimate should include costs in the out years of the future-years defense program and beyond, especially those associated with closing existing personnel basing; creating new basing arrangements; and supporting overseas deployments.

The provision also would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) to provide a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by February 1, 2013, that provides or explains:

- where DOD case officers will be deployed or based and a schedule for those deployments;
- certification that the prospective locations can and will accommodate these deployments;
- the objectives established for each military service, USSOCOM, and the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) to improve career management for case officers, and the plans to achieve the objectives of the DCS; and
- any Memoranda of Agreement or Understanding necessary to implement planned reforms with other departments and agencies and between DOD components.

The committee appreciates the fact that the USDI and the Director of the DIA, in initiating the DCS, intend to make reforms to the Defense Human Intelligence (HUMINT) Service to correct longstanding problems. These problems include inefficient utilization of personnel trained at significant expense to conduct clandestine HUMINT; poor or non-existent career management for trained HUMINT personnel; cover challenges; and unproductive deployment locations. Multiple studies since the end of the Cold War document these deficiencies, and they led the Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community, chaired by two former Secretaries of Defense, to recommend transferring to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) all responsibilities for the clandestine recruitment of human sources, utilizing military personnel on detail from the DOD as necessary.

The committee notes that President Bush authorized 50 percent growth in the CIA's case officer workforce, which followed significant growth under President Clinton. Since 9/11, DOD's case officer ranks have grown substantially as well. The committee is concerned that, despite this expansion and the winding down of two overseas conflicts that required large HUMINT resources, DOD believes that its needs are not being met.

The committee concludes that DOD needs to demonstrate that it can improve the management of clandestine HUMINT before undertaking any further expansion. Furthermore, if DOD is able to utilize existing resources much more effectively, the case could be made that investment in this area could decline, rather than remain steady or grow, to assist the Department in managing its fiscal and personnel challenges.

Authority for short-term extension of lease for aircraft supporting the Blue Devil intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance program (sec. 933)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of the Air Force to extend or renew the current lease of aircraft to support the Blue Devil intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) program. Section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, limits such leases to 5 years. The lease for the Air Force Blue Devil ISR aircraft deployed first in Iraq and now in Afghanistan will expire in September 2013. This ISR system is extremely useful, having contributed directly to the take-down of large numbers of high-value targets in the Kandahar region. Theater commanders have requested that this asset be sustained indefinitely in theater. The committee is deeply concerned that, despite a year's notice from the committee that plans had to be made to address this lease expiration, the Department of Defense has yet to decide on a definite course of action to sustain this capability.

The committee understands that the Air Force leadership and the ISR Task Force are seriously examining alternatives to comply with section 2401, including buying the existing Blue Devil aircraft, buying new C–12 aircraft, modifying existing Liberty aircraft, and modifying the Reaper unmanned aerial vehicles equipped with Gorgon Stare wide-area motion imagery systems.

Based on information that the Air Force provided to the committee, the most attractive option is to purchase additional C–12 aircraft. This option would deliver the needed capability the soonest. All other options under consideration take considerably more time, or would entail reducing deployed ISR support in order to modify existing aircraft, or would not satisfy requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Director of the ISR Task Force, to provide a recommendation on a way forward by September 1, 2012, along with a program schedule that would enable Congress to set an appropriate end date for the lease extension.

Sense of the Senate on potential security risks to Department of Defense networks (sec. 934)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate regarding potential risks to the security of Department of Defense (DOD) networks from the incorporation of equipment and software from foreign sources, and the need for DOD authority and processes to mitigate such risks beyond those that already exist for covered National Security Systems acquired by DOD. The committee provided existing authority to address cybersecurity supply chain risks to DOD National Security Systems

in section 806 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

The provision acknowledges the difficulty involved in blocking sales of information technology systems and services due to concerns about cybersecurity while maintaining our commitment to free trade and fair and transparent competition.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

National Language Service Corps (sec. 941)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (52 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a National Language Service Corps to provide a pool of civilian personnel with foreign language skills who agree to provide foreign language services to the Department of Defense or another department or agency of the United States.

Report on education and training and promotion rates for pilots of remotely piloted aircraft (sec. 942)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2013, on remotely piloted aircraft (RPA), pilot promotion, and education rates. The provision specifies that the report includes the following elements: an in-depth analysis of the causes for persistently lower average promotion and education rates of RPA pilots; the long-term impact on the Air Force if these low rates are sustained; a plan to remedy these imbalances; and near-term and longer-term actions the Air Force intends to undertake to implement the plan. The report must also provide an explanation of any direct or indirect impact of plan implementation on the achievement and sustainment of the 65 RPA combat air patrol objective.

The committee is very concerned about the consistently downward trend in promotion rates of RPA operators. Over the course of the last 5 years, promotion percentages from Majors Promotion Boards have declined from 96 percent to 78 percent, compared to a consistent range of between 96 and 91 percent for their peers. Education rates also consistently lag those for manned aircraft pilots at all levels. It is simply unacceptable for service as an RPA operator to be relegated to substandard status in terms of personnel qualifications or treatment. The committee expects the Air Force to vigorously address this problem.

Budget Items

Operationally Responsive Space Funding

For Fiscal Year 2013, the Department of Defense proposed to deauthorize the Operationally Responsive Space Office and move $10,000,000 from the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program (PE 0604857F, line 54) to three other programs, $3,000,000 to the Technology Transition Program, PE 0604858F, line 55, $2 million to the Space Based Infrared Program, PE0604441F, line 69, $2,000,000 to Space Control Technology, PE 0603438F, line 32,

$1,500,000 to Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite program, PE 0603430F, line 30 and $1,500,000 to the Global Positioning System III Operational Control Segment, PE 0603423F, line 112. The Committee rejects this transfer and restores the $10,000,000 to the ORS PE 0604857F.

The Committee increases PE 0604857F by $35,000,000 to $45,000,000 total to continue working with the COCOMs and in particular PACOM on building responsive low cost satellites similar to ORS–1. This is in addition to the legislative provision which direct the ORS program to build a low cost weather satellite from the weather satellite follow on program funding.

Space Test Program

The budget request for fiscal year 2013 included $10,051,000 in PE 65864F for the Space Test Program. This is a decrease in funding from the $47,926,000 requested and authorized for fiscal year 2012. The Department of Defense has also proposed to terminate the program. This low cost program, created by the Commander, Air Force Systems Command, General Schriever, in 1965, has been the principal mechanism that has put experimental payloads into space. By offering low cost access to space this program has led to a family of important civil and military satellite systems we rely on today, including Milstar, Advanced Extremely High Frequency, Global Positioning System, Defense Support Program, Defense Satellite Communications System, Tracking & Data Relay Satellite, and the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program. More importantly this program serves as the space gateway to universities and military academies, and for their students to put payloads into space and in turn create our future cadre of space leaders. When combined with the proposed termination of the Operationally Responsive Space program, the termination of these two efforts amounts to no more than $170.0 million but has many times the impact on the ability of the Department of Defense to innovate and lower the cost of future satellite systems. The committee rejects the proposed termination of the Space Test Program and increases the program by $37,875,000 to restore it to the prior fiscal year's funding level.

The committee admonishes the Department to look carefully at the combined effects of terminating two programs that have synergistically worked together to lead innovations in national security space while dramatically reducing costs.

Items of Special Interest

Determination of accuracy of spectrum auction proceeds

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review past spectrum auctions (including those for national security systems) performed by Executive Branch agencies to determine historical differences between initial relocation cost estimates and actual auction proceeds. As part of this review, the committee directs the GAO to update its 2001 report to the congressional defense committees on the auction of the 1755–1850 MHz band. The committee asks the GAO to determine if the cost of vacating or sharing subsets of the 1755–1850 MHz band is suffi-

ciently captured in estimates and whether auction proceeds are able to compensate vacating such subsets. The committee directs an initial briefing no later than February 28, 2013.

Development of cyber security expertise and partnerships

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to support multi-disciplinary programs of study and research that focus on developing U.S. cyber security expertise and tackling vital cyber security issues, such as the protection of critical infrastructure on which the Department of Defense relies for critical mission capability, and which the Department would be called upon to defend in the event of a cyber attack on the United States.

Special effort should be made to glean best practices from already established programs, nationally and internationally, at military and civilian organizations and institutions of higher education. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of the enactment of this Act on potential partnerships and methods for gleaning best practices for personnel development.

Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program

Since the committee first raised concerns about the Department of Defense's strategy to acquire space launch under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program last year, the Department has moved in a positive direction. First, whereas the space portfolio appeared disconnected from the Air Force's acquisition oversight apparatus, this portfolio is now properly aligned under the Air Force senior acquisition executive. This will help ensure that space launch programs are subjected to appropriate oversight and acquisition discipline. Second, the newly designated Program Executive Officer (PEO) for Space Launch will be able to focus more on cost, schedule, and performance than before, when the PEO space portfolio encompassed space launch and did not allow for sufficient focus on EELV issues. Third, whereas the System Program Director (SPD) and program managers in this portfolio previously focused on operational mission success, there now appears to be an interest in achieving a proper balance on both mission success and cost. Finally, whereas the SPD tended to have a "stand-off" approach to potential new entrants and little interest in creating a competitive environment conducive to driving the costs of space launch down, today the Air Force appears amendable to embracing new entrants and the prospect of competition more and has developed a path to certification.

The committee's original concerns arose from concerns raised by prospective new entrants that the 2011 proposed block buy of launch vehicles from the incumbent EELV provider would effectively freeze them out of the EELV launch market until 2020. This concern was magnified by a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report in September 2011, that recommended that the Department assess engine costs and mission assurance activities; reassess the length of the proposed block buy; and consider how to address broader launch acquisition and technology development issues. With the Department having generally concurred with GAO's recommendations, Congress required the Department to ex-

plain how it intends to implement each of GAO's recommendations, or explain how it will otherwise address the deficiencies identified in GAO's report. The Department's deadline was March 31, 2012, and the report was delivered to Congress April 19, 2012. The committee understands that GAO is currently assessing the information contained in the report as required by section 839 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

In complying with the requirement under section 839 that EELV be re-designated as a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) or otherwise provide to Congress and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics all of the reports on cost, schedule, and performance that would be required if it were designated as an MDAP, on April 12, 2012, the Department notified the committee that the EELV program exceeded the "critical" cost thresholds specified under section 2433 of title 10, United States Code ("Nunn-McCurdy") for both Program Acquisition Unit Cost and Average Procurement Cost. The breach was based on the program's 2007 current baseline estimate and the 2004 original baseline estimate exceeding 25 and 50 percent respectively. The committee understands that the Department will certify to Congress by July 13, 2012, that the necessary steps have been taken to meet the requirements of section 2433(b) of title 10, United States Code.

As part of the Department's effort to restructure the EELV program to provide cost transparency and promote competition from new entrants, the Department has issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to the incumbent EELV contractor that will allow it to obtain and carefully analyze certified cost data to build a pricing matrix consisting of the number of cores versus years over the future-years defense program (FYDP). This matrix will help the Department structure a contract to achieve optimal pricing while allowing for "on-ramps" of new entrants who meet the Department's new entrant mission assurance criteria.

The Department has told the committee that it is restructuring the Launch Services contract from a stand-alone contract with the incumbent EELV provider to one that is integrated with the acquisition of the booster, mission support, and payload integration to reflect the total cost to launch. This integrated contract will be used to compare amongst multiple competitors. The committee has been concerned about the distinction between Launch Capability and Launch Services that have been structured into the EELV program and how this distinction renders opaque to congressional oversight of the program's true overall costs. For this reason, the committee will ensure that whatever decision is made by the Air Force regarding the next EELV contract is not analytically based inappropriately on this distinction. The committee intends to closely examine how the Air Force addresses this issue more broadly as its effort to restructure this program to accommodate competition matures, and will address this issue further as needed.

To further assist new entrants into the EELV market, the Department will use a bridging contract called "Orbital Suborbital Program–3" or "OSP–3" which will be used to launch low-risk na-

tional security payloads and in turn step the new entrants through the Department's mission assurance criteria.

Generally, the committee is encouraged by the steps that the Department has taken to help control EELV costs and encourage new entrants to provide competition in the EELV market. The committee has been informed that the Department will have a final EELV contract structure in July 2012, that they believe will optimize cost per launch with the incumbent EELV contractor while providing "on-ramps" for new entrants who satisfy mission assurance criteria under the OSP–3 contract. Given the utility of competition to ensuring the affordability of access to space, the committee believes that whatever contracting structure is ultimately selected must be sufficiently flexible to provide meaningful and realistic opportunities for duly certified new entrants to participate in the EELV program at any point within the selected contract duration that a new entrant (if any) is duly certified within that selected contract duration.

The committee will carefully review the restructured EELV contract that the Department will present in July 2012, in light of all of the concerns it has raised to date to ensure that national security access to space is maintained, while balanced by bringing competition into the EELV launch market.

Navigation location and tracking in GPS-denied environments

Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) based navigation systems have become critical to mission success for the Department of Defense in areas such as situational awareness and precision weapon employment. Command and control of U.S. forces is dependent on reliable and accurate GPS signal reception. Our forces are currently operating in complex terrain and environments which can, on occasion, introduce unreliable GPS navigation signals for the warfighter. Current GPS navigation systems can be challenged with line-of-sight constraints such as mountains, dense tree cover, and complex structured environments and have minimal, if any, ability to navigate and/or track inside buildings, caves, underground structures and other challenging locations.

Additionally, future force initiatives recognize the possibility that a technologically advanced foe could disrupt satellite based systems such as GPS. Reliable location through the GPS satellite constellation facilitates uninterrupted use of ground-to-ground precision missiles, navigation, and command and control. Recent events have pointed to hostile nation states introducing jamming in an effort to block or degrade GPS signals. The Department of Defense must develop and incorporate training and contingency operations in a GPS denial environment to ensure mission success.

Reports on airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements and investment strategy

The committee is aware of the increased demand for persistent intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) resources to meet each combatant command's full range of military operations. The committee acknowledges the Department of Defense has had

to make difficult decisions on the acquisition, procurement, and allocation of its persistent ISR assets due to fiscal constraints alone.

However, Congress has not been provided a formal report outlining the Department of Defense's long-term investment strategy to develop, procure, and sustain the necessary ISR platforms to meet these ISR collection requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, working in conjunction with the combatant commands, to provide the congressional defense and intelligence committees a classified report, not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, that identifies the enduring requirements for persistent ISR collection in support of each combatant command's full range of military operations. Further, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, working in conjunction with the service secretaries, to provide a long-term investment strategy, describing the fixed-wing persistent ISR capabilities necessary in both permissive and non-permissive environments to meet those collection requirements and the resources necessary to develop, procure or sustain those platforms. This investment strategy shall also be provided concurrently in a written classified report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act.

Report on cost savings in the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System Program

The committee believes that improvements to the space situational awareness and space command and control capabilities of the United States are critical, and the Department of Defense has the opportunity to achieve efficiency and cost effectiveness by utilizing, to the maximum extent possible, readily available commercial and government-developed capabilities. The committee is aware that the Air Force has made changes in its acquisition process, and the committee fully expects the Air Force to pursue a tailored incremental information technology approach with priority given to transition from the legacy Space Defense Operations Center system by 2014. The committee also expects the Air Force to utilize and achieve cost savings by pursuing a tailored incremental acquisition approach that leverages investment in existing government prototypes and industry applications to rapidly deliver needed capabilities.

The committee directs the Air Force to provide a report within 180 days of enactment of this Act that: (1) describes the government and commercial technologies that can be incorporated into the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System Program; (2) quantifies the cost savings that can be achieved by using commercial items to the maximum extent practical; and (3) summarizes how the acquisition strategy will incorporate commercial technologies.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to $5.0 billion of funds authorized in division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

Authority to transfer of funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to sustain nuclear weapons modernization (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of, subject to regular reprogramming guidelines, $150.0 million from the Department of Defense to the National Nuclear Security Administration if the fiscal year 2013 authorization and appropriations levels fall below the level outlined for fiscal year 2013 as found in the report from section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), which is $7.9 billion.

Audit readiness of Department of Defense statements of budgetary resources (sec. 1003)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to incorporate the goal established by the Secretary of Defense of validating the statement of budgetary resources of the Department of Defense (DOD) as ready for audit by the end of fiscal year 2014. The provision would require the DOD Chief Management Officer and the Chief Management Officers of the military departments to ensure that the plans to achieve this goal minimize one-time fixes and manual work-arounds, are sustainable and affordable, and will not delay full auditability of DOD's financial statements.

Report on effects of budget sequestration on the Department of Defense (sec. 1004)

The committee recommends a provision that would make certain findings and require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report no later than August 15, 2012 on the impact on the Department of Defense of the sequestration of funds authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2013 for the Department if automatically triggered on January 2, 2013.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

Extension of authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorism activities (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 1 fiscal year the support by joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1004 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is currently using this authority to conduct only one operation. While the committee is pleased to learn of the Department's judicious use of this authority, the committee also believes there are additional activities that could potentially be conducted, particularly in Northwest Africa.

Requirement for biennial certification on provision of support for counter-drug activities to certain foreign governments (sec. 1012)

This section would amend section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1006 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), to require biennial certification rather than annual certification for the Department of Defense to provide additional support for counterdrug activities to certain foreign governments.

Authority to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1013)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit, for 1 fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense to expend not more than $50.0 million to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign of the Government of Colombia. The provision would permit the Secretary to provide: (1) logistics support, services, and supplies; (2) the types of support authorized under section 1004(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), as amended; and (3) the types of support authorized under 1033(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as amended. The provision would prohibit U.S. personnel from participating in any combat operation in connection with assistance provided under this authority. Further, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on any assistance provided pursuant to this provision to the congressional defense committees on an annual basis.

The committee notes that the provision is a modification of section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended most recently by section 1007 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The committee's intent is to permit the Secretary to continue all ongoing operations in support of the security forces of the Government of Colombia, including advise and assist operations which have been an important ele-

ment of U.S. support to the Government of Colombia. The committee's underlying intent is to enhance congressional oversight of these activities and provide additional transparency to outside observers without degrading ongoing operations. The committee recognizes that, although the Government of Colombia has made significant progress combating narcotics trafficking and designated terrorist organizations, this authority is still required to assist the Government of Colombia consolidate the notable gains made over the past decade.

Quarterly reports on use of funds in the Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide account (sec. 1014)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit on a quarterly basis reports to the congressional defense committees setting forth, by project code, a description of all of the expenditures of funds and expenditures to support foreign counterdrug activities from the Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities Defense-wide account. Further, the provision would repeal section 1022 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), as most recently amended by section 1008 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Retirement of naval vessels (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chief of Naval Operations to produce a report that would set forth a comprehensive description of the current requirements of the Navy for combatant vessels of the Navy, including submarines. The provision would also require that, if the number of these vessels is less than 313 ships, the report would have to include the justification of the Chief of Naval Operations for that smaller number, and an explanation of how that smaller number is consistent with the recently revised strategic guidance issued by the President and the Secretary of Defense in 2012.

Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) conveyed the sense of Congress that "the Navy should meet its requirement for a 313-ship fleet until such time that modifications to the Navy's ship fleet force structure are warranted, and the Secretary of the Navy provides Congress with a justification of any proposed modifications, supported by rigorous and sufficient warfighting analysis." The Chiefs of Naval Operations since 2006 have consistently stated that they need a fleet of 313 ships to do their jobs. Nevertheless, the Navy has not achieved this number of ships in the fleet since falling below that level in the 1990s.

In testimony before the congressional defense committees and other public remarks, senior Navy leaders, including the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and the Chief of Naval Operations, have noted that the Navy is conducting a new review of Navy force structure review. Navy officials say that they

have not completed the review, but that it will probably reduce the goal for fleet size to approximately 300 ships.

The committee is concerned that the Navy or the Department of Defense (DOD) may propose reductions in the Navy's ship fleet force structure without sufficient justification. The committee reminds the Navy and DOD that the statement of the sense of Congress remains in effect, and that the committee expects that any proposed change in goal for the size of the Navy's fleet will be accompanied by rigorous and sufficient analysis that is convincing.

The committee doubts that neither a strategy shifting DOD's focus to the Pacific and Asia, nor the demands of current operational requirements, nor increased investment by potential adversaries in naval forces and anti-access and area-denial capabilities warrant a reduction in the required Navy fleet size.

Termination of a Maritime Prepositioning Ship squadron (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit funding to terminate a Maritime Prepositioning Ship Squadron until a report is received on the impact of the termination.

Sense of Congress on recapitalization for the Navy and Coast Guard (sec. 1023)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that:

(1) the sea services of the United States should be funded and maintained to provide the broad spectrum of capabilities required to protect the national security of the United States;

(2) such capabilities should include:

(a) the ability to project United States power rapidly anywhere on the globe without the need for host nation basing permission or long and potentially vulnerable logistics supply lines;

(b) the ability to land and recover maritime forces from the sea for direct combat action, to evacuate United States citizens from hostile situations, and to provide humanitarian assistance where needed;

(c) the ability to operate from the subsurface with overpowering conventional combat power, as well as strategic deterrence; and

(d) the ability to operate in collaboration with United States maritime partners in the common interest of preventing piracy at sea and maintaining the commercial sea lanes available for global commerce.

(3) the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, should maintain the recapitalization plans for the Navy as a priority in all future force structure decisions; and

(4) the Secretary of Homeland Security should maintain the recapitalization plans for the Coast Guard as a priority in all future force structure decisions.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

Extension of certain prohibitions and requirements relating to detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2013 two restrictions relating to detainees at the military detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

The provision would extend for 1 year the restriction in section 1026 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1566) on the use of funds made available to the Department of Defense to build any facility in the United States to house Guantanamo detainees.

The provision would also extend for 1 year the certification requirements for transfers of Guantanamo detainees to foreign countries and other foreign entities.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

Enhancement of responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding the National Military Strategy (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to consolidate and clarify the requirements for the submission or update, if any, of the National Military Strategy, and the annual submission of the Chairman's Risk Assessment. The amendment would also clarify the requirement for a Secretary of Defense's Risk Mitigation Plan to accompany the risk assessment if the Chairman identifies significant risk in accomplishing the objectives of the National Military Strategy.

Modification of authority on training of special operations forces with friendly foreign forces (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 2011 of title 10, United States Code, to state that the purposes of the Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) authority are to support the training of U.S. Special Operations Forces and the armed forces and other security forces of a friendly foreign country. Consistent with current practice, the recommended modification would also require the Secretary of Defense to coordinate with the Secretary of State prior to the initiation of any such training. Lastly, the recommended modification would authorize unspecified minor military construction projects, up to $250,000, that are in direct support of authorized training.

The committee notes that the JCET authority is an effective tool for improving the language and cultural expertise of U.S. Special Operations Forces while providing opportunities to practice skills needed to conduct a variety of missions, including foreign internal defense, unconventional warfare, and counterterrorism. The committee also recognizes the inherent benefit of JCET events in building the capacity of foreign partners. The committee notes that the JCET authority allows flexibility for U.S. Special Operations Forces to engage with appropriate partner nation armed forces and other

security forces, including those that conduct border and maritime security, internal defense and security, and counterterrorism operations.

The committee believes the recommended modifications to the JCET authority more accurately reflect the current use of JCETs as a training and engagement tool for geographic combatant commanders and country teams. The committee notes that over the past decade the Department of Defense has used the JCET authority to support the development of national militaries and other security forces in key regions. In countries of particular concern, the Department has sought to be more persistently engaged with partners. The committee believes such persistent engagements support our broader counterterrorism interests, ensure U.S. access and placement in key regions, and enable foreign militaries to better support ongoing multilateral operations. The recommended modifications are intended to increase the flexibility of the JCET authority to facilitate more persistent and enduring engagement with partner nation security forces while continuing to provide a benefit, but not necessarily the primary benefit, to U.S. Special Operations Forces.

Extension of authority to provide assured business guarantees to carriers participating in Civil Reserve Air Fleet (sec. 1043)

Section 9515 of title 10, United States Code, provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to guarantee higher minimum levels of business than would otherwise be authorized by law to United States passenger carrying air carriers participating in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet. This authority will expire on December 31, 2015.

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) extend the sunset date to 2020; and (2) permit the Secretary to expand the possible uses of these assured business guarantees to cargo carrying air carriers.

Participation of veterans in the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense (sec. 1044)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize veterans to participate in the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense for 1 year following discharge or separation from the armed forces.

Modification of the Ministry of Defense Advisors Program (sec. 1045)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the Ministry of Defense Advisors Program, established in section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to permit the Secretary of Defense to assign civilian employees of the Department of Defense as advisors to regional organizations with defense or security components and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

The committee believes that regional security and international security organizations play an important role in ensuring stability and security in a number of key regions around the globe. The committee further believes providing the Secretary with the authority

to assign individuals to these organizations is in U.S. national security interests and will assist the Secretary in influencing decisions and outcomes in various regional and international security organizations.

Interagency collaboration on unmanned aircraft systems (sec. 1046)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) amend section 1036(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to encourage technical collaboration and sharing of personnel, resources, and information among the Department of Defense (DOD), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); (2) direct the Secretary of Defense to collaborate with the FAA and NASA Administrators on solutions to the challenges of unmanned aerial system (UAS) integration into the National Airspace System (NAS); and (3) require the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report for a period of 5 years on the progress of research and development for UAS NAS integration and future funding requirements.

UASs have clearly demonstrated their immense value to DOD military capabilities in the global war on terrorism. Increasingly, UASs are contributing to missions of other agencies and departments within the United States. Large numbers of UASs now deployed overseas may be returned to the United States as the conflict in Afghanistan and operations elsewhere wind down in coming years, and new UASs are under development. Without the ability to operate freely and routinely in the NAS, UAS development and training—and ultimately operational capabilities—will be severely impacted.

As the committee has noted repeatedly in previous years, DOD's leadership belatedly realized how important and difficult UAS NAS integration would be. While progress has been made in the last 5 years, the pace of development must be accelerated; greater cross-agency collaboration and resource sharing will contribute to that objective.

DOD has invested significantly in resolving the technical challenges of UAS NAS integration, and this research and development and associated resources should be utilized for the benefit of this government-wide initiative, where applicable. The committee is encouraged by the relationship built between DOD, the FAA, and NASA for coordinating research and development and planning for this integration. The committee also recognizes the contribution that the Joint Planning and Development Office's (JDPO) report, "NextGen Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research, Development and Demonstration Roadmap," dated March 15, 2012, has made by providing a multi-agency perspective on the technology required to enable UAS operations and integration in the next-generation NAS. The committee supports and encourages a deeper collaborative relationship between DOD and its JPDO partners to expedite development of the necessary technologies and to avoid redundant activities.

Sense of Senate on notice to Congress on unfunded priorities (sec. 1047)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the service chiefs and the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command should provide to Congress, through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, a list of unfunded priorities, if any, within 45 days of the submission of their annual budget request.

Subtitle F—Reports

Report on strategic airlift aircraft (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report that sets forth various assessments related to: (1) possible Federal Aviation Administration certification for commercial use of a commercial variant of the C–17 aircraft, a retired C–17A aircraft, and a retired C–5A aircraft; and (2) the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) and the potential for using these aircraft to augment capability in participating CRAF air carriers. The Secretary would be required to submit that report not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Repeal of biennial report on the Global Positioning System (sec. 1062)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal a biennial report on global positioning systems prepared by the Department of Defense. This information can readily be obtained from the biennial Federal Radionavigation Plan saving approximately $150,000 each year in federal funds.

Repeal of annual report on threat posed by weapons of mass destruction, ballistic missiles, and cruise missiles (sec. 1063)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal an annual report that costs more than $1,000,000 annually to produce and such information can be obtained through normal requests to the intelligence agencies.

Subtitle G—Nuclear Matters

Strategic delivery system (sec. 1071)

The committee recommends a provision that requires the President to certify to the congressional defense committees whether plans to modernize strategic delivery systems are funded at a level equal to or more than that outlined in the November 2010 update to the plan found in section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). If the level of funding is less than that found in the November 2010 update, then the President must submit as part of the reporting requirements under section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), whether a lack of full funding will result in a loss of military capability.

If the President determines that the lack of full funding will result in a loss of military capability, he must submit with the section 1043 report a plan to preserve or retain the capability that would be lost, and a report that assesses the impact of the lack of full funding and a description of the funding required to restore or maintain the capability. In addition, a lack of full funding will require the President in the section 1043 report to certify adherence to declaration 12 of the New START Treaty concerning nuclear modernization.

Requirements definition for combined warhead for certain missile systems (sec. 1072)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Nuclear Weapons Council to define to Congress what a combined warhead is so that the 6.1 and 6.2 process will have clarity in the out-years.

The committee has found that contrary to statements made by the administration during 2010 hearings for the New START Treaty regarding a combined W88/W78 warhead as a way to save maintenance costs, that, the concept remains ill defined at the present time. Recent discussions have focused on two warhead systems (the W88 and W78) that now have interchangeable components.

Congressional Budget Office estimate of costs of nuclear weapons and delivery systems (sec. 1073)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Congressional Budget Office to obtain a 10 year cost estimate of nuclear weapons enterprise in the Departments of Defense and Energy.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Redesignation of Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies as the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (sec. 1081)

The committee recommends a provision that would, as requested by the Department of Defense, redesignate the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies as the William J. Perry Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies.

Technical amendments to repeal statutory references to United States Joint Forces Command (sec. 1082)

The committee recommends a provision, as requested by the Department of Defense, that would amend title 10, United States Code, to remove references to the United States Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) in order to reflect the disestablishment of USJFCOM effective August 4, 2011.

Sense of Congress on non-United States citizens who are graduates of United States educational institutions with advanced degrees in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (sec. 1083)

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of Congress that would strongly urge the Department of De-

fense to investigate innovative mechanisms to access the pool of talent of non-United States citizens with advanced scientific and technical degrees from United States institutions of higher learning.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) contains a provision directing the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of current and potential mechanisms to permit the Department of Defense to employ non-United States citizens with critical scientific and technical skills that are vital to the national security interests of the United States. The committee is awaiting this report, due by the end of calendar year 2012.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Senate Committee on Armed Services on April 17, 2012, Department of Defense science and technology executives expressed concern over the possible unintended consequences of taking significant action on this front. The committee understands the trepidation expressed by the service executives, but feels strongly that the most substantial unintended consequence of lack of action will be the significant loss of technical talent to the country.

Items of Special Interest

Arctic region

The committee recognizes the continued importance of the Arctic region to our broader national strategy. Declining ice cover continues to open the Arctic region and a concerted, systematic, and immediate effort should be undertaken to adequately protect the United States' security, environmental, energy, economic, and natural resource interests in the Arctic.

The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) and, in particular, U.S. Northern Command and the Department of the Navy, and other federal agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), through the U.S. Coast Guard, the Department of Commerce, through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the U.S. Arctic Research Commission, for their progress thus far in studying the region and defining the capabilities required to effectively operate in and protect the domain.

International and interagency collaboration is also needed to develop the necessary mapping and charting resources required for safe navigation and to promote security and economic interests. As sea ice recedes, timely weather forecasts and disaster warnings along with more baseline data will be required to conduct successful search and rescue missions. Search and rescue coordination, planning, and training for the Artic should be thoroughly analyzed and developed to ensure forces can successfully operate in the domain.

The committee recognizes the importance of DOD's involvement in interagency and international efforts to protect national security interests in the region and, accordingly, urges DOD to continue to work in concert with DHS to establish a formal chartered working group to pursue increasing Arctic capabilities in the areas of communications, maritime domain awareness, infrastructure, and pres-

ence, as was recommended by U.S. Northern Command and the U.S. Coast Guard in a joint White Paper dated March 13, 2012. The committee also urges the agencies to develop an investment strategy for funding emerging requirements in balance with a resource constrained environment.

B–52 Combat Network Communications Study

The B–52 Combat Network Communications (CONECT) program has been executing on cost and schedule and has successfully completed all Milestone C criteria. The Senate has concerns with the Air Force's decision to restructure the CONECT program to only replace the current Multi-Function Displays located at each of the crew stations, making the temporary Evolutionary Data Link modification permanent, and demoding the CONECT test aircraft. The committee understands that after the budget was released the Commander of the Air Force Global Strike Command asked that the decision to restructure CONECT be reconsidered. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to do so and to provide the congressional defense committees with a report assessing the available B–52 modernization options no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement

The committee recognizes that the analysis of alternatives for the current B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement (SR2) program certified that replacement of the 30 year APQ–166 is the best option. The APQ–166 Radar is increasingly expensive to maintain. The Air Force justification for the cancellation of the SR2 program in the fiscal year 2012 budget request is noted as funding being needed for higher priorities. However, the recent B–52 Strategic Radar Replacement Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) Final Report stated cost-effectiveness issues with the Air Force proposal. Maintaining the current radar system is more expensive than replacing it with a modern, in production, radar system as determined by the Air Force's Analysis of Alternatives. Therefore, the committee recommends pursuing the most cost-effective solution presented in the AOA.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to continue the effort in replacing the aging radar on B–52 aircraft.

Clarification of scope of requirements for periodic detention review of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

Section 1023 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) requires the Secretary of Defense to issue procedures implementing the periodic review process required by Executive Order 13567 for individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The Department of Defense has requested legislation clarifying congressional intent that this provision does not require periodic review boards for Guantanamo detainees who have already been designated for

transfer or conditional detention, or who have charges pending or a judgment of conviction.

The committee concludes that such legislation is not needed. Section 1023(b)(3) requires the Executive branch to apply the periodic review process of Executive Order 13567 to any detainee who may be brought to Guantanamo Bay in the future, but does not change the scope of Executive Order 13567 as to which detainees at Guantanamo Bay as of the date of enactment of the provision are required to be provided periodic review boards in accordance with that process. The committee understands that under section 3 of the Executive Order, a periodic review board must be provided to any current Guantanamo detainee who has been: (1) designated for continued law of war detention; or (2) referred for prosecution (except for those detainees against whom charges are pending or a judgment of conviction has been entered). Section 1023(b)(3) does not change these requirements.

Combat Network Communications Technology

The President's budget request for fiscal year 2013 for the Combat Network Communications Technology was significantly restructured, delaying the production and deployment from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2015. The committee is fully supportive of this important communications backbone to the B–52 modernization program noting that it should be moved forward if possible to having production and deployment to fiscal year 2014.

Funds transfers between Department of Defense accounts

The committee notes that the President's budget request annually includes legislative provisions to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to certain amounts of funds authorized each year for each account to unforeseen higher priorities. Because the legislation results in the transfers to be deemed as additional authorizations outside the normal congressional authorization process, certain restrictions are imposed on its use by both Congress and the Department of Defense through policy guidance to ensure the transfers are carried out consistent with congressional intent. The Department is expressly prohibited from preparing or forwarding to Congress a prior approval reprogramming action except for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and is determined to be necessary in the national interest.

Despite these restrictions, the committee is concerned about the total amounts transferred among programs, much of which is not required to be counted against the General and Special Transfer Authorities granted by Congress each year. The Department is permitted to transfer funds between military personnel accounts, and has additional special transfer authorities for foreign currency fluctuations, intelligence programs, and certain operations and maintenance accounts. As a result, in fiscal year 2011 alone, the Department transferred nearly $27.0 billion among accounts, but only $11.1 billion or 40 percent of these transfers were approved through the congressional reprogramming process prior to transfer. In addition, the total transfer authority contained in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2011 (Pub-

lic Law 111–383) only totaled $8.0 billion, and the Department of Defense has used only $4.1 billion to date.

The committee notes that the Department currently is authorized to transfer funding between accounts up to certain threshold amounts that do not require prior approval from Congress nor do they require the use of special transfer authorities. These below threshold reprogramming (BTR) amounts are limited to $10.0 million for each military personnel account, $15.0 million for operation and maintenance; $20.0 million for procurement; and $10.0 million for research, development, test, and evaluation. During Fiscal Year 2011, the Department of Defense transferred over $7.0 billion, in 1,629 budget lines using BTR authority and another $9.7 billion using other internal reprogramming authorities. All these transfers were approved by officials in the military services or defense agencies without any congressional review or oversight.

In addition, in fiscal year 2011 the Department of Defense requested approval to transfer funds totaling over $1.0 billion in order to start new procurement and research, development, test and evaluation programs that were not previously authorized by Congress, even though the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation entitled "Reprogramming of Appropriated Funds" states in regard to the new starts that "Congressional committees discourage the use of the reprogramming process to initiate programs." The committee is aware that urgent operational requirements, particularly those supporting on-going contingency operations, may result in the need to initiate a new program without prior congressional authorization or outside the traditional budget cycle. Therefore, the committee continues to discourage the use of transfer authority to initiate programs unless the requirement satisfies a validated emerging or urgent operational warfighter need, is the result of extraordinary situations, and for which the follow-on funding is budgeted.

The committee grants a certain degree of flexibility to the Department of Defense in order to manage federal taxpayer funds efficiently and effectively in response to changing conditions and emerging requirements. On the other hand, this same flexibility facilitates a certain degree of budget gamesmanship, as certain accounts, such as operations and maintenance and base operations support that are intended to satisfy "must-pay" bills, are historically underfunded in the President's annual budget requests with the understanding that the Department will be able to transfer funds between accounts. This type of budget gamesmanship is a major reason why the Department is not able to produce annual financial statements that are auditable. It also facilitates the annual exercise of a rush to transfer funds at the end of the fiscal year to accounts for which contracts or task orders can be obligated quickly.

The committee is concerned that, despite the efforts of the Department to rein in wasteful and unneeded spending, these internal reprogramming processes and year-end rushes do not allow for an objective assessment of the priority or urgency of the funding need. Instead, they encourage action to obligate all authorized funds before they expire or are returned to the General Treasury. The committee believes that in order for the Department to truly

ensure efficient spending at every level of resource management, new standards of performance must be established for each resource manager that rewards the result of acquiring goods and services to meet validated requirements established for the fiscal year within amounts authorized for that account and then returning any unobligated balances back to the General Treasury in order to buy down the federal debt, as opposed to looking for other goods or services to purchase. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after enactment of this Act providing suggestions to increase the transparency and accountability of funds transfers that do not require the prior approval of Congress. The report should also include a description of policies, procedures, or guidance provided to each program manager in the Department to determine the urgency or priority of an unfunded requirement, and to establish a culture of fiscal frugality and efficiency that promotes the return of unobligated balances back to financial managers for the purchase of higher priority goods and services or a return of funds to the General Treasury.

Government Accountability Office report on duplication, overlap and fragmentation in federal programs

On February 28, 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report entitled, "Opportunities to Reduce Duplication, Overlap and Fragmentation, Achieve Savings, and Enhance Revenue," that identified 32 areas of duplication, overlap and fragmentation throughout the Federal Government, and 19 areas of potential cost-saving and revenue-enhancement opportunities in federal programs, agencies, offices and initiatives. This report identified 16 areas of duplication, overlap, or potential savings that relate to the programs and operations of the Department of Defense (DOD).

In the current environment of fiscal austerity and constrained resources, DOD must take advantage of every opportunity to identify efficiencies and achieve savings in its programs and activities. For this reason, careful consideration of the areas of potential savings identified by the GAO report—such as electronic warfare, unmanned aircraft systems, counter-improvised explosive device efforts, defense language and culture training, stabilization and reconstruction operations, Air Force food service, defense headquarters, defense real property, military healthcare costs, and overseas defense posture—is imperative.

The committee concludes that DOD should assess each area of duplication, overlap, or potential savings identified by GAO that relates to DOD programs and operations and, to the extent that it has not already done so, take appropriate steps to address any such areas for which DOD agrees with the GAO recommendations. For any areas as to which DOD concludes that the duplication, overlap, or potential savings identified by GAO are not valid, the committee directs the Secretary to provide the congressional defense committees with an explanation of the basis for this conclusion.

Government Accountability Office review of the Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications System

The U.S. nuclear command, control, and communications system (NC3) includes the activities, processes, and procedures performed by appropriate military commanders and support personnel to allow for senior-level decisions on nuclear weapons employment. The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) for directing a number of initiatives to improve the reliability of the NC3 system. However, the committee is concerned that the Department's efforts are being pursued in a piecemeal fashion rather than part of a coherent system architecture and investment strategy with consistent leadership. For example, a key Air Force modernization program that has been in development for a decade, the Family of Advanced Beyond Line-of-Sight Terminals (FAB–T) program, which is the base terminal for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite, has veered off track and it may take years longer than expected before any of the needed capability becomes part of the NC3 system, especially in the B–2 and B–52H fleet. This means that our strategic bombers, which can carry nuclear weapons, will not be able to use the very satellites designed for nuclear command and control.

The committee directs that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess DOD's efforts to sustain and improve the NC3 system. Specifically, the committee directs GAO to examine: (1) the DOD's efforts and activities underway or planned to upgrade and modernize the Nation's nuclear NC3 capabilities, including activities associated with cryptographic modernization; (2) the extent to which DOD's modernization and upgrade efforts are being coordinated as part of an overarching NC3 architecture and investment strategy; (3) whether there are NC3 gaps, shortcomings, technical challenges, or funding issues that need to be addressed currently; (4) the factors that caused the FAB–T program to go off track and the Air Force's plans to salvage the program, including how land and air platform integration challenges will be addressed; and (5) extent to which DOD has identified and addressed gaps or shortcomings in the NC3 system through its inspections, training, and exercise programs.

Hazard assessments related to new construction of obstructions on military installations and operations

Section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required the Secretary of Defense to establish a systematic process and a comprehensive strategy for assessing and addressing military impacts of renewable energy projects and other energy projects with the objective of ensuring that the robust development of renewable energy sources and the expansion of the commercial electrical grid in the United States are conducted in a manner that minimize or mitigate any adverse impacts on military operations and readiness.

The Department of Defense (DOD) has implemented the requirement of section 358 by establishing a Siting Clearinghouse to serve as a focal point for DOD consideration of proposed energy projects. The Clearinghouse has developed a consistent process for review of such projects, including evaluation criteria, operational impact as-

sessment tools, and mitigation response teams. This process has enabled the Department to focus its attention on those projects that are likely to have adverse impacts on military missions and to conduct additional analysis needed to determine if mitigation is possible.

The Clearinghouse has reviewed 249 renewable energy projects to date that were under consideration at the time section 358 was enacted, and has determined that 229 of them would have little or no impact to military missions. The remaining 20 have been assessed as potentially having an adverse impact on military test, readiness, and operational missions. While further study and negotiations with project developers are underway in consultation with appropriate federal agencies, no determination of an unacceptable risk to national security has yet been made with regard to any of these projects.

The committee expects that any DOD hazard assessment under subsection (e) of section 358 will include an analysis of the electromagnetic interference that the proposed project would cause for the relevant military installation (including interference with military-owned or military-operated air traffic control radar sites, navigation aids, and approach systems), as well as any other adverse impacts on military operations, safety, and readiness (including adverse effects on instrument or visual flight operations). In the event that a potential risk is identified, the hazard assessment should consider the feasibility of the full range of mitigation measures. Such mitigation measures could include modifications to the proposed project (including changes in size, location, or technology), upgrades or modifications to existing DOD systems or procedures, acquisition and fielding of new systems by DOD or other federal agencies, and modifications to military operations.

The committee also expects the Secretary of Defense to give careful consideration to the recommendations of senior military officers with primary responsibility for the affected military installation and affected military operations in making any final determination of unacceptable risk.

The committee concludes that section 358 requires a set of established criteria in order to ensure the risk assessments are objective, rational, and justifiable. The committee also notes that final routes and sites may change after a determination is made, due to ongoing environmental studies, changes in developer plans, and the assessment of alternatives as part of mitigation efforts. In such cases, the Clearinghouse should have processes in place to reopen the review, continue the analysis, and amend the determination if the review results in a change in the determination.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2012, a description of the processes and criteria used to make the determination whether or not an energy project poses an unacceptable risk to national security.

Impacts of "Sequestration" on the Department of Defense

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is subject to automatic funding reductions known as "sequestration" of

$492.0 billion between 2013 and 2021 as required by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a). These reductions are in addition to reductions of $487.0 billion already being implemented by the Department of Defense.

The leaders of the Department of Defense have consistently testified that automatic reductions would have a detrimental impact on the Department's ability to maintain readiness. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta said that these reductions would "inflict severe damage to our national defense for generations" and Chief Staff of the Army, General Raymond Odierno, warned that the cuts would force the Army to separate an additional 100,000 soldiers. Sequestration will also have a detrimental effect on the industrial base that supports the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense submit to the congressional defense committees no later than August 15, 2012 a detailed report on the impact of the sequestration of funds authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2013 for the Department of Defense. The report should include an assessment of the potential impact of sequestration on the readiness of the Armed Forces, on the ability of the Department to carry out the National Military Strategy, and any changes to the most recent Chairman's Risk Assessment.

The committee is also aware that automatically triggered cuts would disrupt programs, projects, and activities across the military departments and components, potentially causing the termination or restructuring of hundreds of contracts. Therefore, the report should include an estimate of the number and value of all contracts that will be terminated or re-scoped due to sequestration, including an estimate of the resulting costs. Finally, the report should include an estimate of the number of civilian, contract, and uniformed personnel whose employment would be terminated due to sequestration.

The committee urges the administration and Congress to work together, beginning immediately, to develop and introduce in both Houses of Congress not later than September 15, 2012, a proposal to replace the automatically triggered, across-the-board reductions in fiscal year 2013 funding required by sequestration, in order to avoid the devastating consequences of continued inaction.

Resiliency and survivability for nuclear air-launched cruise and missile basing

As the United States reduces its deployed nuclear forces in the coming years to comply with limits established in the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), the resiliency and survivability of the Nation's enduring strategic nuclear deterrent assumes a new level of importance. Since the decertification of one Air Force Weapons Storage Area (WSA) in 2007, the Air Force has relied upon a single WSA to meet U.S. Strategic Command's nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missile requirement. The committee notes that following serious Air Force security incidents in 2006 and 2007, the September 2008 Phase 1 Report of the Secretary of Defense Task Force on DOD [Department of Defense] Nuclear Weapons Management concluded that, "The closure of the

WSA at one of the bomber bases was a significant mistake with a negative operational impact," and that "[the closure] simplifies enemy targeting and creates more concentration of vulnerability for the B–52 bomber force." In response, the Air Force requested and Congress appropriated $73.0 million for activities to recertify and reopen the closed WSA.

However, in testimony before the committee in February 2011, Air Force Chief of Staff General Norton A. Schwartz stated that the Air Force had decided not to pursue these activities because of budget constraints. A reconstituted second WSA could enhance the resiliency of the bomber force, provide redundancy in a critical national security mission, and reduce operational risk. Consolidation of the old WSA's existing security perimeter and installation of modern detection and denial systems could reduce security personnel requirements and result in significant cost savings from original estimates. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to reexamine plans, including requirements and costs, for reconstituting a second nuclear weapons storage capability for nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missiles.

Roles of the Air Force Global Strike Command and Air Combat Command

The Air Force Global Strike Command is a major command created in 2007 when the Air Force's ability to manage its portion of the nuclear weapons enterprise came into question. That Command's mission is to "Develop and provide combat-ready forces for nuclear deterrence and global strike operations that are safe, secure and effective to support the President of the United States and combatant commanders". The Command utilizes the fleet of B–2 and B–52 long-range heavy bombers in carrying out its mission. Air Combat Command also exercises some responsibilities for managing the B–2 and B–52 bomber fleets. It is not clear to the committee how the Air Force has apportioned responsibility for exercising authority, direction and control in regards to tasking and funding for the B–2 and B–52 training and operations between the Global Strike Command and the Air Combat Command.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report describing how these functions are apportioned between the Global Strike Command and Air Combat Command no later than January 31, 2013.

Safety and security standards for Department of Defense hazardous materials transport

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is responsible for the transportation of nearly 70,000 separate shipments of security sensitive material every year. Trucks carrying these shipments travel tens of millions of miles on highways across all 50 States.

The Defense Transportation Regulation establishes standards for the safe movement of hazardous materials. The committee understands that an industry group has proposed that DOD adopt enhanced safety standards for hazardous materials. The committee does not prejudge the adequacy of existing safety standards, but believes that it is essential that DOD ensure that transportation

safety standards are commensurate with safety risk posed by the categories of cargo that are transported.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an impartial analysis of its existing standards for the transportation of hazardous materials and submit that analysis to the congressional defense committees not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary's analysis should address past safety performance, number of transportation accidents and causes, accident rates, and standards used by DOD, the Department of Transportation, and other organizations and companies that transport similar hazardous cargo.

The committee further directs the Department to implement such changes to existing regulations and standards (if any) as he determines to be needed on the basis of the review.

Use of general purpose forces and special operations forces for security force assistance

The committee notes that the guidance documents issued by the President and Department of Defense (DOD) have emphasized international security force assistance as an element of our broad security strategy captured in the National Security Strategy, Quadrennial Defense Review, National Strategy for Counterterrorism, and the recent Defense Strategic Guidance. Historically, special operations forces have conducted the majority of the DOD's activities to train, equip, advise, and assist international security forces. However, the fundamental role of building partner nation capability and capacities and the limited availability of special operations forces (SOF) for this mission have required DOD to build the capabilities and capacities of its general purpose forces (GPF) to conduct security force assistance.

The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has projected that the current high demand for SOF will continue and that a "steady state" of approximately 12,000 deployed SOF will be required to meet the future requirements of the geographic combatant commanders for security force assistance, counterterrorism, civil affairs, military information support, and other missions. At the same time, DOD and the military services are also taking steps to identify capability requirements, implementing new approaches to organizing units—including aligning certain GPF to specific regions, and adjusting training to enhance the ability of GPF to conduct security force assistance activities.

The committee is aware of the Comptroller General's previous work on challenges DOD faces in defining its concept for security force assistance and guiding combatant commander and service efforts to plan and conduct related activities, as well as its work on challenges USSOCOM has faced in providing sufficient numbers of trained personnel to meet the demand for increased deployments.

Given that high demand for SOF is projected to continue for the foreseeable future, as well as DOD's efforts to expand the capabilities of the GPF to perform security force assistance, the committee is concerned that the Department risks creating redundancies, investing funds, and utilizing personnel in creating duplicative capabilities when resources are increasingly limited and the size of the GPF is decreasing.

In order to better understand the Department's plan for the security force assistance mission within both GPF and SOF, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on its evaluation of DOD efforts in these areas, including the extent that DOD has delineated the roles and responsibilities of SOF and GPF; distinguished between the types of circumstances where the respective forces would be used to conduct security force assistance activities; and whether DOD has identified and prioritized the respective requirements and resource needs for building and sustaining the capabilities of both types of forces, and other matters the Comptroller General sees fit to include.

Vacancies in critical Inspector General positions

The committee notes with concern that a number of critical Inspector General positions in the Federal Government have been vacant for an extended period of time. The position of Department of Defense Inspector General has been vacant since the beginning of the year, without a successor being nominated. In the view of the committee, continuing vacancies among the Inspectors General undermines needed oversight of critical national security functions and operations. While Acting Inspectors General often do an admirable job, they are unlikely to have the clout and influence of Senate-confirmed officials. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to work with the President to identify and submit a highly-qualified nominee to be the Department of Defense Inspector General as soon as possible.

Working partnerships with State and local law enforcement authorities

The committee is aware of significant jurisdictional gaps and overlaps between Department of Defense (DOD) law enforcement authorities on military installations and civilian law enforcement authorities in areas surrounding military installations. For example, the Department has expressed concern about its lack of jurisdiction over a growing population of non-DOD affiliated civilians living in privatized housing on DOD installations. Similar issues can arise in the case of DOD-leased facilities off of DOD installations.

The committee also recognizes that information collection and sharing among law enforcement agencies is a critical element of effective force protection for military installations inside the United States. For this reason, the committee encourages active participation by both DOD law enforcement authorities and local law enforcement authorities in areas surrounding military installations in ongoing information-sharing programs managed and operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security.

The committee concludes that DOD law enforcement authorities should actively work to develop working partnerships with law enforcement agencies in areas surrounding military installations, and to use such partnerships to address a wide range of issues of mutual interest, including force protection issues. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional de-

fense committees not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on steps that the Department has taken or plans to take to promote such partnerships.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

Authority for transportation of family household pets of civilian personnel during evacuation of non-essential personnel (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5725 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the transport at government expense of family household pets of government employees during evacuations from permanent stations in foreign locations.

Expansion of experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1101(b)(1)(A) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) to authorize the appointment of not more than 60 employees to scientific and engineering positions in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The provision would not be construed as affecting any limitation on the numbers of personnel that may be employed at DARPA overall.

One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to personnel on official duty in a combat zone (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize temporary discretionary authority to federal agencies to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities comparable to those provided to members of the foreign service to an agency's civilian employees on official duty in a combat zone. This authority would expire at the end of fiscal year 2014.

Item of Special Interest

Department of Defense strategic workforce plan

Section 115b of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Defense to prepare a strategic workforce plan to shape and improve the civilian employee workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD) on a biannual basis. The strategic workforce plan is required to include an assessment of the critical skills and competencies that will be needed to support national security requirements and effectively manage the Department and the appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel capabilities needed to ensure the availability of such skills and capabilities.

The most recent strategic workforce plan, submitted to the committee in March 2012, includes a comprehensive assessment of 24

mission critical occupations and 4 cross-cutting mission critical functions in the DOD civilian workforce. The plan includes specific recruitment, retention, and development strategies to address identified gaps in these occupations and functions. While not yet fully compliant with the requirements of section 115b, the March 2012 strategic workforce plan is a significant improvement over earlier plans.

At the same time, the plan is a massive document that DOD assesses is too big and complex to be a practical guide for workforce management. Because of deficiencies in the DOD inventory of contract services required by section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, the plan does not yet include meaningful data on the total workforce (including military, civilian, and contractor employees) that can be used to assess the appropriate workforce mix needed to perform critical functions.

Moreover, the plan was submitted a year late and was based on forecasts completed in December 2010—before the Secretary announced efficiencies initiatives, including a freeze on the civilian workforce at fiscal year 2010 levels. It is not clear to what extent, if any, the military departments and defense agencies took the strategic workforce plan, and the critical capabilities and capabilities gaps identified in the plan, into account as they worked to implement these efficiencies.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to review the requirements for the strategic workforce plan and the process used to develop and implement the plan and to identify steps, including any recommended legislative changes, that may be needed to streamline the planning process, enhance the utility of the plan, and ensure that it is implemented by the military departments and defense agencies in an operationally effective manner. The committee directs the Under Secretary to report the findings and recommendations of this review to the congressional defense committees by no later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

Extension of authority to build the capacity of foreign military forces and modification of notice in connection with initiation of activities (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through September 30, 2014, the authority under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to conduct a program to build the capacity of foreign military forces. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide, as part of the 15-day prior notification of the initiation of a project under this authority, additional information on assistance provided during the 3 preceding fiscal years to the country in which the project is to be initiated. The committee believes the provision of this additional information in the notification will facilitate congressional oversight of the train and equip program.

Extension of authority for non-reciprocal exchange of defense personnel between the United States and foreign countries (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 5 fiscal years the authority for the Department of Defense (DOD) to accept, on a non-reciprocal basis, defense personnel of the defense ministry of an ally or friendly foreign government.

The committee notes that DOD has used this authority judiciously and only recently expanded its use to include countries outside of our traditional partners. The committee urges the Department to continue to use this authority and to consider using it to enhance—consistent with the new Defense Strategic Guidance—our partnerships in the Middle East and Asia Pacific.

Authority to build the capacity of certain counterterrorism forces in Yemen and East Africa (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize for 2 fiscal years the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide training, equipment, supplies, and minor military construction to: (1) the Yemen Ministry of Interior (MOI) Counterterrorism Unit (CTU); (2) the national military forces, counterterrorism forces, security agencies that serve a similar defense function, and border security forces of Djibouti, Ethiopia, and Kenya; and (3) the national military forces of nations participating in the African Union Mission in Somalia; for the purpose

of conducting counterterrorism operations against al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula in Yemen, and al Qaeda affiliates and al Shabaab in East Africa. The provision permits the Secretary of Defense to expend not more than $75.0 million in support of the Yemen MOI CTU, and not more than $75.0 million in support of the named forces conducting counterterrorism operations in East Africa. The provision requires that any support pursuant to this section must be provided in a manner that promotes the observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and for legitimate civilian authority in the country receiving such assistance.

The committee notes that this authority is similar to section 1207(n) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and that the Department requested an extension of that authority. The committee is supportive of the Department's request and associated efforts to better enable counterterrorism forces in East Africa and Yemen, but views this authority as a means to continue providing support to these forces until the Global Security Contingency Fund and its associated processes are fully operational. Further, the committee chose to create this authority as a standalone authority to correct a number of technical errors in section 1207(n) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

The committee believes these authorities will be critical to supporting counterterrorism efforts by partner nations against al Qaeda and al Shabaab in the coming 2 fiscal years as they work to consolidate and build upon recent gains in Somalia and prevent al Qaeda from establishing a safe haven in Yemen as the political process in Yemen continues to unfold.

Limitation on availability of funds for State Partnership Program (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending more than 50 percent of the fiscal year 2013 funds for the State Partnership Program until the final regulations required pursuant to section 1210 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) are completed and the necessary regulatory adjustments have been completed to ensure compliance of the program with the Antideficiency Act (Public Law 97–258).

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan

Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1211)

The committee recommends a provision that would make up to $200.0 million in Department of Defense funds available during fiscal year 2013 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) under section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1619). As explained elsewhere in this report, this is $200.0 million less than the $400.0 million requested in the budget request. CERP enables

commanders in Afghanistan to fund humanitarian relief and reconstruction projects that directly benefit the Afghan people.

Extension of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1212)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority of section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1631; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) for the Secretary of Defense to support the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq and security assistance teams, including life support, transportation and personal security, and construction and renovation of facilities. The provision would limit the total amount of funds available for these purposes to $508.0 million.

One-year extension and modification of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1213)

The committee recommends a provision that extends for 1 year the authority in section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4392), as amended, to use Department of Defense funds to support a program for the reintegration of former insurgent fighters into Afghan society. The provision would authorize the use of up to $35.0 million for these purposes.

One-year extension and modification of authority for program to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in Afghanistan (sec. 1214)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2013 the authority under section 1217 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Program (AIP) to develop and carry out infrastructure programs in Afghanistan that support the counterinsurgency campaign. Funding for the AIP is provided through a fund in the U.S. Treasury known as the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to $350.0 million in fiscal year 2013 for these purposes. The provision would also restrict the availability of funds authorized during fiscal year 2013 for the AIP to no more than 50 percent of the authorized amount until the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a plan for the allocation and use of funds under the program, including information on how each project to be initiated under the program would be sustained following its completion.

The committee notes that a significant portion of the funds available to the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund in fiscal years 2011 and 2012 have supported efforts by the Department of Defense and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to rebuild and improve the delivery of electricity to Kandahar and southern Afghanistan. During fiscal year 2013, over $100.0 million of funds authorized for this program will support Kandahar electrification. The committee recognizes this effort as a priority for the program. At the same time, the committee continues to have concerns about

the sustainability of large-scale infrastructure projects initiated by the Department of Defense under the AIP. The committee believes that as the security, political, and economic transition progresses in Afghanistan, responsibility within the U.S. Government (USG) for any large-scale infrastructure projects in Afghanistan should shift away from the Department of Defense to USG civilian agencies, particularly the Department of State and USAID.

Extension of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (sec. 1215)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2013 the authorities of section 1224 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2521), as amended, regarding the use of the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) for building the capabilities of the Pakistan security forces. The provision would also extend for 1 year the provisions of section 1220 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1633) that restrict the availability of PCF funding to no more than 40 percent of amounts appropriated or transferred to the PCF during fiscal year 2013 until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to Congress on a strategy and metrics for use of the PCF and for enhancing Pakistan's efforts to counter improvised explosive devices.

The committee notes that this Act does not authorize any additional funds for the PCF during fiscal year 2013. Accordingly, any additional funds for the PCF during fiscal year 2013 would have to be transferred to the PCF from amounts appropriated to the Department of State's Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capabilities Fund (PCCF). The committee further notes that section 7046(c)(1) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2012, contained in Division I of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112–74) restricts the availability of funds under the PCCF until the Secretary of State makes certain certifications to Congress regarding Pakistan, including that Pakistan is: (i) cooperating with the United States in counterterrorism efforts against the Haqqani Network, the Quetta Shura Taliban, Lashkar e-Tayyiba, Jaish-e-Mohammed, al Qaeda, and other domestic and foreign terrorist organizations, including taking steps to end support for such groups and prevent them from basing and operating in Pakistan and carrying out cross border attacks into neighboring countries; (ii) not supporting terrorist activities against United States or coalition forces in Afghanistan, and that Pakistan's military and intelligence agencies are not intervening extra-judicially into political and judicial processes in Pakistan; and (iii) dismantling improvised explosive device (IED) networks and interdicting precursor chemicals used in the manufacture of IEDs. The Secretary of State may waive the certification requirement if doing so is in U.S. national security interests. In the event that the provisions of section 7046(c)(1) of Public Law 112–74 are not extended for fiscal year 2013 with respect to the PCCF, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to provide the certification required by section 7046(c)(1)(A) of Public Law 112–74 prior to using any PCF funds from amounts transferred to the PCF from the PCCF during fiscal year 2013. The Secretary of Defense may waive this require-

ment if the Secretary determines that doing so is in the national security interests of the United States.

Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1216)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority of section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 393), as amended, for the use of Department of Defense (DOD) funds ("Coalition Support Funds") to reimburse key nations for logistical and military support provided to or in connection with Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), or to use such funds to assist key nations by providing specialized training, or loaning specialized equipment, in connection with OEF. The provision would limit the aggregate amount of Coalition Support Funds that could be provided during fiscal year 2013 to $1.75 billion, except that reimbursements made to Pakistan for support provided prior to May 1, 2011, using Coalition Support Funds authorized and appropriated during a fiscal year prior to fiscal year 2013, would not count against that limitation.

The provision would also prohibit any reimbursements to Pakistan for claims of support provided during the period when the ground lines of supply through Pakistan to Afghanistan were closed to the transshipment of equipment and supplies needed to support U.S. military operations in Afghanistan.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense, prior to providing any reimbursement to Pakistan using Coalition Support Funds during fiscal year 2013, to certify to the congressional defense committees that: Pakistan has opened and is maintaining security along the ground lines of supply through Pakistan to Afghanistan; Pakistan is not supporting or providing safe haven to militant extremist groups, including the Haqqani Network and the Afghan Taliban Quetta Shura, that are located in Pakistan and that conduct cross-border attacks against U.S., coalition, and Afghan forces; Pakistan is committed to a strategy to counter improvised explosive devices (IED), including through the regulation of explosive materials used in IEDs; and that Pakistan is demonstrably cooperating with U.S. counterterrorism efforts, including by not detaining, prosecuting, or imprisoning Pakistani citizens as a result of their cooperation with U.S. counterterrorism efforts. In this regard, the Committee is particularly concerned and outraged by the case of Dr. Shakil Afridi, who was sentenced to 33 years in prison in connection with assistance he provided to U.S. efforts to locate Osama Bin Laden. The Secretary may waive this certification requirement if doing so would be in the national security interests of the United States.

Extension and modification of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1217)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2013 the authority provided in section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law

111–181; 122 Stat. 394), as most recently amended by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1629), to provide logistical support to coalition forces. The provision would also amend that section to clarify that for fiscal year 2013 logistical support is authorized for coalition forces supporting operations in Afghanistan only, and not Afghanistan and Iraq as in previous years.

Strategy for supporting the achievement of a secure presidential election in Afghanistan in 2014 (sec. 1218)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to develop a strategy to support the Government of Afghanistan in its efforts to ensure the security of its presidential election in 2014. The strategy would include support to the Government of Afghanistan for: (1) training the Afghan security forces to provide security at polling stations and to protect election materials, election workers, and officials; (2) recruiting and training female Afghan security personnel to provide equitable access to polls for Afghan women and to secure polling stations and other election-related locations; and (3) securing the freedom of movement and communication for candidates before and during the election.

Independent assessment of the Afghan National Security Forces (sec. 1219)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for the conduct of a detailed independent assessment of the strength, force structure, force posture, and capabilities required to enable the Afghan National Security Forces to provide security for their own country so as to prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven for terrorists that threaten Afghanistan, the region, and the world. As determined by the Secretary, the assessment would be conducted by either a federally-funded research and development center or an independent, non-governmental institute with expertise in national security and military affairs. The provision would require that the assessment be completed and reported to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees by no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Report on Afghanistan Peace and Reintegration Program (sec. 1220)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the Afghanistan Peace and Reconciliation Program (APRP). The report would be required within 120 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee notes that Department of Defense funds are authorized to be available during fiscal year 2013 to support the activities of the APRP to reintegrate former insurgents into Afghan society. The APRP has had notable success in formally reintegrating around 4,000 fighters who are willing to lay down their

weapons and support the Afghan constitution. The APRP plays an important role in our political strategy in Afghanistan and the committee believes that a close assessment of the effectiveness of the APRP's activities in achieving the program's goals and objectives would help improve that strategy.

Subtitle C—Reports

Review and reports on Department of Defense efforts to build the capacity of and partner with foreign security forces (sec. 1231)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Defense Policy Board to conduct a review, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, of Department of Defense (DOD) efforts to build the capacity of, or partner with, foreign security forces in support of national defense and security strategies. The Secretary of Defense would be required to report to the congressional defense committees on the results of the review.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 120 days after the completion of the Defense Policy Board review, a report setting forth strategic guidance for DOD efforts to build the capacity of, and partner with, foreign military forces in support of national defense and security strategies.

The committee notes that the DOD 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review identified building partner capacity and partnership as one of the Department's core missions. Over the last several years, DOD authorities and programs involved in building partner capacity and partnership have multiplied significantly. These include, but are not limited to: the "Section 1206" global train and equip program; the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund; the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund; targeted authorities for building capacity in Yemen and East Africa; the Global Security Contingency Fund; the State Partnership Program; the Warsaw Initiative Fund; the Ministry of Defense Advisors program; and the DOD counternarcotics authorities. However, the Department has yet to clearly define the strategic ends toward which its efforts to build partner capacity and partner with foreign forces are directed, and how to prioritize among these efforts. The committee believes it is critical, particularly in a resource-constrained environment, that DOD provide clear guidance on the objectives and priorities of these efforts to ensure that these activities directly advance U.S. national defense and security interests and can be assessed for their effectiveness in achieving U.S. strategic goals.

Additional elements in annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China (sec. 1232)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), as amended, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to include in the Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China, certain

additional information relating to cyberwarfare, space and nuclear activities, maritime activities, and China's foreign military transactions and military-to-military relationships. Although some of this information has been included in past iterations of the annual report, the provision would codify the requirement and provide more specificity regarding the details which the committee would like to have included in future reports.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Improved administration of the American, British, Canadian, and Australian Armies' Program (sec. 1241)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to enter into agreements relating to U.S. participation in the land-force program known as the American, British, Canadian, and Australian (ABCA) Armies' Program. The ABCA Armies' Program is a multilateral organization for the purposes of promoting interoperability among the armies and Marine Corps of the participating countries. In addition to the United States, the countries participating in the program are Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. The provision would permit the negotiation of agreements to allow for the equitable sharing of costs associated with the ABCA Armies' Program, including administrative costs and the cost of any monetary claims resulting from participation in the program. The provision would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to accept contributions to cover these costs from the participating nations and deposit those amounts into DOD accounts. The authority provided under this section would sunset at the end of 5 years.

United States participation in Headquarters Eurocorps (sec. 1242)

The committee recommends a provision that would grant the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the authority to allow members of the armed forces to participate as members of the staff of Headquarters Eurocorps, one of seven "Rapid Deployable Corps" associated with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Participation on this staff by U.S. Armed Forces members would only be authorized to support the NATO activities of that corps. The provision would limit United States participation on the staff of Headquarters Eurocorps to two service members until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the plans, benefits, and costs of such participation.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is seeking to negotiate the arrangements for the United States to join Headquarters Eurocorps as a NATO associated nation. United States European Command (EUCOM) has indicated that participation in Headquarters Eurocorps would be part of its overall plans for participation in the NATO force structure, which also includes U.S participation in the other NATO Rapid Deployable Corps. While generally supportive of U.S. participation within the NATO

force and command structures, the committee believes it requires more information on the costs and benefits of U.S. participation in the Headquarters Eurocorps before the Department assigns a number of personnel greater than the two members of the armed forces specified under this provision to participate in the Headquarters Eurocorps.

Department of Defense participation in European program on multilateral exchange of air transportation and air refueling services (sec. 1243)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to enter into multilateral written agreements to provide for U.S. participation in the Air Transport, Air-to-Air Refueling and other Exchanges of Services ("ATARES") program of the Movement Coordination Centre Europe. The ATARES program provides a multilateral framework among certain European countries for the multilateral exchange of air transportation and air refueling services. The program would allow for the exchange or transfer of these services on a reimbursable basis or by replacement in kind. The provision would limit the balance of executed flight hours, whether as credits or debits, that the United States can accumulate under the ATARES program to no more than 500 hours, of which the balance of executed flight hours for air refueling may not exceed 200 hours. The provision would also require the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees within 1 year a report assessing the ATARES program.

The committee recognizes the value of multilateral cooperation in military transportation services and believes the ATARES program may offer opportunities for efficiencies and increased availability of additional transportation capacity to meet U.S. requirements. The committee would authorize U.S. participation in the ATARES program as a 5-year pilot program and intends to monitor closely the implementation of the program, including through the annual reports required under this provision.

Authority to establish program to provide assistance to foreign civilians for harm incident to combat operations of the armed forces in foreign countries (sec. 1244)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a program, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to enable military commanders at their discretion to provide assistance to foreign civilians who are harmed incident to U.S. combat operations overseas.

The committee notes that in armed conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, the Department of Defense has drawn on a number of authorities, including authority to make solatia payments and condolence payments under the Commanders' Emergency Response Program, to provide assistance to civilians who have suffered damage, injury or death incident to U.S. combat operations, including for purposes of winning the hearts and minds of the local population, promoting stability, and enhancing the safety of U.S. personnel. Establishment of a program under this section, in coordination with programs administered by the U.S. Agen-

cy for International Development and Department of State, could help to promote friendly relations with civilian populations in combat zones and as a result contribute to the successful completion of the U.S. military mission in a future conflict.

Limitation on availability of funds for certain capital projects in connection with overseas contingency operations (sec. 1245)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that Department of Defense funds may not be obligated for certain large capital projects overseas for an overseas contingency operation until the Secretary of Defense carries out a detailed assessment of the sustainability and necessity of the project. Capital projects covered by this section would be: (1) any project for building the capability of indigenous security forces with an estimated value over $10.0 million; or any other project for the direct benefit of the host country with an estimated value over $2.0 million. The provision would also require quarterly reports to Congress on each assessment conducted under this section. The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation of this section to initiate a project if doing so would be in the U.S. national security interests, but the assessment required under this section would have to be completed and reported to Congress not later than 180 days after issuance of the waiver.

Items of Special Interest

Insider threat

Since 2007, a number of U.S., international coalition, and Afghan personnel have been killed or wounded in attacks by Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) personnel or ANSF impersonators. Although such attacks are not indicative of the quality and dedication of the overwhelming majority of ANSF personnel who serve alongside coalition forces with honor and distinction, they raise concerns about the sufficiency of the procedures used to screen, vet, and monitor ANSF personnel, as well as whether there is a need for additional training of coalition service members on how to identify insider threats and on appropriate operational procedures while working with ANSF units.

The committee supports ongoing efforts to reduce the risk of insider threat-related attacks on coalition and Afghan forces, including the use of preadmission screening procedures for ANSF candidates and plans to increase the number of counter-intelligence personnel within the ANSF. However, recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) reports indicate that there remain opportunities to eliminate gaps in the screening, vetting, and monitoring processes. Improvements, such as sharing data collected by coalition and ANSF forces, expanding counterintelligence capabilities, and improving the process by which elders recommend ANSF candidates will require cooperation from the Government of Afghanistan.

As such, the committee directs the Department to submit a report, with a classified annex if necessary, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, that assesses and categorizes the na-

ture of insider attacks, and describes all measures taken to protect military and civilian personnel from future insider attacks. The report should include a description of specific programs included in pre-deployment training for civilian and military personnel of all ranks on identifying and reducing insider threats, actions taken by the Government of Afghanistan to prevent such attacks, and the status of negotiations with the Government of Afghanistan to address the issues raised by GAO.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization capabilities and burden-sharing

The committee recognizes the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) renewed focus on burden-sharing, interoperability, and the "Smart Defense" initiative. The committee welcomes these efforts and supports the ongoing work by NATO allies to pool and share resources to get more out of members' national defense budgets and notes that this approach could be enhanced by replicating successful NATO programs such as the Baltic Air Policing initiative and the Strategic Airlift Capability program. The committee also notes that the defense spending burden within the NATO alliance has fallen predominantly on the United States. According to NATO statistics, only 3 of 28 member countries met the requirement of spending 2 percent of their gross domestic product on defense in 2011. In addition, the U.S. share of total defense spending by NATO members increased from 57 percent to 69 percent between 2001 and 2011. The committee recognizes that Europe is dealing with significant budget issues, but urges NATO members to work to ensure that national defense spending levels are sufficient and defense spending decisions are coordinated to the extent possible so as to address the Alliance's shared security requirements.

Review of United States-Egypt military-to-military relations

The committee notes the importance of maintaining and strengthening the close partnership between the United States Armed Forces and the Egyptian Armed Forces. This long-standing relationship has helped to advance U.S. national security interests, such as counterterrorism and intelligence cooperation in the Middle East, the safeguarding of the Camp David Accords, the movement of U.S. forces in the region and through the Suez Canal, and support for internal stability during and after the departure of former President Hosni Mubarak. To enhance this military-to-military relationship, the U.S. Congress has authorized and appropriated approximately $1.3 billion in security assistance to the Egyptian military annually for more than 3 decades.

The Egyptian revolution of 2011 has begun a transition to a democratically-elected, civilian government, which is expected to culminate with the transfer of executive authority from the Supreme Council of the Armed Forces to new civilian leaders in the coming months. Egypt will continue to experience political changes in the coming years, including in civil-military relations. Egypt's security will also be impacted by new and evolving developments stemming from growing instability in the Sinai region, domestic

and foreign terrorist groups, unsecured border crossings, and the reform of security forces to ensure domestic law and order.

The committee notes that the U.S.-Egypt military-to-military relationship must account for the new challenges facing Egypt's newly-elected civilian government. Furthermore, the committee believes it is important for the United States to engage with the new Egyptian president and parliament as they review the military cooperation and security assistance relationship with the United States, including how to define their current national security priorities, what kinds of U.S. security assistance they wish to request, and what balance they desire between military and non-military assistance.

In light of Egypt's political and security challenges, the committee believes the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State should consult with Egypt's civilian and military leaders as part of a review of U.S. military-to-military engagement with Egypt. The goal of this review should be: (1) to ensure that U.S. military assistance, engagement, and arms sales are integrated into a strategy that responds to Egypt's current security challenges; (2) to assist the Egyptian government and military in aligning their acquisition of defense capabilities with their strategic requirements and security challenges; and (3) to reinforce the democratic principle of civilian control of the military in Egypt. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report periodically to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate on the findings of this review.

Special operations security force assistance activities

The committee notes that the defense strategic guidance titled "*Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense*" states "Whenever possible, we will develop innovative, low-cost, and small footprint approaches to achieve our security objectives, relying on exercises, rotational presence, and advisory capabilities." The committee believes that U.S. Special Operations Forces, because of their combat experience, ability to operate independently, and unique cultural and language expertise, are well suited to implement this mandate.

The committee is aware of concerns from the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command and the commanders of the theater special operations commands that the bureaucratic processes associated with the Department of Defense's (DOD) security force assistance authorities may, in some cases, hamper the efforts of special operations forces to remain engaged persistently with partner nation security forces. The committee recognizes that such persistent engagement is important to building the capacity of and establishing an enduring relationship with special operations and other security forces in priority countries.

The committee notes that Congress has made efforts in recent years to provide more flexible and responsive authorities to conduct security force assistance activities. The committee encourages DOD to make more effective use of existing authorities, including the Global Security Contingency Fund, "section 1206" global train and

equip authority, and DOD counternarcotics authorities, to better support the security force assistance activities of special operations forces under the command of the theater special operations commands.

Furthermore, the committee notes that section 1203 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) required the Secretary of Defense to provide a report due no later than 90 days after the enactment of that Act outlining the authorities that may be necessary for U.S. Special Operations Forces to adequately conduct counterterrorism, unconventional warfare, and irregular warfare in the future. That report has not been delivered to the committee. Additionally, elsewhere in this Act and accompanying report, the committee requires a report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the roles of general purpose and special operations forces in conducting security force assistance and a review by the Defense Policy Board on DOD efforts to build partnership capacity and partnership initiatives. The committee looks forward to the results of these reviews to guide future legislative or policy initiatives with respect to security force assistance activities.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill, and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $519.2 million, the amount of the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision would also authorize specific amounts for each CTR program element, require notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2013 funds for a purpose other than a purpose listed in the provision, and require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2013 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

Item of Special Interest

Metrics for Cooperative Threat Reduction

Section 1308 of Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) requires the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program to submit an annual report to Congress outlining a 5 year plan for the program. Section 1304(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the National Academies of Science to submit a report reviewing the metrics of the CTR Program. The report, "Improving Metrics for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program", issued January 25, 2012, made a number of recommendations. The principal recommendation is that "the DOD should include a concise statement of its objectives and how the program is intended to reduce threat or risk." The committee understands in response to the National Academies Report that the Department will brief Congress the summer of 2012 on revised metrics that are "program-specific and linked directly to overall CTR Program goals and objectives".

The committee directs the Department of Defense to include in its annual CTR report to Congress, a concise section on the revised program metrics the Department has developed and an easy to understand chart showing their progress in achieving the metrics. The committee also directs the Department to include in the annual CTR program report what will happen to a particular pro-

gram once the metrics are achieved considering the following three options: (1) will the Department continue to sustain the program and if so what is the estimated cost over 5 years, (2) will the Department move the program in sustainment phase to the host government or another U.S. Government Agency, or (3) close out the program with no additional funding. The goal is to give clear resolution of the program once the metrics are achieved.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense (sec. 1404)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide (sec. 1405)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense-wide, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1406)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile

Release of materials needed for national defense purposes from the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile (sec. 1411)

The committee recommends a provision, as requested by the Department of Defense, which would authorize the President to dele-

gate release authority of the National Defense Stockpile to the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Subtitle C—Chemical Demilitarization Matters

Supplemental chemical agent and munitions destruction technologies at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, and Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky (sec. 1421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to consider using technologies to supplement the neutralization destruction of the stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, and Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky. The provision would authorize the Secretary to consider explosive destruction technologies and any technologies developed for treatment and disposal of agent or energetic hydrolysates, if problems with the current on-site treatment of hydrolysates are encountered. The provision would also repeal an older provision of law that restricted the consideration of supplemental technologies at Pueblo Chemical Depot.

Both the Pueblo and Blue Grass depots contain a limited number of chemical munitions that will be problematic and unsafe for the selected neutralization technology at each plant, including leaking munitions, reject munitions, and explosive components. By augmenting the neutralization technology at each plant with explosive destruction technologies, the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) program would be able to destroy these problematic munitions safely and in a manner that could also save time and money.

The committee notes that the ACWA program is currently constructing the Pueblo and Blue Grass chemical agent destruction plants, the last two facilities of the U.S. chemical weapons destruction program. The United States is obligated under the Chemical Weapons Convention to destroy its entire stockpile of chemical weapons by the extended treaty deadline of April 29, 2012. However, technical, cost and schedule issues have prevented the Pueblo and Blue Grass facilities from being built and operational in time to meet the treaty deadline. The committee notes that the United States has completed the destruction of some 90 percent of its stockpile of chemical weapons prior to the treaty deadline, and is proceeding with the ACWA sites as rapidly as is consistent with the requirements of law, including requirements to protect public health and safety.

The committee observes that the ACWA program experienced a Nunn-McCurdy cost breach in 2011, and the Department of Defense has recently issued a new cost and schedule estimate for the program. If the two facilities are able to use explosive destruction technologies, it would avoid the significant risks that would arise from processing unsafe munitions through each plant, and help reduce the overall cost and schedule for completing destruction of their chemical munitions.

In order to use such technologies, the ACWA program would first have to complete an Environmental Assessment for each site, including public review and comment, subject to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (Public Law 91–190). The

committee understands that the ACWA program is undertaking such an assessment for Pueblo, and plans to do the same at Blue Grass in the future. The committee also understands that the ACWA program has engaged the Citizens' Advisory Commissions at Pueblo and Blue Grass to inform them and obtain their input on issues related to explosive destruction technologies, and other technologies developed for treatment and disposal of hydrolysates, if problems with current on-site treatment of hydrolysates are encountered. The committee directs the Department to ensure that the Citizens' Advisory Commissions are kept fully informed and engaged on these issues as they move forward, and expects the Department to continue keeping Congress properly informed. The committee also urges the Department to seek opportunities to complete the destruction of all chemical agents and munitions at Pueblo and Blue Grass as close to the Chemical Weapons Convention deadline as possible, and as close to the additional December 31, 2017, deadline established by Congress, consistent with the requirements of law governing the chemical weapons destruction program.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1431)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $67.6 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2013 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Additional Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (sec. 1432)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize, retroactively, the Secretary of Defense to have established two additional Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams (WMD-CST) beyond the 55 previously authorized in law, and would prohibit the establishment of additional WMD-CSTs unless the Secretary of Defense requests the authority to establish such teams and their establishment is specifically authorized by law. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report on WMD-CSTs.

The committee notes that section 1403 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), authorized a total of 55 WMD-CSTs, with a requirement for at least 1 team in each State and territory. The Department of Defense established the 55 WMD-CSTs and certified each one, as required in section 12310(c)(5) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 1082 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) required the Secretary of Defense to establish an advisory panel to carry out an assessment of the capabilities of the Department of Defense to provide support to civil authorities in the event of a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive event.

Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the advisory panel to as-

sess and make recommendations on whether there should be any additional WMD–CSTs beyond the 55 already authorized and, if so, how many more and where they should be located.

Prior to the September 15, 2010, report of the advisory panel, "*Report of the Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Capabilities for Support of Civil Authorities After Certain Incidents,*" the Department of Defense, using funds appropriated by Congress, established 2 additional WMD–CSTs beyond the 55 authorized, 1 in New York and 1 in Florida. In its report, the advisory panel concluded that the number of WMD–CSTs, including the 55 certified Civil Support Teams (CST) and the 2 new (as yet uncertified) CSTs in New York and Florida, was adequate, and recommended that the Secretary "neither authorize more Civil Support Teams nor change their locations at this time."

The Department of Defense certified the new CST in New York on November 29, 2010, and certified the new CST in Florida on November 4, 2011.

The committee is disappointed that the Department established 2 additional CSTs that had not been authorized, but—given the advisory panel's conclusion that the 57 CSTs are the adequate number and in the correct locations, and that the 2 new CSTs have been certified—the committee believes their authorization is warranted. However, in order to prevent the creation of future unauthorized CSTs, the committee has included the prohibition on establishing additional CSTs, beyond the 57 that would be authorized in the provision, unless they are specifically authorized in law.

Budget Items

Defense Health Program funding

The amount authorized to be appropriated for the Defense Health Program includes the following change from the budget request. This addition would replace savings assumed by the Department of Defense (DOD) for proposed establishment of enrollment fees and increases to certain other TRICARE fees, which the committee did not adopt.

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Restore DOD assumed savings for TRICARE proposals	452.0
Total	452.0

Demand Reduction Program—expanded drug testing

The budget request included $889.5 million for the Department of Defense's (DOD) Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide, and $109.8 million for the DOD's Drug Demand Reduction Program. The committee recommends a decrease of $25.9 million in Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide, and increase of $25.9 million in Drug Demand Reduction Program.

The committee supports the ongoing efforts of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to expand the existing Drug Demand Reduction Program testing program to include prescription and synthetic drugs. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to program funding for these activities in future years.

Department of Defense Inspector General growth plan

The budget request for the Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General (DODIG), included $273.8 million in Operation and Maintenance (O&M)—$73.1 million less than the fiscal year 2012 appropriated level and $76.5 million less than the amount required to carry out the DODIG's growth plan for fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends an increase of $59.1 million in O&M for the DODIG.

The committee recognizes that all elements of the Department of Defense (DOD) have been required to reduce staffing and expenditures and that a growth plan established in 2008 requires reconsideration in light of new budgetary realities. The committee further recognizes that last year's appropriated funding included $14.0 million for expenses related to base realignment and closing (BRAC) that will not be needed this year.

However, the independent audit and investigative functions of the DODIG play a critical role in identifying waste, fraud, and abuse in DOD programs and operations. In fiscal year 2011, DODIG audits and investigations resulted in $2.6 billion of savings, an average $8.79 saved for every dollar appropriated and $1.6 million saved per DODIG employee.

The increase recommended by the committee would not fully fund the DODIG growth plan, but would restore DODIG funding to the fiscal year 2012 appropriated level, minus the $14.0 million for BRAC funding that is no longer needed. The committee directs that the added funding be used by the DODIG to conduct oversight related to military operations in Afghanistan, review contract management and acquisitions, and support audits to identify potential waste, fraud, and abuse. The committee directs the DODIG to reevaluate the 2008 growth plan and establish future staffing objectives on the basis of audit and investigation need and current budgetary realities.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Purpose (sec. 1501)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in additional to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

Procurement (sec. 1502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1503)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1504)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

Military personnel (sec. 1505)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Working capital funds (sec. 1506)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1507)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1508)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Ac-

tivities, Defense-wide, at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1509)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521)

The committee recommends a provision that would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Special transfer authority (sec. 1522)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to an additional $4.0 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

Subtitle C—Limitations and Other Matters

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1531)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) for fiscal year 2013 remain subject to certain conditions specified in section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public law 110–181; 122 Stat. 428), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4424).

The provision would also explicitly authorize the use of ASFF funds during fiscal year 2013 to increase the capacity of the Afghanistan Ministry of Interior to recruit, vet, train, and manage the Afghan Public Protection Force (APPF), the guard force established to take over the provision of certain security services from private security contractors. The committee is concerned by reports that the APPF lacks adequate capacity in both quantity and quality, and encourages the Department of Defense to take appropriate steps to help build the capacity of the APPF during this transition period. The committee also encourages the Department to continue to monitor and periodically assess the development of the APPF to help ensure that this force has the capacity to provide, and is providing, security to the U.S. military and civilian installations, convoys, and personnel that are under its protection.

Additionally, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for continuing to use the ASFF to build and sustain the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF) through September 30, 2017. The committee believes the ASFF has proven effective for purposes of building the capacity of the ANSF and encourages the continued use of the fund to support the ANSF during and after the transition to an Afghan security lead in 2014.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1532)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, for 1 fiscal year, the authority for the Secretary of Defense to use funds to investigate, develop, and provide equipment, supplies, services, personnel, and funds to assist efforts to defeat improvised explosive devices. The provision would also permit the Secretary to transfer funds from the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund to certain other accounts of the Department of Defense. Further, the provision would permit the Secretary to expend not more than $15.0 million to provide training, equipment, services, and supplies to counter the flow of improvised explosive device precursor chemicals from Pakistan into locations in Afghanistan.

Plan for transition in funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding under the future-years defense program (sec. 1533)

The committee notes that approximately one-quarter of the fiscal year 2013 budget request for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) is Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding. During testimony before the Committee on March 6, 2012, the Commander of USSOCOM predicted "Even with the conclusion of operations in Afghanistan, historical deployment data reveals a constant demand for a "steady state" deployed force of nearly 12,000 special operations forces (SOF) to support the Geographic Combatant Commanders' requirements."

In response to policy questions from the committee prior to his confirmation, the Commander of USSOCOM noted "the new USSOCOM Commander will be challenged to deliver the required [SOF] capabilities in a fiscally constrained environment knowing the budget without OCO transition does not fully resource the Command." Furthermore, the Commander of USSOCOM indicated "A decrease in the Command's budget level would severely impact my ability to meet the demand for SOF and significantly increase the risk to our Nation's security" and "for some higher intensity SOF elements, the OCO percentage is greater than 75 percent. Without this transition, mission failure is a real possibility."

The committee is aware that the fiscal year 2013 budget request begins the initial migration of approximately $960.0 million in USSOCOM funding from the OCO to the base budget to support enduring SOF requirements. However, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not identified a plan to fully transition funding for enduring SOF requirements from the OCO to base budget in future years, potentially putting maintenance of SOF capabilities at risk. As such, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees, as part of the fiscal year 2014 budget request, with a plan to fully transition appropriate USSOCOM funding from the OCO to base budget over the future-years defense program to maintain critical and enduring SOF capabilities.

Extension of authority on Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1534)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2013 the authority under section 1535 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4426), as amended, for the Department of Defense Task Force on Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan. The provision would authorize the use of up to $93.0 million in Overseas Contingency Operations, Operation and Maintenance, for the Army, to support the Task Force's activities to support the counterinsurgency strategy through economic development and job creation.

Assessments of training activities and intelligence activities of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (sec. 1535)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct assessments of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization's (JIEDDO) training activities and intelligence activities.

Six years after the Department of Defense (DOD) established JIEDDO as its coordinating agency to lead, advocate, and coordinate responses to the improvised explosive device (IED) threat across the Department, according to the Government Accountability Office, DOD continues to experience fragmentation, overlap, and duplication in its counter-IED efforts. Two areas where the committee is most concerned about these risks are in the JIEDDO intelligence analysis activities and its training activities. In the case of both of these activities, JIEDDO continues to conduct activities that are wholly duplicative of various elements of the military departments and the intelligence community. Before the committee recommends significant reductions in these activities, the committee hopes the Secretary of Defense—in consultation with the appropriate DOD elements—will identify areas of duplication and make an assessment of whether duplication of effort is necessary to ensure mission success.

The committee hopes this internal assessment will result in JIEDDO divesting of its training activities no later than the end of fiscal year 2013. Further, the committee hopes JIEDDO will transfer the Counter-IED Operations Integration Center to the appropriate entities within the military departments, intelligence directorates, or to elements within the intelligence community no later than the end of fiscal year 2013.

Budget Items

AH–64 Apache Block IIIB new build

The budget request included $71.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), for AH–64 Apache Block IIIB new build aircraft as war replacements.

The committee recommends a decrease of $71.0 million in APA OCO for AH–64 Apache Block IIIB aircraft. The committee continues to disagree, as noted in last year's Senate report accompanying S. 1253 (S. Rept. 112–26) the National Defense Authoriza-

tion Act for Fiscal Year 2012, that procurement of this aircraft, while still in development and testing, is a legitimate war loss replacement.

Rapid equipping soldier support equipment

The budget request included $98.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), for rapid equipping soldier support equipment (RESSE). The committee notes that significant balances of funds appropriated in prior years remain available for obligation in fiscal year 2013. The committee recommends a decrease of $37.0 million in OPA OCO for RESSE.

Solar power units

The budget request included $98.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), for rapid equipping soldier support equipment (RESSE). The committee notes that the Army's Rapid Equipping Force has initiated the procurement of solar power units that significantly increase the operational energy effectiveness and sustainability of remotely located units in Afghanistan. These solar power units will be deployed to support Village Stability Operations, and will substantially reduce the requirement for fuel delivery by ground convoy or by air. These units provide sustainable power for U.S. forces and the Afghan people. The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in OPA OCO for RESSE solar power units.

Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund

The budget request included $62.5 billion for Operation and Maintenance (OM), Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), of which $400.0 million was for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) in fiscal year 2013 to support a program to develop and carry out large-scale infrastructure projects that support the counter-insurgency campaign in Afghanistan. The committee's concerns regarding the need to transition responsibility for large-scale infrastructure projects in Afghanistan from the U.S. Department of Defense to the U.S. Agency for International Development are discussed in the section of this report relating to title XII. The committee also continues to have concerns about the sustainability of large-scale infrastructure projects in Afghanistan as the Government of Afghanistan assumes increasing responsibility for Afghanistan's economic development.

The committee recommends a decrease of $50.0 million for OM, OCO, for AIF, to a level of $350.0 million.

Commanders' Emergency Response Program

The budget request included $400.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in Afghanistan for fiscal year 2013.

The committee notes that a primary purpose of CERP is to enhance force protection for U.S. troops by enabling commanders to fund projects that directly address the humanitarian and reconstruction needs of the Afghan people, particularly in less secure areas of the country, thereby gaining the support of the local popu-

lace. As U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan decrease, the committee anticipates that the requirement for CERP will decrease at the same time, as occurred in Iraq. The committee also notes that the Commander, International Security Assistance Force, has issued new, more stringent guidelines for the use of CERP in Afghanistan. In part as a result of these new guidelines, the rate of expenditure of CERP funds in Afghanistan has decreased significantly. According to a Defense Department report, as of March 31, 2012, CERP in Afghanistan had committed $61.2 million, obligated $31.4 million, and disbursed $19.0 million of the $400.0 million authorized for the program during fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $200.0 million in OMA, OCO, for CERP to a level of $200.0 million to be available for CERP in Afghanistan.

Installation information infrastructure support for United States Southern Command

The budget request included $393.2 million in the Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account for Other Personnel Support. At the request of United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), the committee recommends a decrease of $40.0 million in OMA, OCO and an increase of $40.0 million in Other Procurement, Army, OCO for the Installation Information Infrastructure Modification Program to support the SOUTHCOM Commander's information infrastructure requirements.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request included $1,675.4 million in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (JIEDDF). This amount includes $950.5 million for the attack the network line of operation; $149.5 million for the train the force line of operation; and $400.0 million for the defeat the device line of operation.

As noted in title I of this report, the committee recommended a transfer of $227.4 million from the JIEDDF's base budget request for staff and infrastructure to the OCO budget request. Adding these funds together, JIEDDF's total budget request is: $1,902.8 million.

The committee remains deeply concerned about the threat posed by, and the deadly impact of, improvised explosive devices (IED) to the nearly 70,000 U.S. service members still deployed in Afghanistan. The committee will continue to support robust funding for these efforts as long as U.S. service members are deployed in Afghanistan.

Through fiscal year 2012, Congress has authorized and appropriated over $20.0 billion to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) to address the IED threat. In addition, other Department of Defense (DOD) components, including the military services, have spent billions of dollars from their own funds developing counter-IED capabilities.

Six years after DOD established JIEDDO as its coordinating agency to lead, advocate, and coordinate responses to the IED threat across the Department, according to the Government Ac-

countability Office (GAO), DOD continues to lack comprehensive visibility of its counter-IED expenditures and investments, including those from JIEDDO, the military services, and relevant DOD agencies.

In March 2011, the GAO found that no fewer than 31 DOD entities, many of which started as ad hoc organizations, play a significant role in various urgent needs processes. For example, GAO reported, JIEDDO, the military services, and the Special Operations Command have all established their own processes and guidance on meeting specific urgent needs, and their own feedback mechanisms for assessing how well fielded solutions meet such needs.

In the GAO's February 2012 report on DOD's counter-IED efforts, the Comptroller General warned, again, that DOD risks fragmentation, overlap, and duplication because it still does not have a comprehensive listing of DOD-wide counter-IED initiatives. Additionally, GAO reported that although JIEDDO recently issued its own strategic plan, it has not developed a DOD-wide plan. By not having a comprehensive DOD-wide strategic plan with results-oriented strategic goals, DOD is limited in its ability to evaluate the effectiveness of its counter-IED efforts and prioritize projects within future budget levels. Further, the committee is concerned that JIEDDO has hundreds of millions in unexpended authorized and appropriated funds.

In light of these concerns, the committee recommends a total reduction of $200.0 million to the budget request for the JIEDDF. The reduction to each line of operation is reflected in the budget tables.

Items of Special Interest

Department of Defense procurement of Mi–17 helicopters through Rosoboronexport

The Department of Defense contract with Rosoboronexport, awarded by the Department of the Army on June 1, 2011, on a sole-source basis, procures at minimum 21 Mi–17 helicopters and spares for the Afghan military. The contract has a total value of nearly $1.0 billion and includes options for additional aircraft, spares, and support. The Department has indicated that the procurement of additional Mi–17 for the Afghan military may be required.

The Department states that *"Rosoboronexport is the sole entity controlling export of military-use Mi–17 helicopters."* The committee notes that in 2009 the Department of the Navy procured four commercial Mi–17 helicopters through a private U.S. broker following an open and competitive selection process. Those helicopters were produced by the original equipment manufacturer and are presently in service with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Air Training Command-Afghanistan. On July 6, 2010, the Department of the Navy released a Request for Proposals for a second competitive procurement of Mi–17s, this time for 21 aircraft. On December 20, 2010, prior to a contract award, the Department of Defense cancelled the procurement.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Department's current process for

procuring Mi–17 helicopters and parts through Rosoboronexport. The Comptroller should provide this report to the congressional defense committees by no later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report shall be submitted in an unclassified format, but may include a classified annex if necessary. The review should, at a minimum, assess:

1. The availability of alternative means for the Department of Defense to procure commercial or military versions of the Mi–17 helicopter and parts, rather than buying through Rosoboronexport.

2. The feasibility of procuring a commercial version of the Mi–17 in lieu of the military version (including an assessment of any applicable legal restrictions on such procurement, the relative cost of military and commercial systems, and the operational significance of any differences between military and commercial systems).

3. The impact that purchasing Mi–17 aircraft through Rosoboronexport can reasonably be expected to have on the risk of counterfeiting, access to technical data, and aircraft safety.

4. The reasons for the Department of Defense's cancellation of the Navy's 2010 competitive procurement of 21 Mi–17 helicopters.

The report should include the Comptroller General's findings and recommendations, including findings as to the relative cost-effectiveness of the procurement approaches taken by the Department of the Army and the Department of the Navy, and any recommendations that the Comptroller General may have as to whether future procurements of Mi–17s should be made on a competitive basis, and whether sources other than Rosoboronexport should be considered.

Future size of the Afghan National Security Forces

The committee believes that strong, capable, and sustained Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) are a fundamental component of the long-term United States and coalition strategy in Afghanistan. To this end, the United States and coalition partners have invested substantial resources to build the ANSF to a force of 352,000 in 2012 and sustain that force over time so that, as U.S. and coalition forces draw down, Afghan forces will be sufficiently capable to maintain the hard-won gains that U.S., coalition, and Afghan forces have secured at great cost in both blood and treasure. To achieve this objective, the committee believes it is imperative that the ANSF is correctly sized, structured, and resourced to provide enduring security for their country.

The committee notes with concern that news reports indicate administration officials are considering significant reductions in the size of the ANSF after 2014, by as much as one-third. These proposed reductions appear to be based on presumptions about future security conditions in Afghanistan and the affordability of sustaining these forces years from now. The committee believes that any decisions on the future size and composition of and funding for the ANSF after these forces assume the lead for security throughout Afghanistan in 2014 must be driven principally by strategic considerations and the security conditions on the ground at that time. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report periodically to the congressional defense committees with an assessment of the needs of the ANSF, to include metrics on factors

that will influence decisions on the size and composition of this force. The report should also identify and assess risks to security and stability in Afghanistan associated with reductions to the size and changes in the composition of the ANSF.

Finally, the committee believes that long-term funding for the ANSF should not be a U.S.-only effort and that all North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies and partners share an interest in supporting a strong ANSF that will be sufficiently capable of providing enduring security for the country of Afghanistan. As such, the committee commends those partners who have already committed financial support for this effort and urges the administration to continue its efforts to secure additional support from the international community.

TITLE XVI—MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

Short title (sec. 1601)

The committee recommends a provision that would cite title XVI of this Act as the "Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission Act of 2012".

Purpose (sec. 1602)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the purpose of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission as (1) ensuring the long-term viability of the All-Volunteer Force; (2) enabling a high quality of life for military families; and (3) modernizing and achieving fiscal sustainability of the compensation and retirement systems.

Definitions (sec. 1603)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish definitions for common terms used in the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission Act of 2012.

Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (sec. 1604)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish in the Executive Branch an independent commission called the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. The provision would provide that the Commission be composed of nine members appointed by the President, in consultation with the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives. The provision would provide that the President designate one member as the Commission's Chairman. The provision would require that Commission members have significant expertise in federal compensation and retirement systems, including the military compensation and retirement systems, private sector compensation, retirement, or human resource systems, actuarial science, and be selected based on their knowledge and experience with the uniformed services and the military compensation and retirement systems. The provision would require that at least five members of the Commission have active-duty military experience, that at least one member have experience as an enlisted member of the armed forces, that at least one member have experience as a member of a reserve component, and that at least one member have been a spouse of a military member, or be someone with significant experience in military family issues. Finally, the provision would prohibit the appointment of individuals as members of the Commission who are, or were within the year preceding appointment, employed by a vet-

erans service organization or military-related advocacy group or association.

Commission hearings and meetings (sec. 1605)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to conduct hearings on recommendations for legislative change under consideration, and that all hearings be open to the public, except those where classified information might be considered. The provision would require that any hearing open to the public be advertised on a federal website no less than 14 days prior to the hearing. The provision would require the Commission to hold its initial meeting within 30 days of all members being appointed. The provision would establish that five members constitute a quorum of the Commission. Lastly, the provision would require the Commission to seek written public comment on recommendations under consideration.

Principles and procedure for commission recommendations (sec. 1606)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to conduct a review of the military retirement and compensation systems in the context of current compensation and retirement programs, force management objectives, and changes in life expectancy and the labor force. The provision would require the President, within 5 months of the establishment of the Commission, to establish and transmit to Congress and the Commission principles for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems, including maintaining recruitment and retention of the best military personnel, modernizing the active and reserve military compensation and retirement systems, differentiating between active and reserve military service, differentiating between service in the armed forces and service in the other uniformed services, and ensuring the fiscal sustainability of the military compensation and retirement systems. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense, within 9 months of the establishment of the Commission, to transmit to Congress and the Commission the Secretary's recommendations for military compensation and retirement modernization, and would require the Secretary to consult the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Commerce, and Homeland Security on recommendations that affect the Public Health Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the U.S. Coast Guard, respectively. The provision would require the Commission to conduct public hearings on the Secretary's recommendations. The provision would require the Commission, within 15 months of its establishment, to transmit to the President and Congress a report containing its findings, conclusions, and recommendations for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems, and legislative proposals necessary to implement those recommendations.

Finally, the provision would require that recommendations of the Commission grandfather the benefits of service members who first became a member of a uniformed service before the date of enact-

ment of a military compensation and retirement modernization act pursuant to this title, except that such recommendations may include an opt-in mechanism for members who would choose to be covered by some or all of the provisions of a military compensation and retirement modernization act.

Consideration of commission recommendations by the President and Congress (sec. 1607)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President, within 60 days of receiving the report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission required under section 1606 of this title, to transmit to Congress and the Commission a report approving or disapproving the Commission's recommendations. The provision would also provide for a procedure for the Commission to revise its recommendations in response to a Presidential disapproval. Finally, the provision would provide for expedited and protected consideration of military compensation and retirement modernization legislation in the Senate and the House of Representatives, without amendment, and without being subject to points of order, other than budget points of order.

Pay for members of the commission (sec. 1608)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the pay rate for members of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission as the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code. The provision would set the pay rate for the Chairman of the Commission as the daily equivalent of the annual rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

Executive Director (sec. 1609)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to appoint, and fix the rate of pay of, an Executive Director in accordance with section 3161 of title 5, United States Code. The provision would prohibit the appointment as Executive Director of any person having served on active duty in the armed forces, as a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, or as an employee of a veterans service organization or military-related advocacy group or association during the 1-year period preceding the date of appointment.

Staff (sec. 1610)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission Executive Director to appoint and fix the rate of pay of additional personnel to serve as staff for the Commission. The provision would limit the number of Department of Defense personnel detailed to the Commission to no more than one-third of the total personnel employed as staff, and would prohibit the detail to the Commission staff of anyone employed by the Department of Defense who was involved in the formation of the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense to the Commission. The provision would limit the num-

ber of personnel eligible for military retired pay to no more than one-fourth of the total personnel serving as Commission staff. The provision would prohibit a person from serving on the Commission staff if that person had been employed by a veterans service organization or military-related advocacy group or association within the 1-year period preceding employment on the Commission staff. Finally, the provision would prohibit the service of any staff member to the Commission employed by or detailed from the Department of Defense from being considered in that staff member's efficiency or fitness report.

Contracting authority (sec. 1611)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to lease space and acquire personal property to the extent funds are available.

Judicial review precluded (sec. 1612)

The committee recommends a provision that would preclude the actions of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission under section 1606 of this title, and of the President under section 1607(a) of this title, from judicial review.

Termination (sec. 1613)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the termination of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission no later than 26 months after the Commission's establishment date.

Funding (sec. 1614)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2013, $10.0 million be available to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission until expended to carry out its duties under this title.

TITLE XVII—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE AIR FORCE

National commission on the structure of the Air Force (secs. 1701–1709)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a commission to study the appropriate makeup of the Air Force, considering that the Department of the Air Force draws upon active-duty forces, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard.

Included in the budget request was a plan by the Air Force to retire or realign various aviation units, and to cut 9.9 thousand personnel from the rolls, including 3.9 thousand active duty personnel, 5.1 thousand from the Air National Guard and 0.9 thousand from the Air Force Reserve. These changes represent a percentage reduction of 1.2 percent, 4.8 percent, and 1.3 percent, respectively, of force structure for each component.

The committee believes that there is little justification for the relative imbalance in the cuts applied to the Air National Guard. The Air Force and the Department of Defense have been negotiating potential compromise outcomes that would change the relative distribution of aircraft and personnel, but those negotiations have as yet been unproductive. Since the Air Force proposes to implement many of the planned moves in fiscal year 2013, the committee feels it must take action now to delay those actions that would be difficult or impossible to reverse, and instead place the Air Force's judgment on appropriate force structure mixes under the scrutiny of a national commission.

The commission would be made up of four members appointed by leadership of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and four members appointed by the President. The commission, in considering possible force structure adjustments, would be directed to identify a structure that:

(1) meets current and anticipated requirements of the combatant commands;

(2) achieves an appropriate balance between the regular and reserve components of the Air Force, taking advantage of the unique strengths and capabilities of each;

(3) ensures that the reserve components of the Air Force have the capacity needed to support current and anticipated homeland defense and disaster assistance missions in the United States;

(4) provides for sufficient numbers of regular members of the Air Force to provide a base of trained personnel from which the personnel of the reserve components of the Air Force could be recruited;

(5) maintains a peacetime rotation force to avoid exceeding operational tempo goals of 1:2 for regular members of the Air

Forces and 1:5 for members of the reserve components of the Air Force; and

(6) maximizes achievable costs savings.

The commission would be required to produce a report not later than March 31, 2013.

The provision would also prevent the Air Force from using any fiscal year 2013 funds to divest, retire, or transfer, or prepare to divest, retire, or transfer, any aircraft of the Air Force assigned to units of the Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve as of May 31, 2012.

The provision would allow an exception for the Secretary of the Air Force to divest or retire, or prepare to divest or retire, C–5A aircraft, if the Secretary were to replace that aircraft through a transfer of C–5B, C–5M, or C–17 aircraft so as to maintain all Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units impacted by such divestment or retirement at current or higher assigned manpower levels to operate the transferred aircraft.

The provision also includes authorization of an additional $1.4 billion for the purpose of freezing Air Force structure in place or as planned in order to reserve decision space for the National Commission.

The amount of this additional authorization of appropriations is based on a rough estimate by the Department of the Air Force of the cost required to carry out this section. The committee expects that a review and analysis of the actions required to carry out this section may result in a cost to the Air Force that differs from the additional authorization of appropriation. The committee expects to be promptly notified once the Air Force determines the total cost to carry out this provision.

The Air Force budget request for fiscal year 2013 assumed roughly $1.4 billion in savings that derived from retiring several systems, cutting the numbers of systems that remain, and realigning systems between the active and reserve components.

The committee completely understands that the Air Force had to make tough choices in the budget. However, many of the choices the Air Force made are puzzling, and almost all are lacking sufficient analysis to support the conclusions in the budget. Some actually fly in the face of what the Air Force asserted just within the past couple of years. For example, a very troubling aspect of the budget proposal is that, within these force structure changes, the cuts in manpower and aircraft would fall disproportionately on the Air National Guard. In the fighter forces, the Air Force is planning for a cut of almost one third in the A–10 force, with that cut weighted heavily toward the Air National Guard. Original data provided by the Air Force showed that, simultaneously with making these cuts in A–10 force structure, the Air Force was planning to increase the size of the active-duty A–10 training squadrons.

In tactical airlift programs, the Air Force had established a requirement, validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, for 38 C–27 aircraft to provide direct support to Army ground forces. All of those aircraft were slated to go to the Guard. The committee observes that the Air Force joined what was a joint program with the Army, and then took sole ownership of it. Air Force officials testified that they needed to pursue the C–27 because the

C–130 could not meet requirements. Now, the Air Force has reversed course, and claims that the C–130 is adequate for meeting the direct support mission for the Army.

The committee believes that changing of Air Force force structure is too important to be approached with such a lack of rationale, unsupported by objective analysis. The committee has recommended two steps to improve this situation. For the near term, the committee is recommending creation of a National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force that would report recommendations next year on this matter. Elsewhere, for the longer term, the committee is recommending a provision that would direct the Comptroller General to develop recommendations for objective criteria to be used by the Department of Defense to make decisions relating to realignments of units employed at military installations that are not currently covered by section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee is concerned that, in an effort to realign its force structure, valuable and necessary coordination between the Air Force, Army, and National Guard regarding the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 force structure modifications were overlooked. In addition, the committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has failed to provide accurate analysis on the effects of the Air Force modifications decision. Earlier this year, the Secretary of the Air Force sent a letter to committee members in an attempt to justify the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 force structure modifications that result in the reallocation of Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units. However, the numbers provided in the Secretary's letter are vastly different from numbers received and coordinated between Air Force and Army personnel on-site at locations being affected.

Therefore, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of the Air Force suspend all force structure adjustments until October, 1, 2013, to allow the committee to review the recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force as they pertain to: (1) fielding of integrated joint training, command and control, and essential capabilities; and (2) current and anticipated requirements that support current defense strategy.

Retention of core functions of the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base pending future structure study (sec. 1710)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Secretary of the Air Force shall retain the current leadership rank and core functions of the Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base as existed as of November 1, 2011, until 180 days after the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees the report required under section 1703.

The committee is also puzzled by the Air Force's decision to realign manpower and core functions at the Electronic Systems Center (ESC). Last September, the Commander of Air Force Materiel Command and the Air Force Service Acquisition Executive asserted that the programs executed by ESC employ the largest acquisition workforce and noted that the delivery of integrated electronic capa-

bilities, multifaceted command and control (C2) requirements, and cross-cutting affordable solutions in the cyber domain supported the current defense strategy. Therefore, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of the Air Force to retain until October 1, 2013, the current manpower and leadership authorizations as well as core functions of ESC with the same integrated mission elements, responsibilities, and capabilities as exists from November 1, 2011. This would allow the committee to review the recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force as they pertain to: (1) acquisition and fielding of integrated C2 and cyber capabilities; or (2) current and anticipated requirements related to integration across multiple Program Executive Offices involved in solutions relating to command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) mission areas, ground/air/space networks, datalinks, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, and electronic warfare that support current defense strategy.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General to prepare an independent assessment of the impact of the reorganization of ESC as it relates to national defense including: (1) Air Force acquisition and fielding of integrated C2 and cyber capabilities; (2) Life Cycle Management Center Commander management, span of control, and integration across multiple Program Executive Offices involved in C4I mission areas, ground/air/space networks, datalinks, C2, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, and electronic warfare cyber; (3) enablers required to execute ESC's C4I mission, to include location of expertise, source of expertise, and identification of talent shortfalls; and (4) cycle time drivers for electronic system contractual actions and ultimate fielding timelines.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense (DOD). It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The tables contained in this act provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in Division B of this Act, other than the overseas contingency operations projects authorized in title XXIX, and summarize that funding by account. Funding for base closure projects is summarized in the table that follows, and is explained in additional detail in the table included in title XXVII of this report.

The fiscal year 2013 budget requested $11.2 billion for military construction and housing programs. Of this amount, $8.7 billion was requested for military construction, $1.7 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and $476.7 million for base closure activities, including $126.7 million to implement the results of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure round.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction and housing programs totaling $10.6 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects the committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of DOD facilities and infrastructure.

Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as October 1, 2015, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.9 billion for military construction and $534.7 million for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.6 billion for military construction and $534.7 million for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

The budget requested $192.0 million to construct a new barracks at the United States Military Academy (USMA). The committee has significant concerns about the condition of the current barracks at USMA. Their condition is reminiscent of other facilities that caused national outrage. The committee has been informed that the Army does not plan to renovate its existing barracks infrastructure until fiscal year 2018. The committee believes this is unacceptable and would support immediate action to begin renovations using available operation and maintenance funds.

The budget requests $30.0 million for infrastructure at Fort Bragg, North Carolina to support construction of facilities for special operations forces. These projects are contained in this year's budget request.

The committee recommends eliminating this infrastructure project since the resulting infrastructure would not constitute a "complete and useable" facility as required by statute. The committee recommends moving that $30.0 million to the facilities the infrastructure was expected to support, as inclusion in those facilities will yield complete and useable facilities.

The committee directs the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to provide updated DD form 1391s prior to final passage of the bill with these funds properly apportioned to the facilities requiring infrastructure. The committee further directs SOCOM to budget for complete and useable facilities that do not require supporting stand-alone infrastructure. The committee reiterates the requirement that military construction projects, even those supporting special forces, be complete and useable.

The budget requests $84.0 million for the Millennium Site cemetery expansion at Arlington National Cemetery (ANC). The committee notes that the Army's military construction account has historically not been used to authorize construction at ANC, and the committee believes changing this precedent would not be in the best interest of Arlington National Cemetery.

Further, the committee notes that the Appropriations committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives have moved funding from the Army's military construction accounts to Cemeterial Expenses. The request from Arlington National Cemetery has been fully funded in the Cemeterial Expenses account.

The committee supports fully funding the Arlington National Cemetery request; however, to minimize disruption of the planned cemetery expansion and ensure the project is addressed in the appropriate budget line, the committee recommends removing this request from the military construction accounts consistent with the actions taken by the Senate and House Appropriations committees.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2013. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2013 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Army. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2104)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in the table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2628) to allow for the construction of a standard design Access Control Point at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2009 projects (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for two Army fiscal year 2009 military construction projects until October 1, 2013, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for five Army fiscal year 2010 military construction projects until October 1, 2013, or the date of enactment of an act

authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense.

Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a Cadet Barracks at the United States Military Academy, New York.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.7 billion for military construction and $480.4 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.7 billion for military construction and $480.4 million for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

The budget requested $14.8 million for a Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Maintenance Training Facility at Point Mugu, California. The Department has requested a change in location for that project to Ventura County. This change would result in a $2.1 million reduction in the project. The committee recommends this change of location and reduction in funding.

The budget requests $280.0 million for the second increment of the Explosives Handling Wharf #2 in Naval Base Kitsap, Washington. The committee understands that the Department will be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and therefore recommends a $25.8 million reduction.

The budget requests $25.9 million for the second increment of the North Ramp Parking at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. Because of continuing concerns with the realignment of United States Marines from Okinawa to Guam, addressed later in a separate Item of Special Interest in this title, the committee recommends elimination of this project.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2013. It would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2013 to improve existing Navy family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2013 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1666) for construction of an Explosives Handling Wharf #2 at Naval Base Kitsap, Washington.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2009 projects (sec. 2206)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2009 authorization for three projects until October 1, 2013, or the date of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2207)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2010 authorization for three projects until October 1, 2013, or the date of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

Realignment of Marines in the Asia-Pacific region (sec. 2208)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the prohibition on funds for construction activities to implement the realignment of Marine Corps' forces from Okinawa to other locations.

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General of the United States assessment of the costs of realignment of the Marines in the Asia-Pacific region

On April 27, 2012, the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee issued a joint statement in which they detailed plans for the realignment of marines on Okinawa. Specifically, the U.S. and Japan have decided to delink the realignment of marines from Okinawa to Guam from the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF).

The plan contemplates fewer marines moving from Okinawa to Guam than planned in the 2006 Roadmap to Realignment Agreement. This should result in a reduction of the size and scope of the Guam military buildup. Of the approximately 9,000 marines that

will now eventually leave Okinawa, less than 5,000 would be moved to Guam and, of those, most would be rotational forces. The joint statement also refers to the plan to rotate marines to Australia and to restation marine forces on Hawaii.

This joint statement describes the plan for marines in the Asia-Pacific in broad terms, but leaves unanswered many of the details, particularly with respect to cost and timing of the realignment. The Comptroller General has been involved in assessing the costs associated with the realignment of marines in the past, specifically in its report entitled, *Comprehensive Cost Information and Analysis Alternatives Needed to Assess Military Posture in Asia (GAO–11–316)*, May 2011.

The committee remains concerned with the lack of comprehensive cost and schedule data associated with this important U.S. force posture issue. The strategic implications of the realignment are the subject of an ongoing independent assessment commissioned by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the costs associated with the revised plan to realign marines in the Asia-Pacific region as set forth in the joint statement of the United States-Japan Security Consultative Committee dated April 27, 2012. The assessment shall identify and assess costs associated with the initiatives' projected movement of marines to Guam, Hawaii, and Australia. To the extent possible, the assessment shall distinguish between costs that are known, costs that are estimated, and costs that are not yet known and cannot yet be estimated. The assessment should also include an estimate of the recurring annual costs of the moves that will affect future budgets for the Department of the Defense, including costs for the sustainment of forces, base operating support, and other operations and maintenance requirements.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Comptroller General receives access to such information and other support as the General Comptroller requires to perform this assessment. The Comptroller General shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 1, 2013, on the results of this assessment.

U.S. force posture in the Asia-Pacific and realignment of the U.S. Marines on Okinawa

The committee strongly supports a robust U.S. military force posture in the Asia-Pacific region as the cornerstone of peace and stability and to underwrite the development of new economic and security partnerships. As such, the stationing of U.S. military forces in the Asia-Pacific will stand as an unequivocal commitment to U.S. involvement in the region, and will secure our national interests as well as the mutual interests of our partners. To this end, the United States has embarked on a series of initiatives intended to realign its military force structure to respond to regional interests and it is essential that these initiatives are guided by sound strategic concepts and plans for force posture that are militarily ef-

fective, operationally supportable, and fiscally and politically sustainable.

The committee notes that U.S. bilateral security arrangements in the region, especially with Japan and with South Korea, remain the foundation of our security posture and activities in Asia. One key initiative in the furtherance of the U.S.-Japan bilateral arrangement involves changes to the stationing of U.S. forces in Japan and specifically Okinawa. The Defense Policy Review Initiative, as further detailed in the U.S.-Japan Alliance Transformation and Realignment for the Future and the 2006 U.S.-Japan Roadmap for Realignment Implementation agreement ("Roadmap agreement"), laid out a series of U.S. force consolidations and base closures intended to improve the cooperation of the two allies and reduce the burden on local Japanese communities.

Over the past few years, the committee has become increasingly concerned that terms of the Roadmap agreement as they related to the movement of marines from Okinawa to Guam and to the development of a replacement facility for the existing Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Futenma, were unrealistic, unworkable, and unaffordable. The committee also expressed concern last year about posture planning for U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific; and specifically the strategic implications and costs of U.S. commitments throughout the region. Subsequently, Congress included legislative provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) that required an independent assessment of the U.S. force posture in the Pacific Command area of responsibility and that prohibited the obligation of fiscal year 2012 funds or funds provided by the Government of Japan until certain requirements were met. The independent assessment, which is due to Congress in June 2012, was intended to help identify emerging opportunities to update the U.S. force posture for a better alignment with dynamic regional interests free of the inertia of past decisions.

On April 27, 2012, the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee issued a joint statement detailing changes to the plans for the realignment of marines on Okinawa. Specifically, the U.S. and Japan separated the requirement of tangible progress on the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) from other marine restationing efforts on Okinawa to return lands to local communities. Also, while the overall number of marines to leave Okinawa remained essentially the same as the previous agreement, at about 9,000, the new arrangement will result in fewer marines being restationed to Guam with the remainder of the forces being relocated to new locations in Australia, Hawaii, or to the west coast of the United States.

The committee notes, however, that the parties have made no adjustment to the plan to build the FRF at Camp Schwab in the Henoko area of Okinawa and provided no timeline for the completion of construction of the FRF. In the meantime, the Marine Corps will continue to operate from MCAS Futenma, a heavily-encroached air base in the crowded Ginowan area of Okinawa, in facilities and infrastructure that are in deteriorated condition due to the deliberate decision over a number of years to defer maintenance, repairs, and renovations in light of the eventual base clo-

sure. The committee is concerned that any decision to further delay the construction of a FRF without a plan to provide for safe, secure facilities at MCAS Futenma will put marines and their families at risk. Accordingly, the committee strongly recommends that the U.S. and Japan establish a timeline for the identification of alternatives to the Henoko FRF plan, including the reconsideration of existing military air bases and other airport facilities in the area, in order to allow for prudent and critical investments in the current Marine Corps Air Station by both Governments.

With respect to the plan announced in the April 27th joint statement, the committee has questions about the extent to which the updated initiatives are guided by strategic concepts and plans for force posture that are militarily effective, operationally supportable, and fiscally and politically sustainable. The committee also notes that the new distributed laydown proposed for Marine Corps forces will require the completion of a concept of operations, an analysis of logistics requirements, and basing plans to establish and employ full Marine Air Ground Task Force (MAGTF) capabilities at four geographically dispersed locations in Okinawa, Guam, Australia, and Hawaii. The committee is concerned that the agreement does not include any formal timelines for budgeting or for completion of the realignments. This uncertainty increases the risk that a delay in investments or construction prolonged over 10 years or more will have a detrimental impact on the readiness and operational capabilities of the MAGTFs in the region. The committee also expects the independent assessment to contribute to the review and discussion by the committee of the proposed changes to the strategic framework for U.S. forces in the region. Until the committee is provided details to adequately assess the strategic impact, feasibility, and affordability of these initiatives, the committee is unwilling to authorize further obligations of funds for projects on Guam in support of the relocation, to include investments proposed for civilian facility and infrastructure requirements.

Also, the committee recognizes that some environmental studies will be necessary to consider the effects of the new plans for Guam and for Hawaii. These environmental studies will inevitably take time, but must be expedited to the greatest extent feasible so that the realignments can begin as soon as practical. To this end, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the environmental studies associated with the movement of marines from Okinawa be given the highest priority within the Department and that every effort be made to expedite these studies, consistent with applicable laws and regulations.

As the realignment of U.S. forces in the Pacific Command area of responsibility continues to be formalized through plans and agreements with our allies, the committee should receive regular updates from the Department of Defense on the process, particularly with regard to costs, timelines, planning, and logistics of this critical endeavor. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives receive regular updates, at least once every 3 months, if not more often, on the cost and timelines associated with the realignment of marines on Oki-

nawa and on the environmental planning process for Guam, Australia, and Hawaii.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $388.2 million for military construction and $581.7 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $355.2 billion for military construction and $581.7 million for family housing for fiscal year 2013.

The committee notes that the budget request for the Air Force for military construction is considerably reduced this fiscal year. The Air Force has described this reduction as a 'strategic pause' in military construction. The committee is concerned that this reallocation of budget authority may endanger the Air Force's ability to meet future military construction requirements.

The budget requests $161.0 million for the second increment of the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) Replacement Facility at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska. The committee is concerned that initial contractor bids received for the construction of this facility far exceeded the government's cost estimate and the congressional authorization of $564.0 million.

The committee notes that in an era of budget austerity, the Department of Defense must ensure that only the most critical facility requirements needed to carry out the current missions are supported in new headquarters facilities. As the Department receives new bids for this facility, the committee is concerned that no critical facility requirements for U.S. STRATCOM be eliminated and that no costs are deferred to other funding streams; therefore, the committee directs the Department to submit an updated DD–1391 form, along with current manning requirements for the facility, that captures the complete and usable project to be awarded for the amount previously authorized by Congress.

The committee further notes that the Department will be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and therefore recommends a $33.0 million reduction.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2013. It would also authorize funds

for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2013 to improve existing Air Force family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2013 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2010 authorization for two projects until October 1, 2013, or the date of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $3.5 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, $150.0 million for energy conservation projects, $151.0 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $54.0 million for family housing for the defense agencies, and the Family Housing Improvement Fund for fiscal year 2013.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $3.4 billion for military construction, $150.0 million for energy conservation projects, $151.0 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $54.2 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2013.

The budget requests $300.5 million for the second increment of the High Performance Computing Center at Fort Meade, Maryland. The committee understands that the National Security Agency (NSA) will be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and therefore recommends a $75.0 million reduction.

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization provided last year for this project. The committee required the NSA to validate the cost of the project. The original budget request for the project was $860.5 million. This year's request shows a reduction of approximately $68.3 million in the project's value with no degradation in final performance or schedule.

The budget requests $7.0 million for Base Installation Access/Appearance Plan at Bethesda Naval Hospital, Maryland. The supporting budget documents show that this requirement should be met with operations and maintenance funds and not military construction funds; therefore, the committee recommends this project be eliminated.

The budget requests $207.4 million for the fourth increment of the Hospital Replacement at Fort Bliss, Texas. The committee understands that the Department will be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and therefore recommends a $100.0 million reduction.

Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations

Authorized defense agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal

year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, defense agencies (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2013 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2404)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for a project until October 1, 2013, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later. This extension was requested by the Department of Defense.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2405)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1672), relating to Fort Meade, Maryland, by striking "$29,640,000" and inserting "$792,200,000."

Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2406)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an Upgrade Fuel Pipeline at Andersen Air Force Base with certain limitations.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations

Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the chemical demilitarization program for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1997 project (sec. 2412)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the table in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2775), as amended.

Item of Special Interest

Excess overseas facilities for defense agencies

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is in the process of reviewing U.S. military force posture in Europe and Asia with the intent of consolidating and aligning military forces to meet national security objectives in a fiscally constrained environment.

The committee further notes that most of the attention and efforts to date have centered on the status and realignment of forces of the military departments even though the 16 major defense agencies of the Department maintain significant numbers of facilities and personnel overseas. The committee believes that a request by the Department of Defense for the authority to conduct a domestic Base Realignment and Closure round must be preceded by a comprehensive evaluation of opportunities to obtain efficiencies through the consolidation of the overseas operations of defense agencies and possible relocation back to the United States.

Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense, as the Chief Management Officer of the Department, to evaluate the feasibility and cost-savings that may be realized by closing overseas facilities and consolidating operations of the 16 defense agencies to existing facilities and installations within the United States.

The committee further directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2013, on the results of the review, including the projected personnel realignments, facilities maintenance, and facilities modernization costs and savings that could be achieved by consolidating overseas operations and possibly relocating those functions to facilities located in the United States.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $254.2 million for military construction in fiscal year 2013 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization facilities.

The committee recommends a total of $254.2 million for military construction for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization facilities.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of $254.2 million for the United States' contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2013.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $1.0 billion for military construction in fiscal year 2013 for facilities for the guard and reserve components. The committee recommends this amount. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the State list table included in this report.

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2013. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2013 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The State list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2009 project (sec. 2611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2009 authorization for a project until October 1, 2013, or the date of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2010 authorization for three projects until October 1, 2013, or the date of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2014, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

Summary and explanation of tables

The budget request included $349.3 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds.

In addition, the budget requested an authorization of appropriations of $126.7 million for implementation of the 2005 BRAC round.

The committee recommends funding at these levels.

Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 1990 (sec. 2701)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2013 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995 Base Realignment and Closure rounds.

Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense base closure account 2005 (sec. 2702)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2013 that are required to implement the decisions of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure round. The table included in this title of the report lists the specific amounts authorized at each location.

Technical amendments to section 2702 of fiscal year 2012 Act (sec. 2703)

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical amendment and a conforming amendment to section 2702 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1681).

Criteria for decisions involving certain base closure and realignment activities (sec. 2704)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Comptroller General to develop objective criteria to be used by the Department of Defense to make decisions relating to realignments of units employed at military installations that are not currently covered by section 2687 of title 10, United States Code.

The provision would also include a 1-year moratorium on implementing any realignment that would result in a military installation covered under section 2687 to no longer be covered by section

2687. This moratorium could be waived by the Secretary of Defense if he certifies that the action is in the national security interests of the United States.

Item of Special Interest

Government Accountability Office review of the systems and processes that the Department uses to identify the extent to which bases or facilities are excess to needs

The Department of Defense (DOD) has requested authorization for base realignment and closure (BRAC) rounds in 2013 and 2015. In justifying this request, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, Dorothy Robyn, testified in March 2012, that "given the cost of our installation infrastructure, we cannot afford to maintain excess capacity. Parametric techniques used to analyze various capacity measures in 2004 indicated that the Department had 24 percent excess capacity overall relative to force structure plans developed by the Joint Staff. . . . Because BRAC 2005 eliminated only about three percent of the Department's capacity, we believe we have significant excess capacity today."

The committee is concerned about the adequacy of the processes that DOD uses to determine excess infrastructure capacity based on a variety of conflicting statements from senior departmental officials.

Senior Army officials have been quoted as stating that the Army has no interest in another BRAC round. Yet, recent briefings to the committee suggest that the Army does have excess capacity.

Senior Air Force officers have been quoted as saying that the Air Force has too many bases thus suggesting the need for a BRAC round and yet the Service did not propose many significant base closures when it had the authority to propose such closures in BRAC 2005.

A recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) report raises additional questions about the extent to which DOD actually knows how much excess capacity exists. Specifically, in Excess Facilities: DOD Needs More Complete Information and a Strategy to Guide Its Future Disposal Efforts (GAO–11–814) the GAO reported that the Air Force reported a utilization rate of 0 percent for 22,563 buildings that were in an active status, DOD reported utilization rates for 32,999 facilities to the Federal Real Property Profile even though DOD's database which is the authoritative source of this information had no utilization information for these facilities, and DOD officials acknowledged an inability to accurately identify vacant and underutilized real property.

Finally, the GAO reported in Defense Infrastructure: Army Needs to Improve Its Facility Planning Systems to Better Support Installations Experiencing Significant Growth (GAO–10–602) that the Army planned to spend about $31.0 billion through fiscal year 2015 to meet facility needs but would still have shortages of some types of facilities thus raising questions about whether closing bases is the right strategy for coping with shortages of facilities.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to conduct a review of the systems and processes that DOD uses to identify the

extent to which bases or facilities are excess to needs. This review shall address the following:

(1) How DOD identifies bases or other infrastructure that are excess to its needs;

(2) How well integrated DOD's force structure planning processes are with its base infrastructure planning processes;

(3) To what extent concerns raised in prior GAO reports about the ability of DOD to accurately identify its utilization of bases and facilities have been addressed; and

(4) Any additional matters that the Comptroller General determines to be relevant.

The Comptroller General shall report the results of his study to the congressional defense committees by May 7, 2013.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Authorized cost and scope variations (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the authorizations for scope variations in military construction and family housing projects.

The committee is extremely concerned by recent discoveries that contracts for the construction of Department of Defense (DOD) facilities resulted in military construction projects that exceeded the scope of work authorized by Congress. The committee was notified on April 30, 2012, that nine Army National Guard projects in various states of construction would result in facilities that will exceed the size specifically authorized by Congress in past National Defense Authorization Acts. Army National Guard representatives attributed the violations to "human error" and requested immediate legislative action to authorize the higher scope in order to preclude delays to the construction of the facilities.

In addition, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DODIG) released a report on February 27, 2012, titled "Guidance Needed to Prevent Military Construction Projects From Exceeding the Approved Scope of Work (Report No. DODIG–2012–057)" which found that the design process for three military construction projects did not result in U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE) officials constructing facilities in accordance with facility sizes on the congressional request for authorization. Additionally, AFCEE officials improperly authorized the construction of facilities for one project, because they did not conduct scope verifications and perform proper contract administration. As a result, AFCEE officials improperly authorized the expenditure of at least $3.3 million.

The DODIG concluded that "this occurred because the scope of work variations permissible by section 2853, title 10, United States Code, from the congressional request for authorization are unclear and inconsistently applied." As a result, Department of Defense officials do not have assurances that military construction projects are built consistent with congressional intent and in accordance with legislative requirements.

The committee expects that the Department of Defense has guidance and regulations in place to ensure compliance with military construction statutes and to ensure hundreds of military construction projects authorized each year are carried out consistent with congressional intent. Therefore, the committee directs the Sec-

retary of Defense to incorporate the clarifications of section 2853 imposed by this provision into current Department regulations and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2013, describing clear, concise, and comprehensive guidance and processes established with the Department to preclude any human errors from resulting in a violation of law.

Comptroller General report on in-kind payments (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the construction or renovation of Department of Defense facilities with in-kind payments.

Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize contingency contracting authority in certain areas outside the United States for one more year.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Authority to accept as consideration for leases of non-excess property of military departments and defense agencies real property interests and natural resource management services related to agreements to limit encroachment (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the authorities available under the enhanced use lease program to be used to develop buffer areas around military installations to help prevent land uses that are incompatible with military operations and to preserve the environment under the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative codified in section 2684a of title 10, United States Code.

Clarification of parties with whom Department of Defense may conduct exchanges of real property at military installations (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify with whom the Department of Defense may conduct exchanges of real property at military installations.

Subtitle C—Energy Security

Guidance on financing for renewable energy projects (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to issue guidance for financing renewable energy projects.

Continuation of limitation on use of funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) gold or platinum certification (sec. 2822)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the prohibition on the use of funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) gold or platinum certification until 6 months after the report required in section 2830(b)(1) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1695) is submitted.

Prohibition on biofuel refinery construction (sec. 2823)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense from entering into a contract to plan, design, or construct a biofuel refinery or any other facility or infrastructure used to refine biofuels unless such planning, design, or construction is specifically authorized by law.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

Land conveyance, local training area for Browning Army Reserve Center, Utah (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the conveyance of real property at Browning Army Reserve Center, Utah.

Use of proceeds, land conveyance, Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorities for use of proceeds of a land conveyance at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Clarification of authority of Secretary to assist with development of public infrastructure in connection with the establishment or expansion of a military installation (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would require specific authorization of any grant, cooperative agreement, or supplement of funds available under federal programs administered by agencies other than the Department of Defense that result in the development of public infrastructure.

Petersburg National Battlefield boundary modification (sec. 2842)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the boundary of the Petersburg National Battlefield.

Congressional notification with respect to oversight and maintenance of base cemeteries following closure of overseas military installations (sec. 2843)

The committee recommends a provision that would require notification with respect to oversight and maintenance of base cemeteries following the closure of overseas military installations.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2013, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in three categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); (2) defense environmental cleanup; and (3) other defense activities.

The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at the Department (rounded up to the first significant decimal point) totaled $17.9 billion. Of the total amount requested:

(1) $11.6 billion is for NNSA, of which:

(a) $7.6 billion is for weapons activities;

(b) $2.5 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;

(c) $1.1 billion is for naval reactors; and

(d) $411.3 million is for the Office of the Administrator;

(2) $5.5 billion is for defense environmental cleanup; and

(3) $830.7 million is for other defense activities.

The committee recommends $17.4 billion for atomic energy defense activities. Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

(1) $11.5 billion for NNSA, of which;

(a) $7.6 billion is for weapons activities;

(b) $2.5 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;

(c) $1.2 billion is for naval reactors; and

(d) $386.3 million is for the Office of the Administrator;

(2) $5.0 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities; and

(3) $828.7 million for other defense activities.

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $11.5 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal

year 2013 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to carry out programs necessary to national security.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $7.6 billion for weapons activities.

The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $2.1 billion for directed stockpile work; $1.7 billion for campaigns; $2.2 billion for readiness in the technical base and facilities; $219.4 million for the secure transportation asset; $247.6 million for nuclear counterterrorism incident response; $88.3 million for site stewardship; $643.3 million for safeguards and security; and $10.0 million for national security applications.

The committee notes that notwithstanding the congressional support for further modernization of the nuclear weapons complex infrastructure and the life extension programs, the committee urges the NNSA to find efficiencies where and whenever possible. The ability to sustain these increases during a time of decreasing federal and defense budgets will be increasingly difficult as time goes on. Good stewardship of the funding, as well as the nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapons complex, is critical to the long-term support for and sustainment of the projected increases.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends $2.1 billion for directed stockpile work. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

The committee understands that for fiscal year 2013, the W–76 program was lowered by some $79,000,000 relative to fiscal year 2013 budgetary estimates in the fiscal year 2012 budget submission in order to pay for the increased costs of the B–61 refurbishment. The reduced funding of the W–76 has led to a change in the mix of active verses hedge warheads delivered to the Navy by the Pantex plant. The result is that now only active warheads are to be delivered with hedge warheads in the out years after the submarine fleet has been refurbished. Testimony before the committee had indicated that the Navy, while concerned with this new delivery schedule, can accommodate the increased risk to the submarine fleet. It is the committee's understanding that for fiscal year 2013, the NNSA has actually underfunded the W–76 program such that it cannot even deliver the needed active warheads to the submarine fleet. After inquiries to the NNSA on which adjustments to budget lines must be made to accommodate for this error, the committee is told that the NNSA will not know what to adjust until they have a full cost estimate of the B–61 phase 2A study completed this summer, leading to a cascade of re-programming requests to Congress, all the while the Navy submarine fleet is left uncertain if this error will affect their home port maintenance schedules. The committee recommends an increase of $25,000,000 to the W–76 Directed Stockpile line taken from the NNSA Office of the Adminis-

trator line, which the committee understands is to be used for network integration.

Campaigns

The committee recommends $1.8 billion for campaigns. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three nuclear weapons laboratories, the Nevada National Security Site, and the weapons production plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts form the scientific underpinning of the Department of Energy's annual certification that the stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear weapons testing.

The committee remains concerned about the hurdles to ignition at the National Ignition Facility (NIF), which is still several orders of magnitude below the stated energy level to achieve it. The committee recognizes that the NIF has numerous other stockpile, defense related and non-defense related, missions and that important research remains to be done in these other areas. However, none rise to the level as understanding the physics of ignition for stockpile stewardship. The NNSA must strike a careful balance of ensuring there is still focus on this objective within the limited funding allocated for the machine and must not let lack of achieving ignition in the short-term cause long-term drifting to other missions to justify the funding.

The committee recognizes the importance of having a domestic source for enriched uranium using U.S. technology to meet our Nation's future tritium requirements to ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal consistent with the fiscal year 2013 budget request.

The 2012 Stockpile Stewardship and Management plan defines the elements of the stockpile stewardship program including the careful planning that goes into designing and developing the science, technology, and engineering (STE) program. The STE program provides the physics based understanding needed to predict performance of various weapons components to support the life extension and surveillance programs. As stated in the report: "these [STE capabilities] determine what can be engineered and the spectrum of changes that can be confidently assessed without UGT [underground testing.]" Two of the key elements of the STE program are the Predictive Capability Framework (PCF) and the Component Maturation Framework (CMF). Each of these frameworks have a detailed, complementary 15-year plan. The PCF plan carefully balances the four key components of weapons assessment with the development of experimental and computation capabilities. The CMF develops the components needed for life extension based on the development of the knowledge and predicative capabilities derived from the PCF. As the plan states: "These strategies are coupled because the CMF includes the maturation plans for development and production of stockpile sustainment components. PCF provides the tools and capabilities for establishing the environments that those components will witness and the qualification of those components in meeting performance specifications."

Readiness in the technical base

The committee recommends $2.4 billion for readiness in the technical base (RTBF). This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the nuclear weapons complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The committee is concerned about the additional increase of $150,000,000 added to the budget for replacing building 9212 at the Y–12 plant. The committee is fully supportive of replacing building 9212 and building a Uranium Processing Facility. However, the committee understands that the Y–12 plant was not formally notified of the increase until February 13, 2012, the same day the deferral of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement building was announced to Los Alamos. The way the NNSA announced this decision leads the committee to believe that this additional funding was made in haste. The structure of the contract to build the facility is now changing from integrated product design leading to final construction, to one of "design build" where the building is built first to show progress and then subcontracts are let from the main contractor to back fill the equipment and processes, which are inherently complicated. The committee notes that the "design build" concept was used at the Waste Treatment Project at Hanford, and is considered one of the largest cost overruns in the Department of Energy's history. Not more than $190,000,000 may be spent on project 06–D–141 (the amount identified for fiscal year 2013 in the fiscal year 2012 budget submission) until the NNSA reaches a 90-percent engineering design phase and submits to the congressional defense committees CD–2 baseline information and the structure of the contract to build and equip the Uranium Processing Facility.

With the proposed cancellation of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) building, the NNSA has proposed an alternative plutonium strategy. This alternative strategy concerns the committee.

A good rule of thumb with plutonium is that its operations are centralized in one place. The committee's understanding is that the NNSA will de-inventory the Plutonium Facility (PF)–4 building at Los Alamos where plutonium operations occur and store the plutonium at the Device Assembly Facility (DAF) at the Nevada National Security Site, which is 663 miles and more than 10 hours away from the PF–4. The committee understands that DAF needs upgrades to its safety systems for a material that is inherently exothermic in air. The committee understands that plutonium testing and operations at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory will be reinstated—after the NNSA has told Congress they have saved money by lowering the security posture there and told the local communities that they have de-inventoried the laboratory of plutonium. The committee understands that the NNSA is increasing the quantity of plutonium at the Radiological Laboratory Office Building (RLOUB) at Los Alamos, which is designed for small amounts of plutonium for radio-chemistry purposes (up to 26 grams) and questions what, if anything, increasing the quantity at RLOUB for analytical chemistry purposes gives towards helping the process flow issues inside PF–4 at Los Alamos where large quantities (kilograms) of plutonium are handled. There is a large

excavation next to PF–4 where the CMRR Nuclear Facility (CMRR–NF) was to be built, the committee would like to know how the NNSA plans to maintain such a large excavation next to PF–4 when it plans to defer CMRR–NF "for at least 5 years". Finally there is the issue of a tunnel connecting PF–4 to RLOUB, which must go past the large excavation for the CMRR–NF to help expedite the flow of small samples. This tunnel is larger than that from CMRR–NF to PF–4. The committee's understanding is the deferral of CMRR–NF will lead to in some cases a loss of materials characterization and materials compatibility tests for larger test samples of plutonium that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Some of these capabilities, such as crystal growth, may be impossible to recreate elsewhere.

Once it learned of the proposed cancellation, the committee asked the Department of Defense (DOD) if the requirement for 50–80 pits a year was still valid and was told it was. How will transporting plutonium across the U.S. to different NNSA facilities be any more safe and secure and cost less than CMRR–NF adjacent to PF–4? The committee also understands that without CMRR–NF, no plan exists for meeting the DOD requirements.

The committee finds that the alternative plutonium strategy could cost upwards of $1.0 billion to delay the CMRR–NF by "at least 5 years" resulting if built, a 25–30 percent increase in the CMRR–NF cost or about another $2.0 billion. Unknown is the cost to re-start the CMRR–NF project or how the regulatory structure 5 or more years from now will have changed. The net result of this deferral is a cost escalation of some $3.0 billion to the taxpayer with even more uncertainty on the Nation's plutonium strategy much less ensuring Los Alamos can retain the unique expertise and scientists it has had since the Manhattan Project to handle this vital national mission. If CMRR–NF is not built, the alternative plutonium strategy will simply shift increased pit costs from not using a single facility into future life extension programs in the out years.

Given the magnitude of the consequences of the alternative plutonium proposal by the NNSA, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office, on an expedited basis, to review the NNSA's proposed plutonium strategy to determine relative to the CMRR–NF whether (1) it is safer than if CMRR–NF were started on its original schedule and if not, what are the added risks to public health and safety, (2) what is the added cost in addition to the deferral of CMRR–NF, especially to future life extension programs, (3) what burden will be placed on PF–4 in terms of process flow and ability to meet the DOD requirement (as compared to starting CMRR–NF on its original schedule), (4) what is the estimated cost and time of building an entirely new facility accomplishing both the functions of CMRR–NF and PF–4 at the least costly location in the NNSA complex, and (5) what would be the impact on the plutonium science mission at Los Alamos. The committee requests this study no later than January 31, 2013.

The committee is supportive of the High Explosives Pressing Facility at Pantex and encourages the NNSA to make this facility a center of excellence in the NNSA for high explosives pressing and manufacturing.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends $219.4 million for the secure transportation asset (STA). The secure transportation asset is responsible for the transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials, and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport. If the STA resumes consideration of a third-party leasing option, the committee expects STA to fully notify Congress of such arrangements in advance of executing any leases.

Nuclear counterterrorism incident response

The committee recommends $247.6 million for nuclear counterterrorism incident response.

Site stewardship

The committee recommends $90.0 million for site stewardship.

Safeguards and security

The committee recommends $643.3 million for safeguards and security.

National security applications

The committee recommends $10.0 million for national security applications.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs

The committee recommends $2.6 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program. The NNSA has management and oversight responsibility for the nuclear nonproliferation programs at the DOE.

The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $548.2 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development (R&D), which includes $150,000 for urnanium enrichment R&D; $150.1 million for nonproliferation and international security; $311.0 million for international nuclear materials production and cooperation; $92.3 million for fissile materials disposition; and $466.0 million for the global threat reduction initiative.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development

The committee recommends $548.2 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development. The committee requests a 5 year road map for the nuclear detonation detection mission as integrated with the Department of Defense no later than January 31, 2013.

The committee continues to support the valuable research and development work that is conducted under this program. The additional funding will support high priority research requirements including work to support the long-term ability of the United States to monitor and detect clandestine nuclear weapons development activity, and to attribute nuclear weapons, improvised nuclear devices, and radiological dispersal devices. Much of the work supported by NNSA is unique to the Federal Government and serves as the technical basis for work by many other agencies including

the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense.

Nonproliferation and international security

The committee recommends $150.1 million for nonproliferation and international security. The committee recommends bringing the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program in Russia to a close at the end of 2012.

International nuclear materials protection and cooperation

The committee recommends $311.0 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation.

Fissile materials disposition

The committee recommends $921.3 million for fissile materials disposition. This fissile materials disposition program converts excess weapons grade plutonium to mixed oxide (MOX) fuel for use in commercial power reactors. The United States and Russia have signed an agreement where each country has agreed to the disposition of 34 metric tons of excess weapons grade plutonium, thus removing the possibility that this plutonium could be reused for weapons or fall into the hands of terrorists. The committee has learned of another adjustment to the baseline of this program due in the summer of 2012, which has already grown substantially over the past 13 years, in addition to the cancellation of the feedstock facility after $700,000,000 has been spent in various stages of design. The committee expects to be fully informed of this baseline adjustment. The committee directs the NNSA to report to the congressional defense committees a roadmap over the life of the program on how the NNSA will supply the 34 metric tons of feedstock to the MOX facility noting the capacity and lifetime of each facility to prepare feedstock with a detailed cost estimate in the first 15-year window. The report must take into account recent decisions at the PF–4 facility and CMRR–NF. This report is due no later than December 31, 2012. The committee also understands the MOX facility is before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for license. The committee directs the development of a quarterly update reporting system be established by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to the congressional defense committees, with the first report due September 30, 2012, advising the committees on the status of license review as well as its fuel forms, identifying issues of concern to the NRC. The committee also understands the estimated operating costs for the MOX facility are increasing and directs the NNSA report to the congressional defense committees by July 30, 2012, a historical review of the estimated operating costs of the MOX facility to understand the cost growth and trend.

Global threat reduction initiative

The committee recommends $566.0 million for the global threat reduction initiative. The committee supports this effort to secure within 4 years, vulnerable nuclear material that could be used in a dirty bomb or in an improvised nuclear device.

Naval reactors

The committee recommends $1.1 billion for naval reactors, including a $37.9 million increase above the budget request for the *Ohio*-class replacement reactor program. This program was decreased by $70.0 million relative to the fiscal year 2012 budget projection for fiscal year 2013. The committee notes that the Naval Reactors program is under strong pressure in the 5-year budget profile to meet its design specifications for the *Ohio*-class replacement reactor and recommends that the NNSA support any necessary changes needed to the *Ohio*-class reactor replacement program to ensure it is properly synchronized with the main submarine program which has slipped by 2 years. The committee remains concerned by the 2-year delay of the *Ohio*-class replacement program, and directs Naval Reactors to deviate as little as possible from the schedule identified in the fiscal year 2012 budget. The committee understands the replacement for the Idaho fuel cooling pool has slipped by 2 years as well and requests no later than July 31, 2012, a status update on this effort.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize three new plant projects for the Department of Energy, Naval Reactors that are in the fiscal year 2013 budget request. The first project, 13–D–903, at the Kesselring Site, West Milton, New York, will build a staff building for handling the increased number of trainees at the Kesselring Site Prototype Training Reactor. The second project, 13–D–904, will build additional radiological workspace for the overhaul of the Prototype Training Reactor at the Kesselring Site. The third project, 13–D–905, will develop a low level waste disposal site at the Idaho National Laboratory where Naval Reactors examine spent naval fuel.

Office of the Administrator

The committee recommends $386.3 million for the Office of the Administrator, this represents a $25,000,000 decrease due to transfer of funds to the weapons activities account for information technology and networks. An equivalent amount of funding ($25,000,000) was then added back into the Administrator's account leading to in-effect a double counting.

Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities at the Department of Energy (DOE) but does not as in past years, include the $463,000,000 request for the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund (section 1801 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (Public Law 83–703), as amended) whose authorization expired in 2007. The fiscal year 2013 budget assumption for the $463,000,000 requires legislation to be adopted outside the jurisdiction of this committee. The defense environmental cleanup activities support the cleanup of contaminated facilities, soil, ground, and surface water, and the treatment and disposal of radioactive and other waste generated through the production of nuclear weapons and weapons materials. The environmental management program was established in 1989 to clean up 50 years of

Cold War waste from the production of nuclear weapons and materials including plutonium and highly enriched uranium.

Savannah River Site

The committee recommends $1.2 billion for the Savannah River Site. The committee commends the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Office of Environmental Management for continuing operations at the H-Canyon, which is the only large scale reprocessing line left in the United States. Past experience has shown that the H-Canyon will be needed as new waste streams evolve and as the National Nuclear Security Administration continues to receive returned highly enriched uranium research reactor fuels. The committee requests a 10-year roadmap for the H-Canyon usage due no later than January 31, 2013.

Waste Treatment Plant

The committee continues to follow the progress at the Waste Treatment Plant at the DOE Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. The August 2011 review of the project found that it will likely exceed by $900,000,000 the current total cost estimate of $12.3 billion and now that it is nearing initial operations, attention should be turned towards integration of the tank farms and the plant itself as well as adjusting staffing towards operational personnel. The report recommended a $350,000,000 phased CD–4 approach. The committee directs the Department of Energy to provide to the congressional defense committees the outcome of this phased CD–4 approach no later than July 30, 2012, of efforts to integrate the tank farm and waste treatment plant contracts as well as any change to the total baseline cost of the project.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $828.7 million for other defense activities. The committee recommends $245.5 million for health and safety; $188.6 million for security; $177.9 million for Legacy Management; $118.8 million for departmental administration; and $4.8 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Replacement project for Chemistry and Metallurgy Research building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to construct a building to replace the functions of the existing Chemistry and Metallurgy Research building at Los Alamos National Laboratory associated with Department of Energy (DOE) Hazard Category 2 special nuclear material operations.

The committee is strongly concerned with the budget proposal to defer "by at least 5 years" the replacement project for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility

(CMRR–NF) building at Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico.

A deferral "for at least 5 years" appears to be a cancellation. Based on the analysis the committee has received to date, it appears that such a cancellation would have an adverse impact on nuclear modernization programs.

The 2009 report "America's Strategic Posture", chaired by former Secretaries of Defense, William Perry and James Schlesinger, recognized the significance of the CMRR project not because it was tied to a military number of pits but because it "makes a direct contribution to the intellectual infrastructure that is in immediate danger of attrition". They wisely noted that "because the future size of the stockpile is uncertain, projects that are independent of the stockpile size should take priority. The uranium production facility's (building 9212 at Y–12) size is influenced by stockpile size . . . . The Los Alamos plutonium facility is required independent of stockpile size." They go further stating that, "These considerations lead the commission to the conclusion that, if priority must be given, the Los Alamos plutonium facility should receive it." The point is that while today we are focused on CMRR–NF because the Department of Defense (DOD) states it has a pit need in the range of 50–80 by 2025, the fundamental reason CMRR–NF is needed is to maintain our Nation's ability to conduct continuous research with kilogram quantities of plutonium. A DOE Hazard Category 2 facility, such as CMRR–NF, was planned to be necessary to make a wide range of bulk mechanical measurements on pit behavior to ensure that even as pit aging occurs, we can be sure that the stockpile will continue to be safe, secure, and militarily effective.

In a February 2, 2011, message from the President to the Senate on the New START Treaty, the President stated that he intends to "(a) accelerate to the extent possible, the design and engineering phase of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) building and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF); and (b) request full funding, including on a multi-year basis as appropriate, for the CMRR building and the UPF upon completion of the design and engineering phase for such facilities."

The committee believes that the linkage between nuclear modernization and the New START Treaty's implementation is clearly established.

In 2010, the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) concerning modernization of the U.S. nuclear infrastructure. In this MOA, DOD agreed to work with the Office of Management and Budget to transfer budget authority for NNSA's nuclear weapons and Naval Reactor programs. DOE agreed to use this transferred budget authority to supplement NNSA funding for among other things completing the design and beginning construction of the CMRR–NF facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The committee understands that DOD is providing the resources agreed to under the MOA and commends DOD for its commitment to the modernization of the nuclear weapons complex. The committee is disappointed in DOE's failure to comply with its previously agreed to obligations, and directs NNSA to provide the committee by September 30, 2012, a full accounting of the budget authority DOD is giving to DOE

and a detailed description at the account level of the NNSA programs directly impacted through the transfer of DOD's budget authority.

The committee authorizes $150.0 million of the amounts appropriated in fiscal year 2013 for the construction of the CMRR–NF facility and prohibits NNSA from reducing amounts authorized and appropriated for directed stockpile work, naval reactors, or Facility Project 06–D–141, Project Engineering & Design, Uranium Processing Facility, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, for this purpose.

The committee expresses concern with the overall projected cost of the CMRR–NF facility and therefore directs that the facility meet the requirements identified in the April 2010 MOA regarding capabilities but that funding for the facility shall not exceed $3.7 billion. The practicability of implementing the design and construction of the facility shall focus on the costs and benefits as well as technical and economic feasibility of every major design characteristic that drives cost. The committee stresses the importance of the affordability of CMRR and strongly believes that a $3.7 billion cost ceiling is sufficient. The committee notes that One World Trade Center in New York City, which when complete will be the tallest building in the Western Hemisphere, is estimated to cost $3.9 billion. The committee believes both CMRR–NF and the UPF at Y–12 can be built affordably and directs the administration to achieve the cost savings necessary, so that the cost of CMRR–NF does not exceed the statutorily imposed cost ceiling.

The committee is disappointed in the lack of transparency displayed by NNSA in its fiscal year 2013 budget deliberation process. It is evident that the level of rigor and due diligence necessary for a proposal as significant as the proposed deferral of CMRR–NF did not take place between NNSA and the national security laboratories, NNSA and the Department of Defense, and NNSA and Congress. Not until after the budget was released did NNSA seek input from the national laboratories on the cost and practicality of employing a new plutonium strategy. Furthermore, in testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, General Robert Kehler, the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command testified that NNSA's fiscal year 2013 budget concerned him. According to General Kehler's testimony, "the thing that concerns me the most is our continued investment in the weapons complex. And so the issue with CMRR–NF does concern me."

Elsewhere in this bill, the committee proposes to strengthen the oversight performed by the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC). That provision would require the NWC to certify that the budget request meets nuclear stockpile and stockpile stewardship program requirements and seeks to prevent future instances where the Department of Defense and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command are presented a budget that does not meet strategic requirements or national policy.

Submittal to Congress of selected acquisition reports and independent cost estimates on nuclear weapon systems undergoing life extension (sec. 3112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the National Nuclear Security Administration to provide selected acquisition reports on each nuclear weapon system undergoing life extension. The reports shall be based on existing provisions in section 2432 of title 10, United States Code. The provision also recommends independent cost estimates for nuclear weapons undergoing life extension at the completion of phase 6.2A and before entering Phase 6.5, first production.

Two year extension of schedule for disposition of weapons-usable plutonium at Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina (sec. 3113)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 4306 of the Atomic Defense Energy Act (50 U.S.C. 2566) to extend the dates at which the Department of Energy must pay the State of South Carolina economic impact and assistance funds by 2 years so that it must be able to produce 1 metric ton of Mixed Oxide fuel by January 1, 2014, and 34 metric tons by January 1, 2021.

Program on science engagement for nonproliferation (sec. 3114)

The committee proposes a provision that would authorize a program for scientific engagement of U.S. scientists with scientists in countries of concern with respect to nonproliferation. Such a program could bring insight and transparency into the ability of a country to adhere to international nonproliferation norms. Several conditions are placed on this program before any expenditure of funds: (1) a nonproliferation threat assessment of the country by the Director of National Intelligence; (2) clear metrics for success so that the program does not become stagnant in the country of concern; and (3) rigorous accounting standards approved by the Government Accountability Office to ensure that there is clear oversight of the funds expended. Items (1) and (2) must be performed again when the program transitions to another country. This overall program must demonstrate that it does not duplicate other nonproliferation efforts in the rest of the Executive Branch through a report to Congress due within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

Repeal of requirement for annual update of Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities workforce restructuring plan (sec. 3115)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal an annual reporting requirement of section 4604 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 27074). Since fiscal year 2005, the Department of Energy has neither requested nor received funding for enhanced severance benefits and community transition under section 4604. Given the absence of funding there is no need for the annual reporting requirement.

Quarterly reports to Congress on financial balances for atomic energy defense activities (sec. 3116)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act (division D of Public Law 107–314) to require the Secretary of Energy to provide to the congressional defense committees quarterly obligation and expenditure rates for atomic energy defense programs based on the control points of the conference report accompanying the annual Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. This provision would cover both the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Office (former defense sites). The committee understands that the Department currently provides these reports to the Appropriations committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and requests access to that same level of information necessary for effective oversight.

Transparency in contractor performance evaluations by the National Nuclear Security Administration leading to award fees (sec. 3117)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to publish to the maximum extent practicable the performance evaluations developed by its site offices that result in award fees to the contractor. The provision also requires that future performance evaluations adhere to a common format so that Congress and the public can compare these evaluations between similar management contracts.

Expansion of authority to establish certain scientific, engineering, and technical positions (sec. 3118)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3241 of the National Nuclear Security Act (50 U.S.C. 2441) by increasing the ability of the Administrator to hire up to 700 contracting, scientific, engineering, and technical positions under hiring authorities used by the former Atomic Energy Commission (42 U.S.C. 2201(d)). This provision would only provide for additional hiring flexibility and would not result in an increase in the total number of authorized employees. Such authorities are also used by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which has been rated one of the best places to work in the Federal Government.

Modification and extension of authority on acceptance of contributions for acceleration of removal or security of fissile materials, radiological materials, and related equipment at vulnerable sites worldwide (sec. 3119)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the authority of the Secretary of Energy under section 3132(f) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) for the Secretary to accept contributions from international partners to all programs within the National Nuclear Security Administration's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program.

Cost containment for Y–12 Uranium Processing Facility, Y–12 National Security Complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee (sec. 3120)

The committee recommends a provision that would add enhanced oversight of the Uranium Processing Facility construction project by requiring separate and distinct authorizations for each phase of the project.

The Uranium Processing Facility project was first proposed as a formal construction project in the fiscal year 2006 budget request of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The "preliminary" estimate for the project at that time was between $600,000,000 to $1,000,000,000. The cost estimate in the fiscal year 2013 budget request is now $6,500,000,000, an increase of at least 650 percent.

The committee understands that the project will now be broken into three phases. The first phase involves replacing Building 9212. The second phase involves replacing Buildings 9215 and 9998, which perform uranium metal working, machining, and inspection. The third phase involves replacing Building 9204–2E, which performs radiography, assembly, disassembly, and inspection of nuclear warhead components. The committee understands that the final cost estimate, which is to be completed in early 2013, will only be for replacing the functions of Building 9212. Building 9212 was built during the Manhattan Project and by all accounts needs to be replaced given its poor condition and the critical functions it performs in purifying and casting uranium components.

The committee understands the programmatic need for breaking the project into three phases but is also concerned about additional cost growth, even after accelerating the project by adding an additional $150,000,000 to it for fiscal year 2013.

The committee has changed the budget tables to reflect an authorization of $340,000,000 for phase one of this project. Out of concern for cost growth, the committee is putting a cap on phase one at $4,200,000,000. The NNSA should expect similar budgetary caps to appear when the committee ascertains the projected cost of phases two and three, and will critically examine any additional growth above the fiscal year 2013 total project cost estimate of $6,500,000,000.

The committee requests quarterly updates from the General Accountability Office (GAO) on all phases of the Uranium Processing Facility construction project. The updates should include, at a minimum, progress on adhering to cost projections as well as meeting the requirements of section 2753 of title 50, United States Code, "Notification of cost overruns for certain Department of Energy Projects", the status of the technology readiness levels for equipment and processes that will accompany each phase of the project, independent cost estimates, the programmatic structure of the relationship between the prime contractor and sub-contractors, and any other issues that the GAO believes are important pertaining to the project's requirements, cost, schedule, and technology readiness levels.

Authority to restore certain formerly Restricted Data to the Restricted Data category (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 142 the Atomic Energy Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2162) to restore to the Restricted Data category certain information that has been removed from that category pursuant to sections 142(d) and 142(e). This provision was at the request of the Department of Energy. The data is currently treated as classified information. The provision also makes technical corrections to section 142(e) to account for the Director of National Intelligence. The proposed provision would permit the Department of Energy, in conjunction with the Department of Defense or the Director of National Intelligence to restore formerly Restricted Data to its original Restricted Data category.

Subtitle C—Reports

Report on actions required for transition of regulation of non-nuclear activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration to other federal agencies (sec. 3131)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy submit to the congressional defense committees a report on actions required to transition, to the maximum extent practicable, the regulation of non-nuclear operations of the National Nuclear Security Administration over a period of 5 years to federal agencies other than the Department of Energy (DOE). The provision would require the transition plan be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than February 28, 2013.

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to concurrently report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2013, those DOE regulations in section 851 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, that are more protective, comparable, or less protective, than those of outside federal agencies.

The committee expects the Department to perform wide outreach with the public, affected communities, and employees of its facilities in developing this plan.

Report on consolidation of facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3132)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC) to report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, on the feasibility of consolidation in the National Nuclear Security Administration Complex if excess facilities exist and consolidation would reduce cost. If the NWC finds further consolidation is feasible, the report shall recommend a process for consolidation. No funds may be spent on phase CD–3 (start of construction) of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement building, Department of Energy Project 04–D–125 and the Uranium Processing Facility, 06–D–141 until such report is transmitted to the congressional defense committees.

Regional radiological security zones (sec. 3133)

The committee proposes a provision that would have the National Nuclear Security Administration prepare a report on the feasibility of establishing radiological security zones on a regional basis rather than on a country by country case as is now done. The report should include the estimated costs of establishing and monitoring such zones through centralized monitoring centers. The report is due no later than 180 days after date of enactment of this Act.

Report on legacy uranium mines (sec. 3134)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to prepare a report on abandoned uranium mines used by the U.S. atomic weapons program. The report is due 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Comptroller General of the United States review of projects carried out by the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy pursuant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act projects (sec. 3135)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) which requires the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to conduct several reviews of clean-up projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) carried out by the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management (EM) that would eliminate the 120–day status briefings on project performances. Section 3134 required a number of reviews by the GAO: (1) an initial review due 30 days from the enactment of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2010 on the criteria used by EM to select projects to be carried out under ARRA along with a description of the process used to validate the scope, cost, and schedule for these projects; (2) status briefings on project performance 30 days after submission of the first report and every 120 days thereafter until all EM ARRA funds are expended; and (3) a capping report on the implementation of all EM projects carried out under ARRA. GAO would complete its ongoing engagement as well as the capping report.

GAO completed the first review and has subsequently completed eight status briefings. GAO is currently working on a full engagement to report on project status, which will provide the bulk of the information needed to complete the capping report. At this point, EM is not likely to completely expend ARRA funds until at least the end of fiscal year 2013.

Items of Special Interest

General Accountability Office Study of National Nuclear Security Administration Cost Estimating Practices

The committee has found that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has been inconsistent in the application of cost estimating practices on the B–61 gravity bomb program and several other large projects such at the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Facility for Nuclear Operations.

The committee directs the General Accountability Office to conduct an audit of the cost estimating practices of the NNSA with recommendations to bring the NNSA into compliance with generally accepted cost estimating practices used for similar projects. The report will be due March 1, 2013.

National Ignition Facility overhead structure

The committee has found that National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) National Ignition Facility (NIF) has been using a different overhead rate from the rest of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, which has caused a large dollar impact when requested to be moved to a similar rate as the rest of the lab.

The committee directs the NNSA to move the NIF to the Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities funding schedule in the fiscal year 2014 budget documentation.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

The committee has found that there have been recent attempts to consolidate the funding for the nuclear weapons program's Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) outside the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs. Such consolidation of the RTBF away from the line manager's responsible for the weapons program is inconsistent with principals of good management. The committee directs the National Nuclear Security Administration to ensure that line responsibility for the RTBF rest with the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs.

Acquisition corps

The committee has found that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) suffers from a lack of consistent standards for large program acquisition. The committee directs the NNSA to report no later than January 30, 2013, on a plan to develop a structure for acquisition personnel similar to that in the Department of Defense in chapter 87 of title 10 United States Code.

Plan for use of Office of Science facilities

The committee has found that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) uses a wide range basic science facilities operated by the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Science as part of its stockpile stewardship program. These user facilities include the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory, the Spallation Neutron Source at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the Linac Coherent Light Source at the SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory. Using DOE's state the art user facilities is an excellent example of how the NNSA maintains excellence in its science base while supporting Department of Energy facilities as a whole. The committee directs the NNSA to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees a long-term plan for the use of current and future Office of Science facilities such as the Facility for Rare Isotope Beams and the National Synchrotron Light Source relative to support the stockpile stewardship program.

Independence of the National Nuclear Security Administration

The committee has found that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is often burdened with extra responsibilities assigned by the Secretary of Energy. The committee requests that no later than January 30, 2013, the Nuclear Weapons Council evaluate the semi-independent nature of the NNSA as originally created in 1999 and report back to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on measures that can be taken so that the NNSA operates according to its original legislative intent.

Adherence to section 3114 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011

Section 3114 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) titled "Notification of cost overruns for certain Department of Energy Projects" (50 U.S.C. 2753) set up a series of cost overrun features for life extension programs and construction projects both in the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management. To date, there has been no reporting to the committee on the efforts of the Department of Energy response to this legal requirement.

No later than January 31, 2013, the Secretary of Energy shall submit a report to Congress outlining the status of programs affected by this provision of law.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $29,415,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, an increase of $385,000 above the fiscal year 2012 funding level.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Maritime Administration (sec. 3501)

The committee recommends a provision that would re-authorize certain aspects of the Maritime Administration.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this bill, subject to reprogramming in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, the provision would also require that decisions by agency heads to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on authorized, transparent, statutory criteria, or merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

Funding tables (secs. 4101–4701)

The committee recommends provisions that provide line-item guidance for the funding authorized in this Act, in accordance with the requirements of section 4001. The provisions also display the line-item funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2013 budget request and shows where the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts (as set forth in the provision or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
001	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	2	18,639			2	18,639
002	C–12 CARGO AIRPLANE		0				0
003	MQ–1 UAV	19	518,088			19	518,088
004	RQ–11 (RAVEN)	234	25,798			234	25,798
005	BCT UNMANNED AERIAL VEH (UAVS) INCR 1		0				0
	ROTARY						
006	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	34	271,983			34	271,983
007	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	40	577,115			40	577,115
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		107,707				107,707
009	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	8	153,993			8	153,993
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		146,121				146,121
011	AH–64 BLOCK II/WRA		0				0
012	KIOWA WARRIOR (OH–58F) WRA		0				0
013	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	59	1,107,087			59	1,107,087
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		115,113				115,113
015	CH–47 HELICOPTER	38	1,076,036			38	1,076,036
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		83,346				83,346
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						

017	C12 AIRCRAFT MODS	0		0
018	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS	231,508		231,508
019	MQ–1 WEAPONIZATION—UAS	0		0
020	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)	16,272		16,272
021	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	4,294		4,294
022	AH–64 MODS	178,805		178,805
023	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	39,135		39,135
024	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	24,842		24,842
025	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	0		0
026	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	73,804		73,804
027	KIOWA WARRIOR MODS	192,484		192,484
028	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	0		0
029	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN	190,789		190,789
030	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE	133,191	–44,000	89,191
	JTRS integration delayed		[–44,000]	
031	GATM ROLLUP	87,280		87,280
032	RQ–7 UAV MODS	104,339		104,339
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
033	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	0		0
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS			
034	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	34,037		34,037
035	SURVIVABILITY CM	0		0
036	CMWS	127,751		127,751
	OTHER SUPPORT			
037	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,886		4,886
038	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	82,511		82,511
039	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	77,381		77,381
040	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	47,235		47,235
041	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,643		1,643
042	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	516		516
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**5,853,729**	**–44,000**	**5,809,729**

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	84	646,590			84	646,590
002	MSE MISSILE		12,850				12,850
003	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY		0				0
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		1,401				1,401
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	400	81,121			400	81,121
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,403	64,712			1,403	64,712
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,931				19,931
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,608	218,679			1,608	218,679
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,430	18,767			2,430	18,767
010	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		12,051				12,051
011	PATRIOT MODS		199,565				199,565
012	ITAS/TOW MODS		0				0
013	MLRS MODS		2,466				2,466
014	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		6,068				6,068
015	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS		0				0
016	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		7,864				7,864
017	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,864				3,864
018	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MISSILES)		1,560				1,560
019	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		5,200				5,200
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**1,302,689**		**0**		**1,302,689**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	STRYKER VEHICLE	58	286,818			58	286,818

002	FCS SPIN OUTS		0				0
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
003	STRYKER (MOD)		60,881				60,881
004	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		57,257				57,257
005	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		148,193				148,193
006	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		10,341				10,341
007	PALADIN PIM MOD IN SERVICE	17	206,101			17	206,101
008	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	31	107,909		123,000	31	230,909
	Increased production				[123,000]		
009	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	10	50,039			10	50,039
010	M88 FOV MODS		29,930				29,930
011	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		129,090				129,090
012	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		74,433				74,433
012A	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				91,000		91,000
	Advanced procurement Abrams upgrade program				[91,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
013	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		1,145				1,145
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
014	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		506				506
015	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)		0				0
016	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL		0				0
017	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	610	25,183	–610	–25,183	0	0
	Program termination				[–25,183]		
018	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)		0				0
019	MORTAR SYSTEMS		8,104				8,104
020	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE		0				0
021	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	2,280	14,096			2,280	14,096
022	M110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)		0				0
023	M4 CARBINE		0				0
024	CARBINE	12,000	21,272			12,000	21,272
025	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	2,107	6,598			2,107	6,598
026	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	240	56,725			240	56,725

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
027	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		13,827				13,827
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
028	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		0				0
029	M777 MODS		26,843				26,843
030	M4 CARBINE MODS		27,243				27,243
031	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		39,974				39,974
032	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		4,996				4,996
033	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		6,806				6,806
034	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		14,113				14,113
035	M119 MODIFICATIONS		20,727				20,727
036	M16 RIFLE MODS		3,306				3,306
037	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		3,072				3,072
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
038	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)		2,026				2,026
039	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		10,115				10,115
040	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		442				442
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
041	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,378				2,378
	SPARES						
042	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		31,217				31,217
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**1,501,706**		**188,817**		**1,690,523**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		158,313				158,313
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		91,438				91,438

003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	8,954		8,954
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	109,604		109,604
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	4,041		4,041
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	12,654		12,654
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	72,154	–37,000	35,154
	Decrease for excess		[–37,000]	
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	60,138	–60,138	0
	Decrease for excess		[–60,138]	
	MORTAR AMMUNITION			
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	44,375		44,375
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	27,471		27,471
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	87,811		87,811
	TANK AMMUNITION			
012	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	112,380		112,380
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION			
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP	50,861		50,861
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	26,227		26,227
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	110,329	–55,000	55,329
	Excalibur I-b round schedule delay		[–55,000]	
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	43,924		43,924
	MINES			
017	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES	3,775		3,775
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS			
018	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	17,408	–14,300	3,108
	Program decrease		[–14,300]	
	ROCKETS			
019	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	1,005		1,005
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	123,433		123,433
	OTHER AMMUNITION			
021	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	35,189		35,189
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	33,477		33,477
023	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	9,991		9,991

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
024	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		10,388				10,388
	MISCELLANEOUS						
025	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		19,383				19,383
026	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		7,336				7,336
027	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		6,641				6,641
028	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		15,092				15,092
029	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		15,692				15,692
030	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		14,107				14,107
031	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		106				106
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
032	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		220,171				220,171
033	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL		182,461				182,461
034	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,377				3,377
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,739,706**		**–166,438**		**1,573,268**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED	27	7,097			27	7,097
002	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	1,248	346,115		50,000	1,248	396,115
	Program increase for USAR				[50,000]		
003	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		19,292				19,292
004	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	1,534	52,933			1,534	52,933
005	PLS ESP		18,035				18,035
006	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)		0				0
007	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		0				0
008	FAMILY OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTEC (MRAP)		0				0

009	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	12	3,619	12	3,619
010	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	60	26,859	60	26,859
011	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		0		0
012	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	950	69,163	950	69,163
013	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		91,754		91,754
014	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		0		0
015	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL		0		0
016	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS, OPA1		0		0
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES				
017	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		0		0
018	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,548		2,548
019	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		16,791		16,791
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS				
020	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM	7,038	10,061	7,038	10,061
021	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	2,166	892,635	2,166	892,635
022	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		45,626		45,626
023	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,143		5,143
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS				
024	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	23	151,636	23	151,636
025	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		6,822		6,822
026	SHF TERM		9,108		9,108
027	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)		0		0
028	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	3,592	27,353	3,592	27,353
029	SMART-T (SPACE)		98,656		98,656
030	SCAMP (SPACE)		0		0
031	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		47,131		47,131
032	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	39	23,281	39	23,281
	COMM—COMBAT SUPPORT COMM				
033	MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER		0		0
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM				
034	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		10,848		10,848
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
035	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		979				979
036	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	11,059	556,250		–30,000	11,059	526,250
	AMF integration ahead of need				[–30,000]		
037	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)		86,219				86,219
038	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		7,798				7,798
039	SINCGARS FAMILY		9,001				9,001
040	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	108	24,601			108	24,601
041	TRACTOR DESK		7,779				7,779
042	CMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING		0				0
043	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		34,365		–21,000		13,365
	Funding ahead of need				[–21,000]		
044	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		1,833				1,833
045	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM		12,984				12,984
046	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)		0				0
047	GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS)	46	2,332			46	2,332
048	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		1,132				1,132
049	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	2,535	22,899			2,535	22,899
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
051	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,564				1,564
052	RESERVE CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	1,540	28,781			1,540	28,781
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
053	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	6,087	23,432			6,087	23,432
054	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	2,469	43,897			2,469	43,897
055	BIOMETRICS ENTERPRISE		0				0
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
056	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		2,891				2,891

057	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		13,872			13,872
058	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		9,595			9,595
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
059	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		142,133			142,133
060	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		0			0
061	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		57,727			57,727
062	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		5,000			5,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)					
065	JTT/CIBS-M		1,641			1,641
066	PROPHET GROUND	13	48,797		13	48,797
067	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS)		0			0
068	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)		0			0
069	DCGS-A (MIP)	1,743	184,007		1,743	184,007
070	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5	2,680		5	2,680
071	TROJAN (MIP)		21,483			21,483
072	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		2,412			2,412
073	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRINTING AND COLLECTION		7,077			7,077
074	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MIP)		0			0
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)					
075	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	43	72,594		43	72,594
076	CREW		15,446			15,446
077	FMLY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES		0			0
078	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,470			1,470
079	CI MODERNIZATION		1,368			1,368
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)					
080	FAAD GBS		7,980			7,980
081	SENTINEL MODS	70	33,444		70	33,444
082	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)		6,212	–6,212		0
	Slow execution of prior years appropriations			[–6,212]		
083	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	8,687	166,516		8,687	166,516
084	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		0			0
085	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		82,162			82,162

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
086	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF		20,717				20,717
087	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)		0				0
088	BASE EXPEDITIARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS		0				0
089	GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM (GLIS)		1,014				1,014
090	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS		29,881				29,881
091	PROFILER	136	12,482			136	12,482
092	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		3,075				3,075
093	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)		0				0
094	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	1,032	141,385			1,032	141,385
095	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER		0				0
096	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)		22,403				22,403
097	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32		0				0
098	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		29,505				29,505
099	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	13	244,409			13	244,409
100	ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM (WMD)		2,426				2,426
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
101	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	133	30,196			133	30,196
102	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	1,642	58,903			1,642	58,903
103	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM	445	8,111			445	8,111
104	FAAD C2		5,031				5,031
105	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	12	64,144			12	64,144
106	KNIGHT FAMILY		11,999				11,999
107	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,853				1,853
108	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		14,377				14,377
109	TC AIMS II		0				0
110	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER		0				0

111	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		59,821		59,821
112	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	721	51,228	721	51,228
113	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)	5,976	176,901	5,976	176,901
114	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		15,209		15,209
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION				
115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		8,866		8,866
116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		129,438		129,438
117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYS FAM		9,184		9,184
118	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	2,062	20,639	2,062	20,639
119	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		35,493		35,493
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)				
120	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (A/V)		8,467		8,467
121	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	89	5,309	89	5,309
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT				
122	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		586		586
123	BCT NETWORK		0		0
124	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM		0		0
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
124A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,435		3,435
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
125	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS		0		0
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	1,562	3,960	1,562	3,960
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	637	4,374	637	4,374
128	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION	219	9,259	219	9,259
129	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		0		0
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT				
130	TACTICAL BRIDGING	7	35,499	7	35,499
131	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	68	32,893	68	32,893
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT				
132	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST		0		0
133	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)		0		0
134	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		29,106		29,106

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
135	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	522	25,459			522	25,459
136	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	364	8,044			364	8,044
137	<$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		3,698				3,698
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
138	HEATERS AND ECU'S	1,332	12,210			1,332	12,210
139	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		6,522				6,522
140	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		11,222				11,222
141	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	5,226	103,317			5,226	103,317
142	MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM		0				0
143	FORCE PROVIDER		0				0
144	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	228	27,417			228	27,417
145	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	8,891	52,065			8,891	52,065
146	MORTUARY AFFAIRS SYSTEMS		2,358				2,358
147	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	266	31,573			266	31,573
148	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	818	14,093			818	14,093
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
149	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	208	36,266			208	36,266
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
150	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	1,938	34,101			1,938	34,101
151	MEDEVAC MISSON EQUIPMENT PACKAGE (MEP)		20,540				20,540
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
152	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	20	2,495			20	2,495
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)		0				0
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
154	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,028				2,028
155	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM		0				0

156	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	9	6,146	9	6,146
157	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING	40	31,200	40	31,200
158	COMPACTOR		0		0
159	LOADERS		0		0
160	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR		0		0
161	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	61	20,867	61	20,867
162	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	1	4,003	1	4,003
163	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	1	3,679	1	3,679
164	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	76	30,042	76	30,042
165	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPA	182	13,725	182	13,725
166	CONST EQUIP ESP	47	13,351	47	13,351
167	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CONST EQUIP)		9,134		9,134
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT				
168	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)		0		0
169	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER		0		0
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (FLOAT/RAIL)		10,552		10,552
	GENERATORS				
171	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	2,074	60,302	2,074	60,302
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
172	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)		0		0
173	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	64	5,895	64	5,895
174	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM		0		0
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
175	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	339	104,649	339	104,649
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		125,251		125,251
177	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	8	19,984	8	19,984
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		10,977		10,977
179	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		4,056		4,056
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)				
180	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	3	10,494	3	10,494
181	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1,674	45,508	1,674	45,508
182	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	2,786	24,334	2,786	24,334

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
183	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,078				5,078
184	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		46,301				46,301
185	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,373				1,373
186	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	248	59,141			248	59,141
187	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,446				2,446
188	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	206	12,920			206	12,920
189	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	1,141	19,180			1,141	19,180
190	TRACTOR YARD		7,368				7,368
191	UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE	311	83,937		–12,000	311	71,937
	Transfer to PE 0604641A at Army request				[–12,000]		
192	TRAINING LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT		0				0
	OPA2						
193	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	34	64,507			34	64,507
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**6,326,245**		**–19,212**		**6,307,033**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK		0				0
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		0				0
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE		0				0
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS		227,414		–227,414		0
	Transfer to OCO				[–227,414]		

	TOTAL, JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**227,414**	**–227,414**		**0**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT					
001	EA–18G	12	1,027,443		12	1,027,443
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0			0
003	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	26	2,035,131		26	2,035,131
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,296	60,000		90,296
	Retain option for additional FY 14 aircraft			[60,000]		
005	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	1,007,632		4	1,007,632
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		65,180			65,180
007	JSF STOVL	6	1,404,737		6	1,404,737
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		106,199			106,199
009	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	17	1,303,120		17	1,303,120
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		154,202			154,202
011	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	27	720,933		27	720,933
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,658			69,658
013	MH–60S (MYP)	18	384,792		18	384,792
014	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		69,277			69,277
015	MH–60R (MYP)	19	656,866		19	656,866
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		185,896			185,896
017	P–8A POSEIDON	13	2,420,755		13	2,420,755
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		325,679			325,679
019	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	861,498		5	861,498
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		123,179			123,179
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT					
021	C–40A		0			0
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT					
022	JPATS	33	278,884		33	278,884
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
023	KC–130J		3,000			3,000
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		22,995			22,995

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
025	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		51,124				51,124
026	MQ–8 UAV	6	124,573			6	124,573
027	STUASLO UAV	5	9,593			5	9,593
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
028	EA–6 SERIES		30,062				30,062
029	AEA SYSTEMS		49,999				49,999
030	AV–8 SERIES		38,703				38,703
031	ADVERSARY		4,289				4,289
032	F–18 SERIES		647,306				647,306
033	H–46 SERIES		2,343				2,343
034	AH–1W SERIES		8,721				8,721
035	H–53 SERIES		45,567				45,567
036	SH–60 SERIES		83,527				83,527
037	H–1 SERIES		6,508				6,508
038	EP–3 SERIES		66,374				66,374
039	P–3 SERIES		148,405				148,405
040	E–2 SERIES		16,322				16,322
041	TRAINER A/C SERIES		34,284				34,284
042	C–2A		4,743				4,743
043	C–130 SERIES		60,302				60,302
044	FEWSG		670				670
045	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		26,311				26,311
046	E–6 SERIES		158,332				158,332
047	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		58,163				58,163
048	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		12,421				12,421
049	T–45 SERIES		64,488				64,488

050	POWER PLANT CHANGES		21,569			21,569
051	JPATS SERIES		1,552			1,552
052	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		2,473			2,473
053	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		114,690			114,690
054	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		96,183			96,183
055	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		0			0
056	ID SYSTEMS		39,846			39,846
057	P–8 SERIES		5,302			5,302
058	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		34,127			34,127
059	RQ–7 SERIES		49,324			49,324
060	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		95,856			95,856
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
061	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,166,430			1,166,430
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES					
062	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		387,195			387,195
063	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		23,469			23,469
064	WAR CONSUMABLES		43,383			43,383
065	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		3,399			3,399
066	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		32,274			32,274
067	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,742			1,742
068	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		0			0
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**17,129,296**		**60,000**	**17,189,296**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES					
001	TRIDENT II MODS		1,224,683			1,224,683
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		5,553			5,553
	STRATEGIC MISSILES					
003	TOMAHAWK	196	308,970		196	308,970
	TACTICAL MISSILES					
004	AMRAAM	67	102,683		67	102,683

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
005	SIDEWINDER	150	80,226			150	80,226
006	JSOW	280	127,609			280	127,609
007	STANDARD MISSILE	94	399,482			94	399,482
008	RAM	62	66,769			62	66,769
009	HELLFIRE	998	74,501			998	74,501
010	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)		0				0
011	AERIAL TARGETS		61,518				61,518
012	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,585				3,585
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
013	ESSM	37	58,194			37	58,194
014	HARM MODS	100	86,721			100	86,721
015	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		0				0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
016	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,014				2,014
017	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		21,454				21,454
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
018	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		54,945				54,945
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
019	SSTD		2,700				2,700
020	ASW TARGETS		10,385				10,385
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
021	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	75	74,487			75	74,487
022	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	94	54,281			94	54,281
023	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		6,852				6,852
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
024	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		46,402				46,402

025	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	11,927		11,927
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION			
026	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	3,614		3,614
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS			
027	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	12,594		12,594
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS			
028	CIWS MODS	59,303	7,700	67,003
	Buy additional ordnance alteration kits		[7,700]	
029	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	19,072		19,072
030	GUN MOUNT MODS	54,706		54,706
031	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS	1,591		1,591
032	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	20,607		20,607
	OTHER			
033	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
034	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	60,150		60,150
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**3,117,578**	**7,700**	**3,125,278**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC			
	NAVY AMMUNITION			
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	27,024		27,024
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	56,575		56,575
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	21,266		21,266
004	PRACTICE BOMBS	34,319		34,319
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	53,755		53,755
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	61,693		61,693
007	JATOS	2,776		2,776
008	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE	7,102		7,102
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	48,320		48,320
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	25,544		25,544
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	41,624		41,624
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	65,893		65,893

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,176				11,176
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,116				4,116
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		83,733				83,733
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		24,645				24,645
017	40MM, ALL TYPES		16,201				16,201
018	60MM, ALL TYPES		0				0
019	81MM, ALL TYPES		13,711		–10,000		3,711
	Decrease for excess				[–10,000]		
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		12,557				12,557
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		0				0
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		7,634		–500		7,134
	Decrease for excess				[–500]		
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		27,528				27,528
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		93,065				93,065
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		2,047		–2,000		47
	Decrease for excess				[–2,000]		
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		5,297				5,297
027	NON LETHALS		1,362				1,362
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION		4,566				4,566
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,010				6,010
	PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS						
029B	PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS				–88,300		–88,300
	Ammunition change in requirements				[–88,300]		

	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**759,539**	**–100,800**		**658,739**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	608,195		1	608,195
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0			0
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,217,601		2	3,217,601
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		874,878	777,679		1,652,557
	Advance procurement for 2nd SSN in FY 14			[777,679]		
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	1,613,392		1	1,613,392
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		70,010			70,010
007	SSBN ERO		0			0
008	DDG 1000		669,222			669,222
009	DDG–51	2	3,048,658		2	3,048,658
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		466,283			466,283
011	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	4	1,784,959		4	1,784,959
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0			0
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS					
013	LPD–17		0			0
014	LHA REPLACEMENT		0			0
015	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL	1	189,196		1	189,196
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST					
016	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS		0			0
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		307,300			307,300
018	OUTFITTING		309,648			309,648
019	SERVICE CRAFT		0			0
020	LCAC SLEP	2	47,930		2	47,930
021	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		372,573			372,573
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		**13,579,845**	**777,679**		**14,357,524**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
001	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE		10,658				10,658
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		8,469				8,469
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
003	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		23,392				23,392
	PERISCOPES						
004	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		53,809				53,809
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
005	DDG MOD		452,371				452,371
006	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		16,958				16,958
007	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		2,492				2,492
008	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		20,707				20,707
009	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,046				12,046
010	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		79,870				79,870
011	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		19,865				19,865
012	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		41,522				41,522
013	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		30,543				30,543
014	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		16,257				16,257
015	DSSP EQUIPMENT		3,630				3,630
016	CG MODERNIZATION		101,000				101,000
017	LCAC		16,645				16,645
018	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS		35,446				35,446
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		65,998				65,998
020	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		4,359				4,359
021	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM		10,218				10,218
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
022	REACTOR POWER UNITS		286,859				286,859

023	REACTOR COMPONENTS	278,503	278,503
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
024	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	8,998	8,998
	SMALL BOATS		
025	STANDARD BOATS	30,131	30,131
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
026	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	29,772	29,772
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		
027	OPERATING FORCES IPE	64,346	64,346
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT		
028	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	154,652	154,652
029	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	31,319	31,319
030	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	38,392	38,392
031	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	32,897	32,897
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT		
032	LSD MIDLIFE	49,758	49,758
	SHIP RADARS		
033	RADAR SUPPORT	0	0
034	SPQ–9B RADAR	19,777	19,777
035	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	89,201	89,201
036	SSN ACOUSTICS	190,874	190,874
037	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	17,035	17,035
038	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	13,410	13,410
039	ELECTRONIC WARFARE MILDEC	0	0
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
040	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	21,489	21,489
041	SSTD	10,716	10,716
042	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	98,896	98,896
043	SURTASS	2,774	2,774
044	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISSANCE FORCE	18,428	18,428
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT		
045	AN/SLQ–32	92,270	92,270

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
046	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		107,060				107,060
047	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)		914				914
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
048	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		34,050				34,050
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
049	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		27,881				27,881
050	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)		448				448
051	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		35,732				35,732
052	ATDLS		0				0
053	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)		9,533				9,533
054	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		60,111				60,111
055	SHALLOW WATER MCM		6,950				6,950
056	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		9,089				9,089
057	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE		7,768				7,768
058	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		3,614				3,614
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
059	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		42,911				42,911
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
060	MATCALS		5,861				5,861
061	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		8,362				8,362
062	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM		15,685				15,685
063	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM		16,919				16,919
064	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS		6,828				6,828
065	LANDING SYSTEMS		7,646				7,646
066	ID SYSTEMS		35,474				35,474

067	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	9,958	9,958
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
068	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT	9,064	9,064
069	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	16,026	16,026
070	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	11,886	11,886
071	DCGS-N	11,887	11,887
072	CANES	341,398	341,398
073	RADIAC	8,083	8,083
074	CANES-INTELL	79,427	79,427
075	GPETE	6,083	6,083
076	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,495	4,495
077	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,767	4,767
078	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	81,755	81,755
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
079	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	0	0
080	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	56,870	56,870
081	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)	1,063	1,063
082	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	28,522	28,522
083	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	4,183	4,183
084	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	69,025	69,025
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS		
085	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	49,294	49,294
086	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	184,825	184,825
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		
087	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	2,180	2,180
088	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,354	1,354
089	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	0	0
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		
090	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	144,104	144,104
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		
091	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	12,604	12,604
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
092	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		6,680				6,680
093	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM		0				0
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
094	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		0				0
	SONOBUOYS						
095	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		104,677				104,677
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
096	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		70,753				70,753
097	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,678				8,678
098	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		11,349				11,349
099	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		82,618				82,618
100	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		18,339				18,339
101	DCRS/DPL		1,414				1,414
102	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		40,475				40,475
103	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		61,552				61,552
104	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		18,771				18,771
105	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS		7,954				7,954
106	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,023				10,023
107	AUTONOMIC LOGISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEM (ALIS)		3,826				3,826
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
108	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM		3,472				3,472
109	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		4,528				4,528
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
110	NATO SEASPARROW		8,960				8,960
111	RAM GMLS		1,185				1,185
112	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		55,371				55,371

113	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	81,614	81,614
114	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	77,767	77,767
115	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	754	754
116	MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM—MIPS	4,965	4,965
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
117	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	181,049	181,049
118	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	71,316	71,316
119	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,018	4,018
120	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,465	6,465
121	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	47,930	47,930
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
122	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	3,579	3,579
123	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,125	3,125
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		
124	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	31,743	31,743
125	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	34,174	34,174
126	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	23,450	23,450
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
127	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	7,158	7,158
128	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	3,325	3,325
129	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	8,692	8,692
130	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,533	14,533
131	TACTICAL VEHICLES	15,330	15,330
132	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	10,803	10,803
133	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	7,265	7,265
134	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	15,252	15,252
135	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,161	1,161
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
136	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	15,204	15,204
137	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,330	6,330
138	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	6,539	6,539
139	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	34,804	34,804

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TRAINING DEVICES						
140	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25,444				25,444
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
141	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,165				43,165
142	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,251				2,251
143	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,148				3,148
146	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,502				3,502
148	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,696				15,696
149	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		4,344				4,344
150	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		19,492				19,492
151	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		177,149				177,149
152	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		183,995				183,995
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
152A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		13,063				13,063
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
153	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		250,718				250,718
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**6,169,378**		**0**		**6,169,378**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	AAV7A1 PIP		16,089				16,089
002	LAV PIP		186,216		–140,000		46,216
	LAV procurement acquisition objective change				[–140,000]		
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,502				2,502
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		17,913				17,913

005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		47,999		47,999
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		17,706		17,706
	OTHER SUPPORT				
007	MODIFICATION KITS		48,040		48,040
008	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		4,537		4,537
	GUIDED MISSILES				
009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		11,054		11,054
010	JAVELIN		0		0
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		19,650		19,650
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		20,708		20,708
	OTHER SUPPORT				
013	MODIFICATION KITS		0		0
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS				
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		1,420		1,420
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
015	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		25,127		25,127
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)				
016	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		25,822		25,822
017	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831		2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)				
018	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		5,498		5,498
019	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		11,290		11,290
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
020	RADAR SYSTEMS		128,079		128,079
021	RQ–21 UAS	5	27,619	5	27,619
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
022	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		7,319		7,319
023	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,466		7,466
025	RQ–11 UAV		2,318		2,318
026	DCGS-MC		18,291		18,291
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
029	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		48,084		48,084

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
030	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		206,708				206,708
031	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		35,190				35,190
032	RADIO SYSTEMS		89,059				89,059
033	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		22,500				22,500
034	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		42,625				42,625
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
035A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,290				2,290
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
035	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		2,877				2,877
036	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		13,960				13,960
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
037	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)		8,052				8,052
038	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		50,269				50,269
039	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT		0				0
040	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	8	37,262			8	37,262
041	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		48,160				48,160
042	TRAILERS		0				0
	OTHER SUPPORT						
043	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,705				6,705
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
044	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		13,576				13,576
045	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		16,869				16,869
046	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		19,108				19,108
047	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		56,253				56,253
048	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		13,089				13,089

049	EOD SYSTEMS		73,699			73,699
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
050	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		3,510			3,510
051	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		11,490			11,490
052	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		20,659			20,659
053	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		132			132
	GENERAL PROPERTY					
054	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		31,068			31,068
055	TRAINING DEVICES		45,895			45,895
056	CONTAINER FAMILY		5,801			5,801
057	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		23,939			23,939
058	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		0			0
059	BRIDGE BOATS		0			0
060	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		8,365			8,365
	OTHER SUPPORT					
061	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,077			7,077
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
062	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		3,190			3,190
	PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS					
062A	PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS			–135,200		–135,200
	LAV procurement acquisition objective change PY			[–135,200]		
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**1,622,955**	**–275,200**		**1,347,755**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	TACTICAL FORCES					
001	F–35	19	3,124,302		19	3,124,302
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		293,400			293,400
003	F–22A		0			0
004	C–17A (MYP)		0			0
	OTHER AIRLIFT					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
005	C–130J		68,373				68,373
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
007	HC–130J	1	152,212			1	152,212
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
009	MC–130J	4	374,866			4	374,866
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0				0
011	HC/MC–130 RECAP		0				0
012	C–27J		0				0
	UPT TRAINERS						
013	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT		0				0
014	USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM		0				0
	HELICOPTERS						
015	HH–60 LOSS REPLACEMENT/RECAP		60,596				60,596
016	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM (CVLSP)		0				0
017	CV–22 (MYP)	4	294,220			4	294,220
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		15,000				15,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
019	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	5	2,498			5	2,498
020	LIGHT ATTACK ARMED RECON ACFT		0				0
021	RQ–11		0				0
022	STUASL0		0				0
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
023	INTERIM GATEWAY		0				0
024	TARGET DRONES	15	129,866			15	129,866
025	C–37A		0				0
026	RQ–4		75,000				75,000

027	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0		0
028	AC–130J	2	163,970	2	163,970
029	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0		0
030	MQ–9	24	553,530	24	553,530
031	RQ–4 BLOCK 40 PROC		11,654		11,654
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT				
032	B–2A		82,296		82,296
033	B–1B		149,756		149,756
034	B–52		9,781		9,781
035	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		28,800		28,800
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT				
036	A–10		89,919		89,919
037	F–15		148,378		148,378
038	F–16		6,896		6,896
039	F–22A		283,871		283,871
040	F–35 MODIFICATIONS		147,995		147,995
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
041	C–5		6,967		6,967
042	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0		0
043	C–5M		944,819		944,819
044	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		175,800		175,800
045	C–9C		0		0
046	C–17A		205,079		205,079
047	C–21		199		199
048	C–32A		1,750		1,750
049	C–37A		445		445
050	C–130 AMP		0		0
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
051	GLIDER MODS		126		126
052	T–6		15,494		15,494
053	T–1		272		272
054	T–38		20,455		20,455

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
055	U–2 MODS		0				0
056	U–2 MODS		44,477				44,477
057	KC–10A (ATCA)		46,921				46,921
058	C–12		1,876				1,876
059	MC–12W		17,054				17,054
060	C–20 MODS		243				243
061	VC–25A MOD		11,185				11,185
062	C–40		243				243
063	C–130		67,853				67,853
064	C–130 INTEL		0				0
065	C–130J MODS		70,555				70,555
066	C–135		46,707				46,707
067	COMPASS CALL MODS		50,024				50,024
068	RC–135		165,237				165,237
069	E–3		193,099				193,099
070	E–4		47,616				47,616
071	E–8		59,320		12,000		71,320
	Restart production line for the JSTARS re-engining program				[12,000]		
072	H–1		5,449				5,449
073	H–60		26,227				26,227
074	RQ–4 MODS		9,257				9,257
075	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		22,326				22,326
076	OTHER AIRCRAFT		18,832				18,832
077	MQ–1 MODS		30,861				30,861
078	MQ–9 MODS		238,360				238,360

079	MQ–9 UAS PAYLOADS	93,461	93,461
080	CV–22 MODS	23,881	23,881
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		
081	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	729,691	729,691
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
082	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	56,542	56,542
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		
083	A–10	5,100	5,100
084	B–1	965	965
085	B–2A	0	0
086	B–2A	47,580	47,580
087	C–5	0	0
088	KC–10A (ATCA)	13,100	13,100
089	C–17A	181,703	181,703
090	C–130	31,830	31,830
091	C–135	13,434	13,434
092	F–15	2,363	2,363
093	F–16	8,506	8,506
094	HH–60 PPS	0	0
095	T–6	0	0
096	OTHER AIRCRAFT	9,522	9,522
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		
097	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS	20,731	20,731
	WAR CONSUMABLES		
098	WAR CONSUMABLES	89,727	89,727
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		
099	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	842,392	842,392
	DARP		
103	U–2	0	0
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
103A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	20,164	20,164

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS						
103B	PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS				–920,748		–920,748
	Light attack armed reconnaissance (LAAR) cancellation				[–115,049]		
	Light mobiilty aircraft cancellation				[–65,296]		
	Common vertical lift support platform (CVLSP) cancellation				[–52,800]		
	C–130 AMP cancellation				[–207,163]		
	RQ–4 Global Hawk Block 30 cancellation				[–480,440]		
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**11,002,999**		**–908,748**		**10,094,251**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		56,906				56,906
	TACTICAL						
002	JASSM	157	240,399			157	240,399
003	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	164	88,020			164	88,020
004	AMRAAM	113	229,637			113	229,637
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	413	47,675			413	47,675
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	144	42,000			144	42,000
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
007	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		744				744
	CLASS IV						
008	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		0				0
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS		54,794				54,794
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK		271				271
011	AGM–88A HARM		23,240				23,240

012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		13,620			13,620
013	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		5,000			5,000
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		74,373			74,373
	SPACE PROGRAMS					
015	ADVANCED EHF		557,205			557,205
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0			0
017	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		36,835			36,835
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0			0
019	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	2	410,294		2	410,294
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		82,616			82,616
021	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		10,554			10,554
022	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		58,147			58,147
023	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		89,022			89,022
024	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	1,679,856		4	1,679,856
025	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	2	454,251		2	454,251
026	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0			0
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS					
028	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM		0			0
030	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		138,904			138,904
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
030A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,097,483			1,097,483
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**5,491,846**	**0**		**5,491,846**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE					
	ROCKETS					
001	ROCKETS		8,927			8,927
	CARTRIDGES					
002	CARTRIDGES		118,075			118,075
	BOMBS					
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		32,393			32,393
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		163,467			163,467

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,259	101,921			3,259	101,921
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B						
006	CAD/PAD		43,829				43,829
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		7,515				7,515
008	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,003				1,003
009	MODIFICATIONS		5,321				5,321
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,066				5,066
	FUZES						
011	FLARES		46,010				46,010
012	FUZES		36,444				36,444
	SMALL ARMS						
013	SMALL ARMS		29,223				29,223
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		**599,194**		**0**		**599,194**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,905				1,905
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		18,547				18,547
003	CAP VEHICLES		932				932
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,699				1,699
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		10,850				10,850
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,246				9,246
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		23,148				23,148

	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	18,323	18,323
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT		
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU	1,685	1,685
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	17,014	17,014
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		
011	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	0
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)		
012	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	166,559	166,559
013	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	1,133	1,133
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS		
014	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	2,749	2,749
015	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	32,876	32,876
016	ADVANCE TECH SENSORS	877	877
017	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	15,295	15,295
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS		
018	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	21,984	21,984
019	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	30,698	30,698
020	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	17,368	17,368
021	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	23,483	23,483
022	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	17,864	17,864
023	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	53,995	53,995
024	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	14,578	14,578
025	TAC SIGINT SPT	208	208
026	DRUG INTERDICTION SPT	0	0
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS		
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	69,743	69,743
028	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	15,829	15,829
029	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,023	11,023
030	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	64,521	64,521
031	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	18,217	18,217
032	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	11,899	11,899

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
033	GCSS-AF FOS		13,920				13,920
034	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		9,365				9,365
035	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		33,907				33,907
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
036	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS		52,464				52,464
037	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		0				0
038	AFNET		125,788				125,788
039	VOICE SYSTEMS		16,811				16,811
040	USCENTCOM		32,138				32,138
	DISA PROGRAMS						
041	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		47,135				47,135
042	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		2,031				2,031
043	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE		5,564				5,564
044	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE		44,219				44,219
045	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		109,545				109,545
046	MILSATCOM SPACE		47,592				47,592
047	SPACE MODS SPACE		47,121				47,121
048	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM		20,961				20,961
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
049	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		126,131				126,131
050	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER		23,707				23,707
051	RADIO EQUIPMENT		12,757				12,757
052	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		10,716				10,716
053	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		74,528				74,528
	MODIFICATIONS						
054	COMM ELECT MODS		43,507				43,507

	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP			
055	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	22,693		22,693
056	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	30,887		30,887
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ			
057	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	2,850		2,850
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
058	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	8,387		8,387
059	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	10,358		10,358
060	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	3,473		3,473
061	RAPID IMPROVEMENT PROCUREMENT INOVAT	0		0
062	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	14,471		14,471
063	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,894		1,894
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS			
065	DARP RC135	24,176		24,176
066	DCGS-AF	142,928		142,928
068	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	479,446		479,446
069	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	39,155		39,155
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
069A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,331,312		14,331,312
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
071	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	14,663		14,663
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**16,720,848**	**0**	**16,720,848**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA			
001	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA	0		0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA			
002	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,486		1,486
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA			
003	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	2,129		2,129
	EQUIPMENT			
004	EQUIPMENT	0		0

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
005	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		6,147				6,147
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
012	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		12,708				12,708
013	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		0				0
014	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,002				3,002
015	TELEPORT PROGRAM		46,992				46,992
016	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		108,462				108,462
017	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		2,865				2,865
018	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		116,906				116,906
019	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,827				1,827
020	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		0				0
021	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		10,319				10,319
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
022	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		9,575				9,575
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
023	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	6	15,179			6	15,179
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						
024	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,458				1,458
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY						
025	EQUIPMENT		0				0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
026	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,522				2,522
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
027	VEHICLES	1	50			1	50
028	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	13,096			3	13,096

	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA					
029	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		0			0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY					
030	THAAD	36	460,728	100,000	36	560,728
	THAAD Interceptors			[100,000]		
031	AEGIS BMD	29	389,626		29	389,626
032	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS	1	217,244		1	217,244
033	RADAR SPARES		10,177			10,177
034	IRON DOME		0			0
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA					
041	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		6,770			6,770
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD					
042	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		45,938			45,938
043	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		17,582			17,582
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS					
044	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		21,878			21,878
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS					
045	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		26,550			26,550
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
045A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		555,787			555,787
	AVIATION PROGRAMS					
046	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		74,832			74,832
047	MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM		0			0
048	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		126,780			126,780
049	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	7	99,776	–62,776	7	37,000
	Transfer to Line 51 at USSOCOM request			[–62,776]		
050	TANKER RECAPITALIZATION		0			0
051	U–28		7,530	109,376		116,906
	Transfer from Line 49 at USSOCOM request			[62,776]		
	USSOCOM UFR			[46,600]		
052	MH–47 CHINOOK	7	134,785		7	134,785
053	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		2,062			2,062

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
054	CV–22 MODIFICATION	4	139,147			4	139,147
055	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,963		23,000		26,963
	USSOCOM UFR				[23,000]		
056	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,952		35,400		39,352
	USSOCOM UFR				[35,400]		
057	RQ–7 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		0				0
058	STUASL0		12,945				12,945
059	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		73,013				73,013
060	AC/MC–130J		51,484				51,484
061	MQ–8 UAV		0				0
062	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		25,248				25,248
063	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		5,314				5,314
	SHIPBUILDING						
064	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		23,037		–8,000		15,037
	Transfer to RDDW Line 272 at USSOCOM request				[–8,000]		
065	SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		0				0
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
066	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		113,183				113,183
067	ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		36,981				36,981
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
068	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS		99,838		3,900		103,738
	USSOCOM UFR				[3,900]		
069	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		71,428				71,428
070	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		27,108				27,108
071	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		12,767		3,200		15,967
	USSOCOM UFR				[3,200]		

073	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS	0		0
074	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	42,348		42,348
075	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	600		600
077	TACTICAL VEHICLES	37,421		37,421
078	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS	36,949	5,000	41,949
	USSOCOM UFR		[5,000]	
079	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	20,255		20,255
080	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	17,590		17,590
082	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	66,573		66,573
083	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	6,549		6,549
084	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	32,335		32,335
085	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	15,153		15,153
086	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	33,920		33,920
087	TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	75,132		75,132
088	MARITIME EQUIPMENT	0		0
089	DRUG INTERDICTION	0		0
090	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	6,667		6,667
091	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	217,972	25,300	243,272
	USSOCOM UFR		[25,300]	
092	MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	27,417		27,417
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
092A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0		0
	CBDP			
093	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION	24,025		24,025
094	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	73,720		73,720
095	DECONTAMINATION	506		506
096	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)	32,597		32,597
097	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	3,144		3,144
098	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	164,886		164,886
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**4,187,935**	**234,400**	**4,422,335**

NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	ARMY RESERVE						
001	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	NAVY RESERVE						
002	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
003	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
004	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
005	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
006	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	NATIONAL GUARD AIRCRAFT						
007	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		0				0
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		**0**		**0**		**0**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		99,477				99,477
	TOTAL, JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**99,477**		**0**		**99,477**
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT		**97,432,379**		**–473,216**		**96,959,163**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	ROTARY						
009	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	2	71,000	–2	–71,000	0	0
	Funding ahead of need			[–2]	[–71,000]		
012	KIOWA WARRIOR (OH–58F) WRA	16	183,900			16	183,900
015	CH–47 HELICOPTER	6	231,300			6	231,300
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**486,200**		**–71,000**		**415,200**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	161	29,100			161	29,100
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	186	20,553			186	20,553
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**49,653**		**0**		**49,653**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
036	M16 RIFLE MODS		15,422				15,422
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**15,422**		**0**		**15,422**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		1,500				1,500
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		80,000				80,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		14,000				14,000

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		6,000				6,000
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		56,000				56,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP		29,956				29,956
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		37,044				37,044
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982		12,300				12,300
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		17,000				17,000
	MINES						
017	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES		12,000				12,000
	ROCKETS						
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		63,635				63,635
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
023	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		16,858				16,858
	MISCELLANEOUS						
028	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,200				1,200
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**357,493**		**0**		**357,493**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
002	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	223	28,247			223	28,247
004	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		2,050				2,050
011	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM	2,128	271,000			2,128	271,000
014	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		927,400				927,400
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
052	RESERVE CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	–660	8,000			–660	8,000

	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
061	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(		25,000	40,000		65,000
	Transfer from OMA OCO at SOUTHCOM request			[40,000]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)					
069	DCGS–A (MIP)	960	90,355		960	90,355
073	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRINTING AND COLLECTION		6,516			6,516
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)					
075	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		27,646			27,646
077	FMLY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIES		52,000			52,000
078	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		205,209			205,209
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)					
092	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		14,600			14,600
099	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	–4	54,585		–4	54,585
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS					
102	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		22,430			22,430
103	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,400			2,400
112	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		6,400			6,400
113	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		5,160			5,160
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT					
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		15,000			15,000
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	–5,400	66,100		–5,400	66,100
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT					
135	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		3,565			3,565
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
143	FORCE PROVIDER	1	39,700		1	39,700
145	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	15	650		15	650
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT					
149	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	13	2,119		13	2,119
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT					
152	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	4	428		4	428
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)		30			30
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
175	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		7,000				7,000
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	–202	27,250			–202	27,250
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		1,000				1,000
179	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		5,900				5,900
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
183	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		98,167		–7,000		91,167
	Slow execution of prior years appropriations				[–37,000]		
	Solar power units				[30,000]		
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**2,015,907**		**33,000**		**2,048,907**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK		950,500		–100,000		850,500
	Program decrease—under execution				[–100,000]		
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT						
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		400,000		–50,000		350,000
	Program decrease—under execution & program delays				[–50,000]		
	FORCE TRAINING						
003	TRAIN THE FORCE		149,500		–21,000		128,500
	Program decrease—under execution & program delays				[–21,000]		
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
004	OPERATIONS		175,400		198,414		373,814
	Transfer from Base				[227,414]		
	Program decrease—excessive contractor service support				[–29,000]		
	TOTAL, JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**1,675,400**		**27,414**		**1,702,814**

	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT					
011	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	1	29,800		1	29,800
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT					
030	AV–8 SERIES		42,238			42,238
032	F–18 SERIES		41,243			41,243
035	H–53 SERIES		15,870			15,870
038	EP–3 SERIES		13,030			13,030
043	C–130 SERIES		16,737			16,737
048	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		2,714			2,714
054	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		570			570
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES					
062	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		2,380			2,380
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**164,582**	**0**		**164,582**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	TACTICAL MISSILES					
009	HELLFIRE	212	17,000		212	17,000
010	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	50	6,500		50	6,500
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**23,500**	**0**		**23,500**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC					
	NAVY AMMUNITION					
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		18,000			18,000
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		80,200			80,200
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		21,500			21,500
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		20,303			20,303
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		532			532
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		2,643			2,643
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		2,322			2,322
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,308			6,308
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION					

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		10,948				10,948
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		9,940				9,940
017	40MM, ALL TYPES		5,963				5,963
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		11,605				11,605
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		2,831				2,831
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		2,359				2,359
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		3,051				3,051
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		54,886				54,886
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		1,391				1,391
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		30,945				30,945
027	NON LETHALS		8				8
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		12				12
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**285,747**		**0**		**285,747**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
070	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		3,603				3,603
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
097	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		58,200				58,200
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
127	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,901				3,901
128	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		852				852
129	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		2,436				2,436
130	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		3,798				3,798
131	TACTICAL VEHICLES		13,394				13,394
134	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		375				375

	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
149	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		3,000			3,000
151	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		9,323			9,323
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**98,882**	**0**		**98,882**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS					
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					
002	LAV PIP		10,000			10,000
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS					
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		108,860			108,860
	GUIDED MISSILES					
010	JAVELIN		29,158			29,158
	OTHER SUPPORT					
013	MODIFICATION KITS		41,602			41,602
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT					
015	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		13,632			13,632
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)					
017	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831			2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)					
019	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	51	15,575		51	15,575
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)					
020	RADAR SYSTEMS		8,015			8,015
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)					
023	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		35,310			35,310
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)					
029	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	332	652		332	652
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)					
030	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	25	19,807		25	19,807
032	RADIO SYSTEMS	74	36,482		74	36,482
033	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	4	41,295		4	41,295
	TACTICAL VEHICLES					
039	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	32	10,466		32	10,466

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
041	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		7,642				7,642
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
045	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		18,239				18,239
046	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		51,359				51,359
047	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		20,247				20,247
049	EOD SYSTEMS	207	362,658			207	362,658
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
050	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		55,500				55,500
052	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		19,100				19,100
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
054	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		15,751				15,751
055	TRAINING DEVICES		3,602				3,602
057	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		15,900				15,900
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**943,683**		**0**		**943,683**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
035	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		139,800				139,800
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
055	U–2 MODS		46,800				46,800
063	C–130		11,400				11,400
067	COMPASS CALL MODS		14,000				14,000
068	RC–135		8,000				8,000
075	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		4,700				4,700
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
081	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		21,900				21,900

	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES					
099	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		59,000			59,000
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**305,600**	**0**		**305,600**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	TACTICAL					
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	304	34,350		304	34,350
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**34,350**	**0**		**34,350**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE					
	CARTRIDGES					
002	CARTRIDGES		13,592			13,592
	BOMBS					
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		23,211			23,211
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,419	53,923		1,419	53,923
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B					
006	CAD/PAD		2,638			2,638
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,600			2,600
	FUZES					
011	FLARES		11,726			11,726
012	FUZES		8,513			8,513
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		**116,203**	**0**		**116,203**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES					
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		2,010			2,010
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,675			2,675
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES					
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,557			2,557
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,329			4,329
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT					

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		984				984
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,120				9,120
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
022	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		5,600				5,600
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		11,157				11,157
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
049	TACTICAL C–E EQUIPMENT		7,000				7,000
053	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		10,654				10,654
	MODIFICATIONS						
054	COMM ELECT MODS		8,000				8,000
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
055	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		902				902
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
059	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		60,090				60,090
062	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		9,400				9,400
063	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,175				9,175
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
069A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,672,317				2,672,317
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
071	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		2,300				2,300
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**2,818,270**		**0**		**2,818,270**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
015	TELEPORT PROGRAM		5,260				5,260

	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
045A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		126,201			126,201
	AVIATION PROGRAMS					
061	MQ–8 UAV		16,500			16,500
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
068	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	4	151		4	151
069	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	41	30,528		41	30,528
077	TACTICAL VEHICLES	54	1,843		54	1,843
082	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	1	1,000		1	1,000
086	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	12	108		12	108
091	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	31	14,758		31	14,758
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**196,349**	**0**		**196,349**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		100,000			100,000
	TOTAL, JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**100,000**	**0**		**100,000**
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT		**9,687,241**	**–10,586**		**9,676,655**

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	20,860		20,860
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	219,180		219,180
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	80,986		80,986
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	123,045		123,045
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**444,071**	**0**	**444,071**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	29,041		29,041
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	45,260		45,260
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	22,439		22,439
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	51,607		51,607
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	15,068		15,068
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	49,383		49,383
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	25,999		25,999
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	23,507		23,507
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	69,062		69,062

014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	60,823		60,823
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	4,465		4,465
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,169		7,169
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	35,218		35,218
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	60,300		60,300
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	53,244		53,244
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	18,850		18,850
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	19,872		19,872
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,095		20,095
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	28,852		28,852
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	9,830		9,830
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	70,693		70,693
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	17,781		17,781
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	28,281		28,281
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	107,891		107,891
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**874,730**	**0**	**874,730**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,359		39,359
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	69,580		69,580
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,215		64,215
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	67,613		67,613
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	104,359		104,359
034	0603006A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,157		4,157
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,856		9,856
036	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,661		50,661
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	9,126		9,126
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	17,257		17,257
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	9,925		9,925
040	0603105A	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,984		6,984
041	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,716		9,716
042	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,487		3,487

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
043	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,323		2,323
044	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	21,683		21,683
045	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	71,111		71,111
046	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	10,902		10,902
047	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	180,582		180,582
048	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	27,204		27,204
049	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,095		6,095
050	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,217		37,217
051	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	13,626		13,626
052	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,458		28,458
053	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	25,226		25,226
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**890,722**	**0**	**890,722**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	14,505		14,505
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	9,876		9,876
056	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	5,054		5,054
057	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS—ADV DEV	2,725		2,725
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,560		30,560
059	0603653A	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	14,347		14,347
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	10,073		10,073
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	8,660		8,660
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,715		10,715
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	4,631		4,631
064	0603782A	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL—DEM/VAL	278,018		278,018
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,961		4,961
066	0603801A	AVIATION—ADV DEV	8,602		8,602

067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	14,605		14,605
068	0603805A	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	5,054		5,054
069	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	24,384		24,384
070	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	32,050		32,050
071	0603850A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	96		96
072	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	24,868		24,868
073	0604131A	TRACTOR JUTE	59		59
074	0604284A	JOINT COOPERATIVE TARGET IDENTIFICATION—GROUND (JCTI-G)/TECHNOLOGY DEV	0		0
075	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	76,039		76,039
076	0604775A	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0		0
077	0604785A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE (BUDGET ACTIVITY 4)	4,043		4,043
078	0305205A	ENDURANCE UAVS	26,196		26,196
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**610,121**	**0**	**610,121**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
079	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	78,538		78,538
080	0604220A	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS	90,494		90,494
081	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	181,347		181,347
082	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	0		0
083	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	12,636		12,636
084	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	5,694		5,694
085	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	32,095		32,095
086	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	96,478		96,478
087	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,006		3,006
088	0604609A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS—ENG DEV	0		0
089	0604611A	JAVELIN	5,040		5,040
090	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,077		3,077
091	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,769		9,769
092	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	13,141	12,000	25,141
		Transfer from OPA line 191 at Army request		[12,000]	
093	0604642A	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	0		0
094	0604661A	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	0		0

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
095	0604662A	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS	0		0
096	0604663A	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES	0		0
097	0604664A	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	0		0
098	0604665A	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D	0		0
099	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	32,621		32,621
100	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,132		2,132
101	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	44,787		44,787
102	0604716A	TERRAIN INFORMATION—ENG DEV	1,008		1,008
103	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	73,333		73,333
104	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,937		28,937
105	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	10,815		10,815
106	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	13,926		13,926
107	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	17,797		17,797
108	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	214,270		214,270
109	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	14,581		14,581
110	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	43,706		43,706
111	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	20,776		20,776
112	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	43,395		43,395
113	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	104,983		104,983
114	0604814A	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS—EMD	4,346		4,346
115	0604817A	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	0		0
116	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	77,223		77,223
117	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	3,486		3,486
118	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	9,963	17,200	27,163
		GFEBS realignment per Army request		[17,200]	
119	0604823A	FIREFINDER	20,517		20,517
120	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	51,851		51,851

121	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	167,797		167,797
122	0604869A	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	400,861	–400,861	0
		No funds authorized		[–400,861]	
123	0604870A	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,922		7,922
124	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	51,463		51,463
125	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	158,646		158,646
126	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	10,000		10,000
127	0605455A	SLAMRAAM	0		0
128	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	69,029		69,029
129	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	277,374		277,374
130	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	639,874		639,874
131	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	47,426		47,426
132	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	72,295		72,295
133	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	4,232		4,232
134	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	13,942		13,942
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**3,286,629**	**–371,661**	**2,914,968**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,090		18,090
136	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	14,034		14,034
137	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,394		37,394
138	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	21,026		21,026
139	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	176,816		176,816
140	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	27,902		27,902
141	0605502A	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
142	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	369,900		369,900
143	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	69,183		69,183
144	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	44,753		44,753
145	0605605A	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	0		0
146	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,762		5,762
147	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,402		7,402
148	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	19,954		19,954

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
149	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,535		5,535
150	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	67,789		67,789
151	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	62,765		62,765
152	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,545		1,545
153	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	83,422		83,422
154	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	50,820		50,820
155	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	46,763		46,763
156	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,601		4,601
157	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	18,524		18,524
158	0909999A	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,153,980**	**0**	**1,153,980**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
159	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	143,005		143,005
160	0607665A	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	0		0
161	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	109,978		109,978
162	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	190,422		190,422
163	0203347A	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO CYBER (ISC) MIP	0		0
164	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	32,556		32,556
165	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	253,959		253,959
166	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	68,325		68,325
167	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	280,247	–54,000	226,247
		Improved turbine engine program delay		[–54,000]	
168	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	898		898
169	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	35,180		35,180
170	0203759A	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	0		0
171	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	20,733		20,733

172	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	63,243		63,243
173	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	31,738		31,738
174	0208058A	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	35		35
176	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	7,591		7,591
177	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	15,961		15,961
178	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	120,927		120,927
179	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	15,756		15,756
180	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,443		14,443
182	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	31,303		31,303
183	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	40,876		40,876
184	0305219A	MQ–1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV	74,618		74,618
185	0305232A	RQ–11 UAV	4,039		4,039
186	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	31,158		31,158
187	0305235A	VERTICAL UAS	2,387		2,387
188	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	15,248		15,248
189	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	59,908		59,908
189A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,628		4,628
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,669,162**	**–54,000**	**1,615,162**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**8,929,415**	**–425,661**	**8,503,754**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	113,690		113,690
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,261		18,261
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	473,070		473,070
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**605,021**	**0**	**605,021**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	89,189		89,189
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	143,301		143,301
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	46,528		46,528
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	41,696		41,696

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	44,127		44,127
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	78,228		78,228
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,635		49,635
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	5,973		5,973
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	96,814		96,814
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	162,417		162,417
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	32,394		32,394
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**790,302**	**0**	**790,302**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,543		56,543
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,616		18,616
017	0603235N	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	0		0
018	0603236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	0		0
019	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	54,858		54,858
020	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	130,598		130,598
021	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,706		11,706
022	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	256,382		256,382
023	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,880		3,880
024	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	0		0
025	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	51,819		51,819
026	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**584,402**	**0**	**584,402**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
027	0603128N	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEM	0		0
028	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	34,085		34,085

029	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	8,783	8,783
030	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,773	3,773
031	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	24,512	24,512
032	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,090	8,090
033	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,301	5,301
034	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,506	1,506
035	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	190,622	190,622
036	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	93,346	93,346
037	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	108,871	108,871
038	0603513N	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	0	0
039	0603525N	PILOT FISH	101,169	101,169
040	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	74,312	74,312
041	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	90,730	90,730
042	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	777	777
043	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	6,704	6,704
044	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	555,123	555,123
045	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	9,368	9,368
046	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	24,609	24,609
047	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	13,710	13,710
048	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	249,748	249,748
049	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	29,897	29,897
050	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	509,988	509,988
051	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	429,420	429,420
052	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	56,551	56,551
053	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,342	7,342
054	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	95,182	95,182
055	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	10,496	10,496
056	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	52,331	52,331
057	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	56,512	56,512
058	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,029	7,029
059	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	21,080	21,080
060	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	55,324	55,324

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
061	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,401		3,401
062	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	45,966		45,966
063	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,811		3,811
064	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	341,305		341,305
065	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	181,220		181,220
066	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	174,014		174,014
067	0603755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE—DEM/VAL	0		0
068	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	68,654		68,654
069	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	44,487		44,487
070	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,389		9,389
071	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	16,132		16,132
072	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	44,994		44,994
073	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	137,369		137,369
074	0603889N	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	0		0
075	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	0		0
076	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	73,934		73,934
077	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	711		711
078	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	71,300		71,300
079	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	5,654		5,654
080	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	31,549		31,549
081	0604775N	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0		0
082	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	86,801		86,801
083	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	44,500		44,500
084	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	13,172		13,172
085	0303562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS—MIP	0		0
086	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	643		643
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,335,297**	**0**	**4,335,297**

		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
087	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	33,978	33,978
088	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	32,789	32,789
089	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	84,988	84,988
090	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	6,866	6,866
091	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,060	4,060
092	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,451	3,451
093	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	13,071	13,071
094	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	71,645	71,645
095	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	119,065	119,065
096	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	31,105	31,105
097	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	34,299	34,299
098	0604262N	V–22A	54,412	54,412
099	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	2,717	2,717
100	0604269N	EA–18	13,009	13,009
101	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	51,304	51,304
102	0604273N	VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	61,163	61,163
103	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	187,024	187,024
104	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	337,480	337,480
105	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	260,616	260,616
106	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	824	824
107	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	31,064	31,064
108	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	63,891	63,891
109	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	73,246	73,246
110	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	10,568	10,568
111	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	39,974	39,974
112	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	122,481	122,481
113	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	255,516	255,516
114	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	82,620	82,620
115	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	5,633	5,633
116	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	55,826	55,826

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
117	0604518N	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	918		918
118	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	165,230		165,230
119	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	49,141		49,141
120	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	196,737		196,737
121	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,889		3,889
122	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	8,335		8,335
123	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	49,818		49,818
124	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,099		10,099
125	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,348		7,348
126	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	5,518		5,518
127	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	87,662		87,662
128	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	64,079		64,079
129	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	151,489		151,489
130	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	0		0
131	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	12,707		12,707
132	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	47,764		47,764
133	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	737,149		737,149
134	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	743,926		743,926
135	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,143		12,143
136	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	72,209		72,209
137	0605018N	NAVY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (N-IMHRS)	0		0
138	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	606,204		606,204
139	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	0		0
140	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	421,102		421,102
141	0204202N	DDG–1000	124,655		124,655
142	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	1,170		1,170
143	0304503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION—MIP	0		0

144	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	23,255		23,255
145	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,747,232**	**0**	**5,747,232**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
146	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,790		30,790
147	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	59,221		59,221
148	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	35,894		35,894
149	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	7,573		7,573
150	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	20,963		20,963
151	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	46,856		46,856
152	0605502N	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
153	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	796		796
154	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	32,782		32,782
155	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,306		3,306
156	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	70,302		70,302
157	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	144,033		144,033
158	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	342,298		342,298
159	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,399		16,399
160	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	4,579		4,579
161	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	8,000		8,000
162	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	18,490		18,490
163	0305885N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	2,795		2,795
164	0804758N	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC	0		0
165	0909999N	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**845,077**	**0**	**845,077**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
167	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	142,282		142,282
168	0604717M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	0		0
169	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	0		0

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
170	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	105,892		105,892
171	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,729		34,729
172	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,434		1,434
173	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	19,208		19,208
174	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	25,566		25,566
175	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	188,299		188,299
176	0204152N	E–2 SQUADRONS	8,610		8,610
177	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	15,695		15,695
178	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	4,171		4,171
179	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	11,265		11,265
180	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	45,922		45,922
181	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	8,435		8,435
182	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	75,088		75,088
183	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	20,229		20,229
184	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,756		1,756
185	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	19,843		19,843
186	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	11,477		11,477
187	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	118,818		118,818
188	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	27,342		27,342
189	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	28,717		28,717
190	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	89,157		89,157
191	0205658N	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	3,450		3,450
192	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	86,435		86,435
193	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	219,054		219,054
194	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	181,693		181,693
195	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	58,393		58,393
196	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	22,966		22,966

197	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,107		21,107
198	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,857		2,857
199	0208058N	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	1,932		1,932
204	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	188,482		188,482
205	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	16,749		16,749
206	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	26,307		26,307
207	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	500		500
208	0303238N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)—MIP	0		0
210	0305149N	COBRA JUDY	17,091		17,091
211	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	810		810
212	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	8,617		8,617
213	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	9,066		9,066
214	0305206N	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	0		0
215	0305207N	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	30,654		30,654
216	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	25,917		25,917
217	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	14,676		14,676
218	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	657,483		657,483
219	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	99,600		99,600
220	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	495		495
221	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	863		863
222	0305234M	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	0		0
223	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	9,734		9,734
224	0305237N	MEDIUM RANGE MARITIME UAS	0		0
225	0305239M	RQ–21A	22,343		22,343
226	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	5,908		5,908
227	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	27,391		27,391
228	0702239N	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	0		0
229	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	54,879		54,879
230	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	5,000		5,000
230A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,151,159		1,151,159
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,975,546**	**0**	**3,975,546**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
230B		PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS		–8,832	–8,832
		Medium range maritime UAS cancellation		[–8,832]	
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**16,882,877**	**–8,832**	**16,874,045**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	361,787		361,787
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	141,153		141,153
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,094		13,094
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**516,034**	**0**	**516,034**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	114,166		114,166
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	120,719		120,719
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	89,319		89,319
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	232,547		232,547
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	127,637		127,637
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	98,375		98,375
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	77,175		77,175
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	106,196		106,196
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	104,362		104,362
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	38,557		38,557
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,109,053**	**0**	**1,109,053**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	47,890		47,890

015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	6,565		6,565
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	37,657		37,657
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	81,376		81,376
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	151,152		151,152
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	32,941		32,941
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	64,557		64,557
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	29,256		29,256
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	21,523		21,523
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	36,352		36,352
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,004		19,004
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	37,045		37,045
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	31,419		31,419
027	0603924F	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**596,737**	**0**	**596,737**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
028	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,866		3,866
029	0603287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,704		3,704
030	0603430F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	229,171	–1,500	227,671
		Excess funding		[–1,500]	
031	0603432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	120,676		120,676
032	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	25,144	–2,000	23,144
		Excess funding		[–2,000]	
033	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	32,243		32,243
034	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,507		4,507
035	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	652		652
036	0603830F	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	10,429		10,429
037	0603850F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE—DEM/VAL	19,938		19,938
038	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	71,181		71,181
039	0603854F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE)	12,027		12,027
040	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	2,054		2,054
041	0603860F	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	57,975		57,975

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
042	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	291,742		291,742
043	0604283F	BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	114,417		114,417
044	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,576		2,576
045	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	16,711		16,711
046	0604330F	JOINT DUAL ROLE AIR DOMINANCE MISSILE	0		0
047	0604337F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,343		16,343
048	0604422F	WEATHER SATELLITE FOLLOW-ON	2,000		2,000
049	0604436F	NEXT-GENERATION MILSATCOM TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	0		0
050	0604635F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	9,423		9,423
051	0604775F	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0		0
052	0604796F	ALTERNATIVE FUELS	0		0
053	0604830F	AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING	0		0
054	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	0	45,000	45,000
		Restore Operationally Responsive Space		[45,000]	
055	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	37,558	–3,000	34,558
		Excess funding		[–3,000]	
056	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	96,840		96,840
057	0305178F	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM (NPOESS)	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,181,177**	**38,500**	**1,219,677**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
058	0603840F	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	14,652		14,652
059	0604222F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	25,713		25,713
060	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	6,583		6,583
061	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,975		1,975
062	0604280F	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	2,594		2,594
063	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	24,534		24,534

064	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	51		51
065	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	143,000		143,000
066	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	28,797		28,797
067	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	267,252	–20,000	247,252
		Excess funding		[–20,000]	
068	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	4,118		4,118
069	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	448,594	–2,000	446,594
		Excess funding		[–2,000]	
070	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	9,951		9,951
071	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,567		2,567
072	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	13,059		13,059
073	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	9,720		9,720
074	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	9,222		9,222
075	0604740F	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	0		0
076	0604750F	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	803		803
077	0604800F	F–35—EMD	1,210,306		1,210,306
078	0604851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—EMD	135,437		135,437
079	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	7,980		7,980
080	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	2,004		2,004
081	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	73,512		73,512
082	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	140,100		140,100
083	0605221F	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	1,815,588	–87,130	1,728,458
		Excess prior year funds		[–87,130]	
084	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	123,210		123,210
085	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	19,039		19,039
086	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	281,056		281,056
087	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	80,200		80,200
088	0207100F	LIGHT ATTACK ARMED RECONNAISSANCE (LAAR) SQUADRONS	0		0
089	0207604F	READINESS TRAINING RANGES, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	310		310
090	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	14,861		14,861
091	0305230F	MC–12	19,949		19,949
092	0401138F	C–27J AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	0		0

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
093	0401318F	CV–22	28,027		28,027
094	0401845F	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	1,960		1,960
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**4,966,724**	**–109,130**	**4,857,594**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
095	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	22,812		22,812
096	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,236		42,236
097	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	25,579		25,579
098	0605502F	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	0		0
099	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	16,197		16,197
100	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	722,071		722,071
101	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	16,200		16,200
102	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	10,051	35,000	45,051
		Restore Space Test Program		[35,000]	
103	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	42,597		42,597
104	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,301		27,301
105	0606323F	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	13,964		13,964
106	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	203,766		203,766
107	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	42,430		42,430
108	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,294		1,294
109	0909980F	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	0		0
110	0909999F	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,851		3,851
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,190,349**	**35,000**	**1,225,349**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	371,595	–1,500	370,095

		Excess funding		[–1,500]	
113	0604263F	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	0		0
114	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	91,697		91,697
115	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	17,037		17,037
117	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	53,208		53,208
118	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	431		431
119	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	16,265		16,265
120	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	35,970	–15,000	20,970
		Efficiencies		[–15,000]	
121	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	30,889		30,889
122	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	10		10
124	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	5,609		5,609
125	0102823F	STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	0		0
126	0203761F	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	15,098		15,098
127	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	147,971		147,971
128	0207040F	MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT	49,848		49,848
129	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS	13,538		13,538
130	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	190,257		190,257
131	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	192,677		192,677
132	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	13,683		13,683
133	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	371,667		371,667
134	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	8,117		8,117
135	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	8,234		8,234
136	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	87,041		87,041
137	0207170F	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	1,472		1,472
138	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	2,095		2,095
139	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	1,119		1,119
140	0207247F	AF TENCAP	63,853		63,853
141	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,063		1,063
142	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	12,094		12,094
143	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	187,984		187,984
144	0207277F	ISR INNOVATIONS	0		0

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
145	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	7,950		7,950
146	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	76,315		76,315
147	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	8,653		8,653
148	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	65,200		65,200
149	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,767		5,767
150	0207423F	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	0		0
152	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	5,756		5,756
153	0207438F	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	0		0
154	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	16,226		16,226
155	0207445F	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	0		0
156	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,633		1,633
157	0207449F	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	18,086		18,086
158	0207452F	DCAPES	15,690		15,690
159	0207581F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	24,241		24,241
160	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	22,654		22,654
161	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	15,501		15,501
162	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,699		5,699
163	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,425		4,425
164	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	69,377		69,377
165	0208021F	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	7,159		7,159
166	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	66,888		66,888
174	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,056		12,056
175	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	4,159		4,159
176	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	20,124		20,124
177	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	69,133		69,133
178	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	6,512		6,512
179	0303150F	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	4,316		4,316

180	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	107,237	107,237
182	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	129,106	129,106
185	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,461	4,461
186	0305103F	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,055	2,055
187	0305105F	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	285	285
188	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	33,773	33,773
189	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	29,048	29,048
190	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	43,187	43,187
191	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	50,496	50,496
194	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	354	354
195	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	4,000	4,000
196	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	342	342
198	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	29,621	29,621
199	0305165F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	14,335	14,335
201	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,680	3,680
202	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,430	2,430
203	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	8,760	8,760
204	0305193F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	0	0
205	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	23,644	23,644
206	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	21,000	21,000
207	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	96,735	96,735
208	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,316	13,316
209	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	63,501	63,501
210	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	9,122	9,122
211	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	236,265	236,265
212	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	7,367	7,367
213	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	38,094	38,094
214	0305238F	NATO AGS	210,109	210,109
215	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	24,500	24,500
216	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	318,992	318,992
217	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	54,645	54,645
218	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	4,007	4,007

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
219	0305887F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	13,357		13,357
220	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	64,965		64,965
221	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	19,586		19,586
222	0307141F	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT	0		0
223	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,175		1,175
224	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	5,000		5,000
225	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	35,115		35,115
226	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	99,225		99,225
227	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	30,652		30,652
228	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	7,758		7,758
229	0401139F	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT (LIMA)	100		100
230	0401218F	KC–135S	0		0
231	0401219F	KC–10S	24,022		24,022
232	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	7,471		7,471
233	0401315F	C-STOL AIRCRAFT	0		0
234	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	4,984		4,984
235	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,588		1,588
236	0708012F	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	577		577
237	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	119,327		119,327
238	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,873		15,873
239	0801711F	RECRUITING ACTIVITIES	0		0
240	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	349		349
241	0804757F	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	0		0
242	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	117		117
243	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	2,018		2,018
244	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,561		1,561
245	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	7,634		7,634

246	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,175		1,175
247	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	3,491		3,491
248	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	100,160		100,160
249	0902998F	MANAGEMENT HQ—ADP SUPPORT (AF)	0		0
249A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,172,183	–22,600	11,149,583
		Classified reduction		[–4,600]	
		Classified reduction		[–18,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**15,867,972**	**–39,100**	**15,828,872**
249B		PRIOR YEAR SAVINGS		–78,426	–78,426
		C–130 AMP cancellation		[–6,509]	
		MALD II Cancellation		[–7,917]	
		Global Hawk Block 30 cancellation		[–64,000]	
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**25,428,046**	**–153,156**	**25,274,890**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	45,071		45,071
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	309,051		309,051
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	19,405		19,405
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	39,676		39,676
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	87,979		87,979
006	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	50,566		50,566
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**551,748**	**0**	**551,748**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
007	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,615		20,615
008	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	110,900		110,900
009	0602228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	0		0
010	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	36,826		36,826
011	0602250D8Z	SYSTEMS 2020 APPLIED RESEARCH	7,898		7,898

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
012	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	392,421		392,421
013	0602304E	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	30,424		30,424
014	0602305E	MACHINE INTELLIGENCE	0		0
015	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	19,236		19,236
016	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	223,269		223,269
017	0602663D8Z	DATA TO DECISIONS APPLIED RESEARCH	13,753		13,753
018	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	18,985		18,985
019	0602670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH	6,771		6,771
020	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	233,209		233,209
021	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	166,067		166,067
022	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	222,416		222,416
023	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	172,352		172,352
024	1160401BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	28,739		28,739
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,703,881**	**0**	**1,703,881**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)			
025	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,612		25,612
026	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	26,324		26,324
027	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	77,144	–11,300	65,844
		Reduction due to duplication of effort		[–11,300]	
028	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	275,022		275,022
029	0603175C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	79,975		79,975
030	0603200D8Z	JOINT ADVANCED CONCEPTS	0		0
031	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	20,032		20,032
032	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	3,892		3,892
033	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	36,685		36,685
034	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	174,316		174,316

035	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	159,704		159,704
036	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	234,280		234,280
037	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,983		6,983
038	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	158,263		158,263
039	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	25,393		25,393
040	0603663D8Z	DATA TO DECISIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,754		13,754
041	0603665D8Z	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	0		0
042	0603668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	19,935		19,935
043	0603670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,235		8,235
044	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	21,966	30,000	51,966
		Industrial Base Innovation Fund		[30,000]	
045	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,662		24,662
046	0603711D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	0		0
047	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	24,605		24,605
048	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	30,678		30,678
049	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	65,282		65,282
050	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	72,234	–3,000	69,234
		DMEA upgrade reduction		[–3,000]	
051	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	8,403		8,403
052	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	111,008		111,008
053	0603755D8Z	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	0		0
054	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	237,859		237,859
055	0603765E	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	3,000		3,000
056	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	236,883		236,883
057	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	299,438		299,438
058	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,195		12,195
059	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	30,036		30,036
060	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	107,002		107,002
061	0603828D8Z	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	0		0
062	0603828J	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	21,230		21,230
063	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	47,433		47,433
064	0603901C	DIRECTED ENERGY RESEARCH	46,944		46,944

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
065	0603902C	NEXT GENERATION AEGIS MISSILE	224,077		224,077
066	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	92,602		92,602
067	0603942D8Z	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	0		0
068	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	26,244		26,244
069	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	53,946		53,946
070	1160402BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	45,317		45,317
071	1160422BB	AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	861		861
072	1160472BB	SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,959		4,959
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)	**3,194,413**	**15,700**	**3,210,113**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**3,194,413**	**15,700**	**3,210,113**
073	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	33,234		33,234
074	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	21,023		21,023
075	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	94,624		94,624
076	0603709D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	0		0
077	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	16,958	2,000	18,958
		Reverse cuts to testing		[2,000]	
078	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	75,941		75,941
079	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	316,929		316,929
080	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	903,172		903,172
081	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	179,023		179,023
082	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	347,012		347,012
083	0603888C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	0		0
084	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	362,711		362,711
085	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	272,387		272,387
086	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	992,407		992,407
087	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	51,313		51,313

088	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,912		6,912
089	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION.	366,552		366,552
090	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	55,550		55,550
091	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	63,043		63,043
092	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	11,371		11,371
093	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	9,730		9,730
094	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	99,836	310,000	409,836
		Arrow Weapon System improvements		[20,000]	
		Arrow–3 interceptor		[20,000]	
		David's Sling short-range BMD		[60,000]	
		Iron Dome short-range rocket defense		[210,000]	
095	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	454,400		454,400
096	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	435,747		435,747
097	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	13,231		13,231
098	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	11,398		11,398
099	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,283	20,800	24,083
		Increase for requirements shortfall		[20,800]	
100	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	12,368		12,368
101	0604670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	5,131		5,131
102	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0	200,000	200,000
		Rapid Innovation Program		[200,000]	
103	0604787D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	0		0
104	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	3,273		3,273
105	0604828D8Z	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	0		0
106	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,364		7,364
107	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	276,338		276,338
108	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	420,630		420,630
109	0604883C	PRECISION TRACKING SPACE SENSOR RDT&E	297,375		297,375
110	0604884C	AIRBORNE INFRARED (ABIR)	0		0
111	0604886C	ADVANCED REMOTE SENSOR TECHNOLOGY (ARST)	58,742		58,742
112	0605017D8Z	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST	0		0

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
113	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,158		3,158
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**6,282,166**	**532,800**	**6,814,966**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)			
114	0604051D8Z	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)	0		0
115	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	6,817		6,817
116	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	110,383		110,383
117	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	311,071		311,071
118	0604709D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM—EMD	0		0
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	25,787		25,787
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	20,688		20,688
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	5,749		5,749
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,699		12,699
123	0605018BTA	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (DIMHRS)	0		0
124	0605020BTA	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES	0		0
125	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	387		387
126	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	1,859		1,859
127	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	7,010		7,010
128	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	133,104		133,104
129	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	25,269		25,269
130	0605140D8Z	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	0		0
131	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	10,238		10,238
132	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,670		19,670
133	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	3,556		3,556
134	0807708D8Z	WOUNDED ILL AND INJURED SENIOR OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (WII-SOC) STAFF OFFICE	0		0
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)	**694,287**	**0**	**694,287**

		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	6,383		6,383
136	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,845		3,845
137	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	144,109		144,109
138	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,419		2,419
139	0604943D8Z	THERMAL VICAR	8,214		8,214
140	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	19,380		19,380
141	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	32,266		32,266
142	0605110D8Z	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	840		840
143	0605117D8Z	FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	56,012		56,012
144	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	55,508		55,508
145	0605128D8Z	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	0		0
146	0605130D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	18,174		18,174
147	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	43,195		43,195
148	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	6,457		6,457
149	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,901		4,901
150	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	6,307		6,307
151	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,601		6,601
152	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	92,849		92,849
153	0605502BR	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	0		0
154	0605502C	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH—MDA	0		0
155	0605502D8W	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
156	0605502D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
157	0605502E	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
158	0605502S	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	0		0
159	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (S	1,857		1,857
160	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	12,056		12,056
161	0605799D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES	0		0
162	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	55,454		55,454
163	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	16,364		16,364
164	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,110	5,000	20,110
		DT&E increase		[5,000]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
165	0605897E	DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION	0		0
166	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	69,767		69,767
167	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,454		4,454
168	0606301D8Z	AVIATION SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES	0		0
169	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	2,637		2,637
170	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	0		0
173	0303166D8Z	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	0		0
174	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	8,238		8,238
175	0303169D8Z	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	0		0
176	0305103E	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,801		1,801
177	0305193D8Z	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	16,041		16,041
179	0305400D8Z	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	0		0
180	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	77,475		77,475
181	0901585C	PENTAGON RESERVATION	0		0
182	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	34,855		34,855
183	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	104		104
184	0909999D8Z	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
184A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	64,255		64,255
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**887,928**	**5,000**	**892,928**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
185	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	8,866		8,866
186	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MGMT	3,238		3,238
187	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	288		288
188	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	14,745		14,745
189	0607828D8Z	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	0		0
190	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	5,013		5,013

191	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,922		3,922
192	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	72,574		72,574
194	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	6,214		6,214
201	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	499		499
202	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	14,498		14,498
203	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	26,164		26,164
204	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,931		12,931
205	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	6,296		6,296
206	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	30,948		30,948
207	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,780		11,780
208	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	191,452		191,452
209	0303140K	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	0		0
210	0303149J	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	0		0
211	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	36,575		36,575
212	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	24,278		24,278
213	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	2,924		2,924
214	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	1,294		1,294
215	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	6,050		6,050
217	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	17,058		17,058
220	0305103D8Z	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	0		0
222	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	4,189		4,189
223	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	10,462		10,462
227	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	6,360		6,360
229	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	21,190		21,190
232	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	7,114	600	7,714
		USSOCOM UFR		[600]	
235	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,247		3,247
237	0305219BB	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	1,355		1,355
239	0305231BB	MQ–8 UAV	0		0
240	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,303		2,303
241	0305600D8Z	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES	1,478		1,478
249	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	27,044		27,044

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
250	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	4,711		4,711
251	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	4,100		4,100
252	1001018D8Z	NATO AGS	0		0
253	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	3,002		3,002
254	1105232BB	RQ–11 UAV	0		0
255	1105233BB	RQ–7 UAV	0		0
256	1160279BB	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG	0		0
257	1160403BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	97,267		97,267
258	1160404BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	821		821
259	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	25,935		25,935
260	1160408BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	51,700		51,700
261	1160421BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV–22 DEVELOPMENT	1,822		1,822
262	1160427BB	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	10,131		10,131
263	1160429BB	AC/MC–130J	19,647		19,647
264	1160474BB	SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS	2,225		2,225
265	1160476BB	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	3,036		3,036
266	1160477BB	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	1,511		1,511
267	1160478BB	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	4,263		4,263
268	1160479BB	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	4,448		4,448
269	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	11,325		11,325
270	1160481BB	SOF MUNITIONS	1,515		1,515
271	1160482BB	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	24,430		24,430
272	1160483BB	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	26,405	8,000	34,405
		Transfer from PDW Line 64 at USSOCOM request		[8,000]	
273	1160484BB	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	8,573		8,573
274	1160488BB	SOF MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	0		0
275	1160489BB	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	7,620		7,620

276	1160490BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,386		16,386
276A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,754,516		3,754,516
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**4,667,738**	**8,600**	**4,676,338**
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
		UNDISTRIBUTED		**–100,000**	**–100,000**
		DARPA undistributed reduction		[–75,000]	
		DARPA classified programs reduction		[–25,000]	
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**17,982,161**	**462,100**	**18,444,261**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	72,501	4,000	76,501
		NCR transition		[4,000]	
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	49,201		49,201
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	63,566		63,566
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**185,268**	**4,000**	**189,268**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL	**69,407,767**	**–121,549**	**69,286,218**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	19,860		19,860
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**19,860**	**0**	**19,860**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**19,860**	**0**	**19,860**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
056	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	4,600		4,600
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,600**	**0**	**4,600**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
131	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,173		2,173
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**2,173**	**0**	**2,173**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
160	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	5,200		5,200
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**5,200**	**0**	**5,200**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
195	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	6,762		6,762
221	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	7,600		7,600
230A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	33,784		33,784
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**48,146**	**0**	**48,146**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**60,119**	**0**	**60,119**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
249A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	53,150		53,150
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**53,150**	**0**	**53,150**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**53,150**	**0**	**53,150**

		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
239	0305231BB	MQ–8 UAV	5,000		5,000
276A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	107,387		107,387
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**112,387**	**0**	**112,387**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**112,387**	**0**	**112,387**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL	**245,516**	**0**	**245,516**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,223,087		1,223,087
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	80,574		80,574
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	723,039		723,039
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	706,974		706,974
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,226,650		1,226,650
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,319,832		1,319,832
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,447,174		3,447,174
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	454,774		454,774
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,762,757		1,762,757
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,401,613		7,401,613
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	3,041,074		3,041,074
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	410,171		410,171
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	177,819		177,819
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	0		0
160	RESET	0		0
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	461,333		461,333
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**22,436,871**	**0**	**22,436,871**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	MOBILIZATION			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	405,496		405,496
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	195,349		195,349
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,379		6,379
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**607,224**	**0**	**607,224**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	112,866		112,866
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	73,265		73,265
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	51,227		51,227
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	443,306		443,306
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,099,556		1,099,556
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,130,627		1,130,627
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	191,683		191,683
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	652,095		652,095
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	507,510		507,510
300	EXAMINING	156,964		156,964
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	244,343		244,343
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	212,477		212,477
330	JUNIOR ROTC	182,691		182,691
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**5,058,610**	**0**	**5,058,610**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	601,331		601,331
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	741,324		741,324
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	610,136		610,136

380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	478,707		478,707
390	ADMINISTRATION	556,307	–17,200	539,107
	GFEBS realignment per Army request		[–17,200]	
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,547,925		1,547,925
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	362,205		362,205
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	220,754		220,754
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,153,556	–8,100	1,145,456
	Decrease for ahead of need request		[–8,100]	
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	250,970		250,970
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	222,351		222,351
460	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	222,379		222,379
470	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	459,710		459,710
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	25,637		25,637
490	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,052,595		1,052,595
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**8,505,887**	**–25,300**	**8,480,587**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	UNDISTRIBUTED		**–120,000**	**–120,000**
	Unobligated balances		[–120,000]	
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**36,608,592**	**–145,300**	**36,463,292**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,918,144		4,918,144
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,886,825		1,886,825
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	44,032		44,032
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	101,565		101,565
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	374,827		374,827
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	960,802		960,802
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	37,545		37,545
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	328,805		328,805

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	4,686,535		4,686,535
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	769,204		769,204
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,089,981		5,089,981
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,315,366		1,315,366
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	619,909		619,909
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	92,364		92,364
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	174,437		174,437
160	WARFARE TACTICS	441,035		441,035
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	333,554		333,554
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	910,087		910,087
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	167,158		167,158
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	4,183		4,183
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	95,528		95,528
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	204,569		204,569
230	CRUISE MISSILE	111,884		111,884
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,181,038		1,181,038
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	87,606		87,606
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	519,583		519,583
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	300,435		300,435
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	1,077,924		1,077,924
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	2,101,279		2,101,279
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,822,093		4,822,093
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**33,758,297**	**0**	**33,758,297**
	MOBILIZATION			
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	334,659		334,659
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,562		6,562

330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	1,066,329		1,066,329
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	83,901		83,901
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,695		2,695
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	23,502		23,502
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**1,517,648**	**0**	**1,517,648**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	147,807		147,807
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,473		10,473
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	139,220		139,220
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	582,177		582,177
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	5,456		5,456
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	170,746		170,746
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	153,403		153,403
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	241,329		241,329
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	108,226		108,226
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	105,776		105,776
470	JUNIOR ROTC	51,817		51,817
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,716,430**	**0**	**1,716,430**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	797,177		797,177
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	12,872		12,872
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,181		120,181
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	235,753		235,753
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	263,060		263,060
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	363,213		363,213
540	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	182,343		182,343
560	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0		0
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	282,464		282,464
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,092,123		1,092,123

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	53,560		53,560
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,299		25,299
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	64,418		64,418
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	580,042		580,042
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,984		4,984
690	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
700	JUDGEMENT FUND	0		0
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	537,079		537,079
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**4,614,568**	**0**	**4,614,568**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	UNDISTRIBUTED		**–23,000**	**–23,000**
	Unobligated balances		[–23,000]	
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**41,606,943**	**–23,000**	**41,583,943**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	788,055		788,055
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	762,614		762,614
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	168,447		168,447
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	100,374		100,374
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	825,039		825,039
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,188,883		2,188,883
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**4,833,412**	**0**	**4,833,412**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			

070	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,251		18,251
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	869		869
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	80,914		80,914
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	42,744		42,744
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	292,150		292,150
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	168,609		168,609
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	56,865		56,865
140	JUNIOR ROTC	19,912		19,912
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**680,314**	**0**	**680,314**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	39,962		39,962
170	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	83,404		83,404
180	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT	0		0
190	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	346,071		346,071
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**469,437**	**0**	**469,437**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**5,983,163**	**0**	**5,983,163**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,973,141		2,973,141
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,611,032		1,611,032
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,472,806		1,472,806
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,545,470		5,545,470
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,353,987		1,353,987
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,595,032		2,595,032
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	957,040		957,040
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	916,200		916,200
090	JCS EXERCISES	0		0
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	733,716		733,716
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	314,490		314,490

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	488,762		488,762
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	862,979		862,979
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	222,429		222,429
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**20,047,084**	**0**	**20,047,084**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,785,379		1,785,379
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	154,049		154,049
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,477,396		1,477,396
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	309,699		309,699
190	BASE SUPPORT	707,574		707,574
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**4,434,097**	**0**	**4,434,097**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	115,427		115,427
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	17,619		17,619
220	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	92,949		92,949
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	336,433		336,433
240	BASE SUPPORT	842,441		842,441
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	482,634		482,634
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	750,609		750,609
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	235,114		235,114
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	101,231		101,231
290	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	233,330		233,330
300	JUDGEMENT FUND	0		0
310	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	130,217		130,217
320	EXAMINING	2,738		2,738

330	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	155,170		155,170
340	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	175,147		175,147
350	JUNIOR ROTC	74,809		74,809
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,745,868**	**0**	**3,745,868**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
360	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,029,734		1,029,734
370	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	913,843		913,843
390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	303,610		303,610
400	BASE SUPPORT	1,266,800		1,266,800
410	ADMINISTRATION	587,654		587,654
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	667,910		667,910
430	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,094,509		1,094,509
440	CIVIL AIR PATROL	23,904		23,904
450	JUDGEMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	0		0
470	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	81,307		81,307
480	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,239,040		1,239,040
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**7,208,311**	**0**	**7,208,311**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	UNDISTRIBUTED		**–32,000**	**–32,000**
	Unobligated balances		[–32,000]	
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**35,435,360**	**–32,000**	**35,403,360**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	485,708		485,708
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	0	5,107,501	5,107,501
	Transfer from Line 025		[5,091,001]	
	USSOCOM UFR		[16,500]	
025	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	5,091,001	–5,091,001	0

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	Transfer to Line 020		[–5,091,001]	
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**5,576,709**	**16,500**	**5,593,209**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	147,210		147,210
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	84,999		84,999
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**232,209**	**0**	**232,209**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	161,294		161,294
070	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	0		0
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	573,973		573,973
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,293,196		1,293,196
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	17,513		17,513
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	676,186		676,186
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,346,847		1,346,847
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	35,137		35,137
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	431,893		431,893
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	224,013		224,013
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,964		21,964
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	557,917	–17,600	540,317
	Program decrease—Defense Security Assessment		[–2,600]	
	Program decrease—Global Train and Equip		[–15,000]	
190	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE		506,662	506,662
	Transfer from Line 280		[506,662]	
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	35,319		35,319
210	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY		443,382	443,382

	Transfer from Line 280		[443,382]	
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,744,971		2,744,971
230	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	259,975		259,975
250	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	253,437	–139,400	114,037
	Decrease for ahead of need request		[–139,400]	
260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,095,362		2,095,362
270	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	521,297		521,297
280	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,933,801	–775,044	14,158,757
	Transfer to Line 190		[–506,662]	
	Transfer to Line 210		[–443,382]	
	Commercial imagery service level agreement		[125,000]	
	Additional ISR Support to Operation Observant Compass		[50,000]	
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**26,184,095**	**–157,000**	**26,202,095**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	UNDISTRIBUTED		**5,000**	**5,000**
	Unobligated balances		[–25,000]	
	Impact aid for schools with military dependent students		[25,000]	
	Impact aid for children with severe disabilities		[5,000]	
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**31,993,013**	**39,500**	**32,032,513**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,391		1,391
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	20,889		20,889
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	592,724		592,724
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	114,983		114,983
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	633,091		633,091
060	AVIATION ASSETS	76,823		76,823
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	481,997		481,997
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	70,118		70,118

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	141,205		141,205
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	561,878		561,878
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	287,399		287,399
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	52,431		52,431
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**3,034,929**	**0**	**3,034,929**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
140	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	12,995		12,995
150	ADMINISTRATION	32,432		32,432
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	4,895		4,895
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	16,074		16,074
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	60,683		60,683
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**127,079**	**0**	**127,079**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**3,162,008**	**0**	**3,162,008**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	616,776		616,776
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	15,076		15,076
030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	1,479		1,479
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	107,251		107,251
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	355		355
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	82,186		82,186
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	589		589
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	48,593		48,593
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,274		15,274

100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	124,917		124,917
110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,978		1,978
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	43,699		43,699
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	60,646		60,646
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	105,227		105,227
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**1,224,046**	**0**	**1,224,046**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	3,117		3,117
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	14,337		14,337
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,392		2,392
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,090		3,090
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**22,936**	**0**	**22,936**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**1,246,982**	**0**	**1,246,982**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	89,690		89,690
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,735		16,735
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	37,913		37,913
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	103,746		103,746
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**248,084**	**0**	**248,084**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	873		873
060	ADMINISTRATION	14,330		14,330
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,998		8,998
080	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT	0		0
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**24,201**	**0**	**24,201**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**272,285**	**0**	**272,285**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,089,326		2,089,326
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	112,992		112,992
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	406,101		406,101
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	71,564		71,564
050	BASE SUPPORT	364,862		364,862
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**3,044,845**	**0**	**3,044,845**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	78,824		78,824
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	16,020		16,020
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	19,496		19,496
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,489		6,489
100	AUDIOVISUAL	808		808
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**121,637**	**0**	**121,637**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**3,166,482**	**0**	**3,166,482**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	680,206		680,206
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	186,408		186,408
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	865,628		865,628
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	112,651		112,651
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	36,091		36,091
060	AVIATION ASSETS	907,011		907,011
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	751,606		751,606
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	60,043		60,043

090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	411,940		411,940
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	995,423		995,423
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	688,189		688,189
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	953,716		953,716
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**6,648,912**	**0**	**6,648,912**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	11,806		11,806
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,656		1,656
150	ADMINISTRATION	89,358		89,358
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	39,513		39,513
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,224		7,224
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	310,143		310,143
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**459,700**	**0**	**459,700**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**7,108,612**	**0**	**7,108,612**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,559,824		3,559,824
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	721,225		721,225
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	774,875		774,875
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	270,709		270,709
050	BASE SUPPORT	624,443		624,443
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**5,951,076**	**0**	**5,951,076**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	32,358		32,358
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	32,021		32,021
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**64,379**	**0**	**64,379**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,015,455**	**0**	**6,015,455**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,516		13,516
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	274,198		274,198
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	108,759		108,759
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	519,111		519,111
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	335,921		335,921
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	310,594		310,594
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	529,263		529,263
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	11,133		11,133
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	237,543		237,543
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,340,038**	**0**	**2,340,038**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**174,938,933**	**–160,800**	**174,778,133**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	2,758,162		2,758,162
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	991,396		991,396
060	AVIATION ASSETS	40,300		40,300
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,755,445		1,755,445

080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	307,244		307,244
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	393,165		393,165
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	250,000		250,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	12,524,137		12,524,137
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	400,000	–200,000	200,000
	Program decrease		[–200,000]	
160	RESET	3,687,973		3,687,973
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**23,107,822**	**–200,000**	**22,907,822**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	3,238,310		3,238,310
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	129,000		129,000
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	78,022		78,022
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	137,277	–40,000	97,277
	Transfer to OPA OCO Line 061 at SOUTHCOM request		[–40,000]	
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	72,293		72,293
490	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,828,717		1,828,717
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,483,619**	**–40,000**	**5,443,619**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**28,591,441**	**–240,000**	**28,351,441**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	937,098		937,098
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	1,000		1,000
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	15,794		15,794
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	19,013		19,013
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	201,912		201,912
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,000		3,000
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	44,150		44,150
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	463,738		463,738
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	24,774		24,774
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,310,010		1,310,010

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	42,965		42,965
160	WARFARE TACTICS	25,970		25,970
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	19,226		19,226
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,668,359		1,668,359
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	7,954		7,954
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	94,655		94,655
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	303,087		303,087
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	3,218		3,218
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	143,442		143,442
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**5,329,365**	**0**	**5,329,365**
	MOBILIZATION			
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	31,395		31,395
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	254,461		254,461
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**285,856**	**0**	**285,856**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	50,903		50,903
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**50,903**	**0**	**50,903**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	1,377		1,377
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	487		487
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	6,022		6,022
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	3,514		3,514
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	184,864		184,864
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	2,026		2,026

620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,425		1,425
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,556		14,556
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**214,271**	**0**	**214,271**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**5,880,395**	**0**	**5,880,395**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	1,921,258		1,921,258
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	1,094,028		1,094,028
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	222,824		222,824
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	88,690		88,690
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**3,326,800**	**0**	**3,326,800**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	215,212		215,212
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**215,212**	**0**	**215,212**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	512,627		512,627
190	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,701		11,701
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**524,328**	**0**	**524,328**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**4,066,340**	**0**	**4,066,340**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,494,144		1,494,144
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	809,531		809,531
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	13,095		13,095
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,403,238		1,403,238
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	155,954		155,954
060	BASE SUPPORT	342,226		342,226
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	15,108		15,108

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	271,390		271,390
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	25,400		25,400
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,110		5,110
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	52,173		52,173
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**4,587,369**	**0**	**4,587,369**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,187,211		3,187,211
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	43,509		43,509
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	554,943		554,943
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	4,431		4,431
190	BASE SUPPORT	9,256		9,256
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**3,799,350**	**0**	**3,799,350**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	424		424
240	BASE SUPPORT	1,036		1,036
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	10,923		10,923
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	72		72
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	323		323
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	352		352
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**13,130**	**0**	**13,130**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
360	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	100,429		100,429
390	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	47,200		47,200
400	BASE SUPPORT	7,242		7,242

410	ADMINISTRATION	1,552		1,552
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	82,094		82,094
430	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	582,977		582,977
480	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	20,270		20,270
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**841,764**	**0**	**841,764**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**9,241,613**	**0**	**9,241,613**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	2,000		2,000
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,503,060		2,503,060
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**2,505,060**	**0**	**2,505,060**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	30,674		30,674
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	69,803		69,803
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	3,334		3,334
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	152,925		152,925
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	102,322		102,322
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	10,823		10,823
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	2,200,000		2,200,000
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	139,830		139,830
260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	87,805		87,805
280	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,522,003		2,522,003
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**5,319,519**	**0**	**5,319,519**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**7,824,579**	**0**	**7,824,579**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	78,600		78,600
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,811		20,811
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,726		20,726

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	34,400		34,400
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**154,537**	**0**	**154,537**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**154,537**	**0**	**154,537**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	24,834		24,834
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	300		300
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,364		13,364
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	8,213		8,213
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	929		929
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	8,244		8,244
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	40		40
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**55,924**	**0**	**55,924**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**55,924**	**0**	**55,924**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	22,657		22,657
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,820		2,820
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**25,477**	**0**	**25,477**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**25,477**	**0**	**25,477**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			

010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	7,600		7,600
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	106,768		106,768
050	BASE SUPPORT	6,250		6,250
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**120,618**	**0**	**120,618**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**120,618**	**0**	**120,618**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	38,485		38,485
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	1,959		1,959
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	20,076		20,076
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	2,028		2,028
060	AVIATION ASSETS	183,811		183,811
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	43,780		43,780
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	70,237		70,237
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	20,072		20,072
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**380,448**	**0**	**380,448**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,000		2,000
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**2,000**	**0**	**2,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**382,448**	**0**	**382,448**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	19,975		19,975
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**19,975**	**0**	**19,975**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**19,975**	**0**	**19,975**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
010	SUSTAINMENT	2,523,825		2,523,825

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
020	INFRASTRUCTURE	190,000		190,000
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	241,521		241,521
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	758,380		758,380
	SUBTOTAL, MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**3,713,726**	**0**	**3,713,726**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
050	SUSTAINMENT	1,305,950		1,305,950
060	INFRASTRUCTURE	50,000		50,000
070	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	84,859		84,859
080	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	569,868		569,868
	SUBTOTAL, MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**2,010,677**	**0**	**2,010,677**
	RELATED ACTIVITIES			
090	SUSTAINMENT	18,325		18,325
100	INFRASTRUCTUE	1,200		1,200
110	EQUIPMENT & TRANSPORTATION	1,239		1,239
120	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	4,000		4,000
	SUBTOTAL, RELATED ACTIVITIES	**24,764**	**0**	**24,764**
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**5,749,167**	**0**	**5,749,167**
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
010	POWER	400,000	–50,000	350,000
	Program decrease		[–50,000]	
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND	**400,000**	**–50,000**	**350,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**62,512,514**	**–290,000**	**62,222,514**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	135,111,799	6,000	135,117,799
BAH for Full-time Guard Transition to Active Duty		[6,000]	
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	**135,111,799**	**6,000**	**135,117,799**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	14,060,094		14,060,094
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	**14,060,094**	**0**	**14,060,094**

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
010	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	60,037		60,037
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**60,037**	**0**	**60,037**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
010	C–17 CLS ENGINE REPAIR	0		0
020	TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES	0		0
040	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL)	45,452		45,452
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**45,452**	**0**	**45,452**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
010	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	39,135		39,135
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**39,135**	**0**	**39,135**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
010	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,371,560		1,371,560
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,371,560**	**0**	**1,371,560**
	NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
010	T–AKE	0		0

020	MPF MLP	38,000		38,000
030	POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	39,386		39,386
040	NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL	0		0
050	LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	128,819		128,819
060	DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	26,598		26,598
070	TAH MAINTENANCE	29,199		29,199
080	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	42,811		42,811
090	READY RESERVE FORCE	303,323		303,323
100	MARAD SHIP FINANCING GUARANTEE PROGRAM	0		0
	TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**608,136**	**0**	**608,136**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
	DHP, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	8,625,507		8,625,507
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	16,148,263		16,148,263
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,309,185		2,309,185
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,465,328		1,465,328
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	332,121		332,121
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	722,081		722,081
070	BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,746,794		1,746,794
070A	UNDISTRIBUTED		452,000	452,000
	Restore DOD assumed Savings for TRICARE Proposals		[452,000]	
	SUBTOTAL, DHP, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**31,349,279**	**452,000**	**31,801,279**
	DHP, RDT&E			
080	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	672,977		672,977
	SUBTOTAL, DHP, RDT&E	**672,977**	**0**	**672,977**
	DHP, PROCUREMENT			
090	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	506,462		506,462
	SUBTOTAL, DHP, PROCUREMENT			

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**32,528,718**	**452,000**	**32,980,718**
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
001	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	635,843		635,843
002	RDT&E	647,351		647,351
003	PROCUREMENT	18,592		18,592
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**1,301,786**	**0**	**1,301,786**
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
010	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	889,545	–25,900	863,645
	Transfer to Demand Reduction Program		[–25,900]	
020	DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	109,818	25,900	135,718
	Expanded drug testing		[25,900]	
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**999,363**	**0**	**999,363**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	272,821	59,100	331,921
	DoD IG growth plan		[59,100]	
020	RDT&E	0		0
030	PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**273,821**	**59,100**	**332,921**
	TOTAL, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**37,228,008**	**511,100**	**37,739,108**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
010	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	42,600		42,600
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**42,600**	**0**	**42,600**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
010	C–17 CLS ENGINE REPAIR	230,400		230,400
020	TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES	10,000		10,000
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**240,400**	**0**	**240,400**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
010	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	220,364		220,364
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**220,364**	**0**	**220,364**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
	DHP, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	483,326		483,326
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	376,982		376,982
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	111,675		111,675
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	4,773		4,773
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	660		660
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	15,370		15,370
070	BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,112		1,112
	SUBTOTAL, DHP, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**993,898**	**0**	**993,898**
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
010	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	469,025		469,025

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**469,025**	**0**	**469,025**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	10,766		10,766
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,766**	**0**	**10,766**
	TOTAL, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**1,977,053**	**0**	**1,977,053**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
ARMY Milcon						
ARMY	ALASKA	FORT WAINWRIGHT	Modified Record Fire Range	10,400		10,400
ARMY	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Modified Record Fire Range	7,900		7,900
ARMY	CALIFORNIA	CONCORD	Lightning Protection System	5,800		5,800
ARMY	CALIFORNIA	CONCORD	Engineering/Housing Maintenance Shop	3,100		3,100
ARMY	COLORADO	FORT CARSON, COLORADO	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	18,000		18,000
ARMY	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	FORT MCNAIR	Vehicle Storage Building, Installation	7,200		7,200
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT BENNING	Ground Source Heat Transfer System	16,000		16,000
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT GORDON	Modified Record Fire Range	4,000		4,000
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT GORDON	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	7,100		7,100
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT GORDON	Ground Source Heat Transfer System	12,200		12,200
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	Digital Multipurpose Training Range	22,000		22,000
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	Automated Combat Pistol Qual Crse	3,650		3,650
ARMY	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	24,000		24,000
ARMY	HAWAII	POHAKULOA TRAINING AREA	Automated Infantry Platoon Battle Course	29,000		29,000
ARMY	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	Barracks	41,000		41,000
ARMY	HAWAII	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS	Barracks	55,000		55,000
ARMY	HAWAII	Wheeler Army Air Field	Combat Aviation Brigade Barracks	85,000		85,000
ARMY	KANSAS	FORT RILEY, KANSAS	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	12,200		12,200

ARMY	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	Battalion Headquarters Complex	55,000		55,000
ARMY	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse	3,800		3,800
ARMY	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	23,000		23,000
ARMY	KENTUCKY	FORT KNOX	Automated Infantry Squad Battle Course	6,000		6,000
ARMY	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Trainee Barracks Complex 3, Ph 2	58,000		58,000
ARMY	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	39,000		39,000
ARMY	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Battalion Complex Facilities	26,000		26,000
ARMY	NEW JERSEY	PICATINNY ARSENAL	Ballistic Evaluation Center	10,200		10,200
ARMY	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	Flight Equipment Complex	47,000		47,000
ARMY	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM, NEW YORK	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	95,000		95,000
ARMY	NEW YORK	U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY	Cadet Barracks	192,000	–192,000	0
ARMY	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	Aerial Gunnery Range	42,000		42,000
ARMY	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	Infrastructure	30,000	–30,000	0
ARMY	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	26,000		26,000
ARMY	OKLAHOMA	FORT SILL	Modified Record Fire Range	4,900		4,900
ARMY	SOUTH CAROLINA	FORT JACKSON	Trainee Barracks Complex 2, Ph 2	24,000		24,000
ARMY	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	Aircraft Component Maintenance Shop	13,200		13,200
ARMY	TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	Aircraft Paint Shop	24,000		24,000
ARMY	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	7,200		7,200
ARMY	TEXAS	FORT HOOD, TEXAS	Modified Record Fire Range	4,200		4,200
ARMY	TEXAS	FORT HOOD, TEXAS	Training Aids Center	25,000		25,000
ARMY	TEXAS	FORT HOOD, TEXAS	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	22,000		22,000
ARMY	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Barracks	21,000		21,000
ARMY	VIRGINIA	ARLINGTON	Cemetery Expansion Millennium Site	84,000	–84,000	0
ARMY	VIRGINIA	FORT BELVOIR	Secure Admin/Operations Facility	94,000		94,000
ARMY	VIRGINIA	FORT LEE	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph2	81,000		81,000
ARMY	WASHINGTON	YAKIMA	Convoy Live Fire Range	5,100		5,100
ARMY	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis-McChord	Battalion Complex	73,000		73,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
ARMY	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis-McChord	Waste Water Treatment Plant	91,000		91,000
ARMY	ITALY	CAMP EDERLE	Barracks	36,000		36,000
ARMY	ITALY	VICENZA	Simulations Center	32,000		32,000
ARMY	JAPAN	OKINAWA	Satellite Communications Facility	78,000		78,000
ARMY	JAPAN	SAGAMI	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	18,000		18,000
ARMY	KOREA	CAMP HUMPHREYS	Battalion Headquarters Complex	45,000		45,000
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Minor Construction FY 13	25,000		25,000
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Host Nation Support FY 13	34,000		34,000
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design FY13	65,173	–19,000	46,173
Milcon, A—SUBTOTAL				**1,923,323**	**–325,000**	**1,598,323**
NAVY Milcon						
NAVY	ARIZONA	YUMA	Security Operations Complex	13,300		13,300
NAVY	ARIZONA	YUMA	Combat Aircraft Loading Apron	15,985		15,985
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA	Comm. Information Systems Ops Complex	78,897		78,897
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA	San Jacinto Road Extension	5,074		5,074
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CALIFORNIA	MV22 Aviation Simulator Building	4,139		4,139
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	VENTURA COUNTY	BAMS Maintenance Training Facility	14,843	–2,053	12,790
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	Hangar 5 Renovations & Addition	27,897		27,897
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	Entry Control Point (Gate Five)	11,752		11,752
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	LCS Training Facility	59,436		59,436

NAVY	CALIFORNIA	SEAL BEACH	Strategic Systems Weapons Eval. Test Lab	30,594	30,594
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA	Land Expansion Phase 2	47,270	47,270
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	Bachelor Quarters	76,063	76,063
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	H–60S Simulator Training Facility	2,478	2,478
NAVY	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	BAMS Mission Control Complex	21,980	21,980
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	MV–22 Hangar and Infrastructure	82,630	82,630
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	Aircraft Staging Area	14,680	14,680
NAVY	MISSISSIPPI	MERIDIAN	Dining Facility	10,926	10,926
NAVY	NEW JERSEY	EARLE	Combat System Engineering Building Addition	33,498	33,498
NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	Staff NCO Academy Facilities	28,986	28,986
NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	Base Access and Road—Phase 3	40,904	40,904
NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION	Marine Air Support Squadron Compound	34,310	34,310
NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	CHERRY POINT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION	Armory	11,581	11,581
NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	NEW RIVER	Personnel Administration Center	8,525	8,525
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	Ground Support Equipment Shop	9,465	9,465
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	Simulated LHD Flight Deck	12,887	12,887
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	Recycling/Hazardous Waste Facility	3,743	3,743
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	42,010	42,010
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFORT	Airfield Security Upgrades	13,675	13,675
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	PARRIS ISLAND	Front Gate ATFP Improvements	10,135	10,135
NAVY	VIRGINIA	DAHLGREN	Cruiser/Destroyer Upgrade Training Facility	16,494	16,494
NAVY	VIRGINIA	DAHLGREN	Physical Fitness Center	11,734	11,734
NAVY	VIRGINIA	OCEANA NAVAL AIR STATION	A School Barracks	39,086	39,086
NAVY	VIRGINIA	PORTSMOUTH	Drydock 8 Electrical Distribution Upgrade	32,706	32,706
NAVY	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	The Basic School Student Quarters—Phase 7	31,012	31,012
NAVY	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	Infrastructure—Widen Russell Road	14,826	14,826

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
NAVY	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	Weapons Training Battalion Mess Hall	12,876		12,876
NAVY	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	Regimental Headquarters	11,015		11,015
NAVY	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	18,422		18,422
NAVY	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	Motor Transportation Facility	6,188		6,188
NAVY	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	Supply Warehouse Facility	8,939		8,939
NAVY	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	Armory	4,259		4,259
NAVY	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	EA–18G Flight Simulator Facility	6,272		6,272
NAVY	WASHINGTON	KITSAP	Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (INC)	280,041	–25,800	254,241
NAVY	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	Transient Quarters	41,529		41,529
NAVY	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	Combined Dining Facility	9,819		9,819
NAVY	DIEGO GARCIA	DIEGO GARCIA	Communications Infrastructure	1,691		1,691
NAVY	GREECE	SOUDA BAY	Aircraft Parking Apron Expansion	20,493		20,493
NAVY	GREECE	SOUDA BAY	Intermodal Access Road	4,630		4,630
NAVY	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	North Ramp Parking (Andersen AFB)—INC 2	25,904	–25,904	0
NAVY	JAPAN	IWAKUNI	Maintenance Hangar Improvements	5,722		5,722
NAVY	JAPAN	IWAKUNI	Vertical Take-Off and Landing Pad North	7,416		7,416
NAVY	JAPAN	OKINAWA	Bachelor Quarters	8,206		8,206
NAVY	ROMANIA	Deveselu, Romania	AEGIS Ashore Missile Defense Complex	45,205		45,205
NAVY	SPAIN	ROTA	General Purpose Warehouse	3,378		3,378
NAVY	SPAIN	ROTA	High Explosive Magazine	13,837		13,837
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	BAMS Operational Facilities	34,048		34,048
NAVY	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	Containerized Living and Work Units	7,510		7,510
NAVY	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	Galley Addition and Warehouse	22,220		22,220
NAVY	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	Joint HQ/Joint Operations Center Facility	42,730		42,730
NAVY	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	Fitness Center	26,960		26,960

NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	16,535		16,535
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MCON Design Funds	102,619		102,619
Milcon, N—SUBTOTAL				**1,701,985**	**–53,757**	**1,648,228**
AF Milcon						
AF	ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK AFB	C–130J Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar	26,000		26,000
AF	ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK AFB	C–130J Flight Simulator Addition	4,178		4,178
AF	FLORIDA	TYNDALL AFB	F–22 ADAL Hangar for Low Observable/Composite	14,750		14,750
AF	GEORGIA	FORT STEWART, GEORGIA	Air Support Operations Center (ASOC)	7,250		7,250
AF	GEORGIA	MOODY AFB	HC–130J Simulator Facility	8,500		8,500
AF	NEBRASKA	OFFUTT AFB	US STRATCOM Replacement Facility, Incr 2	161,000	–33,000	128,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	MQ–9 Maintenance Hangar	25,000		25,000
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	MINOT AFB	B–52 Add/Alter Munitions AGE Facility	4,600		4,600
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Dormitory (144 RM)	18,000		18,000
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 ADAL Hangar 45W/AMU	7,250		7,250
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 Modular Storage Magazines	2,280		2,280
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 ADAL Building 118 for Flight Simulator	4,000		4,000
AF	GREENLAND	THULE AB	Dormitory (48 PN)	24,500		24,500
AF	ITALY	AVIANO AB	F–16 Mission Training Center	9,400		9,400
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Transient Contingency Dormitory—100 RM	17,625	–17,625	0
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Transient Aircraft Hangars	15,032	–15,032	0
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Sanitary Sewer Lift/Pump Station	2,000		2,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	18,200		18,200
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	18,635		18,635
Milcon, AF—SUBTOTAL				**388,200**	**–65,657**	**322,543**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
DEF-WIDE						
Milcon						
DEFW	BELGIUM	BRUSSELS	NATO Headquarters Facility	26,969		26,969
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000		150,000
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
DFAS	TEXAS	RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	DFAS Facility	16,715		16,715
DISA	ILLINOIS	SCOTT AFB	DISA Facility Upgrades	84,111		84,111
DISA	GERMANY	STUTTGART-PATCH BARRACKS	DISA Europe Facility Upgrades	2,413		2,413
DLA	ARIZONA	YUMA	Truck Unload Facility	1,300		1,300
DLA	CALIFORNIA	DEF FUEL SUPPORT POINT—SAN DIEGO	Replace Fuel Pier	91,563		91,563
DLA	CALIFORNIA	EDWARDS AIR FORCE BASE	Replace Fuel Storage	27,500		27,500
DLA	DELAWARE	DOVER AFB	Replace Truck Off-Load Facility	2,000		2,000
DLA	FLORIDA	HURLBURT FIELD	Construct Fuel Storage Facility	16,000		16,000
DLA	INDIANA	GRISSOM ARB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	26,800		26,800
DLA	LOUISIANA	BARKSDALE AFB	Upgrade Pumphouse	11,700		11,700
DLA	NORTH CAROLINA	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB	Replace Pipeline	1,850		1,850
DLA	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	Replace Sewage Treatment Plant	6,300		6,300
DLA	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	Replace Communications Building	6,800		6,800

DLA	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	Replace Reservoir	4,300		4,300
DLA	GUAM	ANDERSEN AFB	Upgrade Fuel Pipeline	67,500	–67,500	0
DLA	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY	Replace Truck Load Facility	2,600		2,600
DLA	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	GUANTANAMO BAY	Replace Fuel Pier	37,600		37,600
DODEA	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	Replace Barkley Elementary School	41,767		41,767
DODEA	GERMANY	VOGELWEH	Replace Vogelweh Elementary School	61,415		61,415
DODEA	GERMANY	WEISBADEN	Weisbaden High School Addition	52,178		52,178
DODEA	JAPAN	CAMP ZAMA	Renovate Zama High School	13,273		13,273
DODEA	JAPAN	KADENA AB	Replace Elementary School	71,772		71,772
DODEA	JAPAN	KADENA AB	Replace Stearley Heights Elementary School	71,773		71,773
DODEA	JAPAN	ZUKERAN	Replace Zukeran Elementary School	79,036		79,036
DODEA	JAPAN	SASEBO	Replace Sasebo Elementary School	35,733		35,733
DODEA	KOREA	OSAN AFB	Replace Osan Elementary School	42,692		42,692
DODEA	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF FELTWELL	Feltwell Elementary School Addition	30,811		30,811
DODEA	UNITED KINGDOM	MENWITH HILL STATION	Replace Menwith Hill Elementary/High School	46,488		46,488
MDA	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM, NEW YORK	IDT Complex	25,900		25,900
MDA	ROMANIA	Deveselu, Romania	Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex	157,900		157,900
NSA	COLORADO	BUCKLEY AIR FORCE BASE	Denver Power House	30,000		30,000
NSA	MARYLAND	FORT MEADE	NSAW Recapitalize Building #1/Site M Inc 1	25,000		25,000
NSA	MARYLAND	FORT MEADE	High Performance Computing Center Inc 2	300,521	–75,000	225,521
NSA	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	IC CNCI Data Center 1 Inc 4	191,414		191,414
NSA	UNITED KINGDOM	MENWITH HILL STATION	MHS Utilities and Roads	3,795		3,795
SOCOM	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF Indoor Dynamic Shooting Facility	31,170		31,170
SOCOM	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF Close Quarters Combat/Dynamic Shoot Fac	13,969		13,969
SOCOM	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	SOF Mobile Comm Detachment Support Facility	10,120		10,120
SOCOM	COLORADO	FORT CARSON, COLORADO	SOF Battalion Operations Complex	56,673		56,673
SOCOM	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	SOF AVFID Ops and Maintenance Facilities	41,695		41,695
SOCOM	FLORIDA	MACDILL AFB	SOF Joint Special Ops University Fac (JSOU)	34,409		34,409
SOCOM	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	SOF SDVT–1 Waterfront Operations Facility	24,289		24,289

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
SOCOM	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	SOF Landgraf Hangar Extension	3,559		3,559
SOCOM	KENTUCKY	FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY	SOF Ground Support Battalion	26,313		26,313
SOCOM	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	SOF AC–130J Combat Parking Apron	22,062		22,062
SOCOM	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	SOF Marine Battalion Company/Team Facilities	53,399		53,399
SOCOM	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	SOF Survival Evasion Resist. Escape Tng Fac	5,465		5,465
SOCOM	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF Support Addition	3,875		3,875
SOCOM	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	40,481	10,000	50,481
SOCOM	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF Civil Affairs Battalion Complex	31,373	10,000	41,373
SOCOM	NORTH CAROLINA	FORT BRAGG	SOF Sustainment Brigade Complex	24,693	10,000	34,693
SOCOM	VIRGINIA	Joint Exp Base Little Creek—Story	SOF Combat Services Support Facility—East	11,132		11,132
SOCOM	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	SOF Military Working Dog Kennel	3,967		3,967
SOCOM	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	46,553		46,553
SOCOM	CONUS CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	SOF Parachute Training Facility	6,477		6,477
SOCOM	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	SOF CV–22 Simulator Facility	6,490		6,490
TMA	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CALIFORNIA	Medical Clinic Replacement	27,400		27,400
TMA	COLORADO	PIKES PEAK	High Altitude Medical Research Lab	3,600		3,600
TMA	ILLINOIS	GREAT LAKES	Drug Laboratory Replacement	28,700		28,700
TMA	ILLINOIS	SCOTT AFB	Medical Logistics Warehouse	2,600		2,600
TMA	MARYLAND	ANNAPOLIS	Health Clinic Replacement	66,500		66,500
TMA	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	Temporary Medical Facilities	26,600		26,600

TMA	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	Base Installation Access/Appearance Plan	7,000	–7,000	0
TMA	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	Electrical Capacity and Cooling Towers	35,600		35,600
TMA	MARYLAND	FORT DETRICK	USAMRIID Stage I, Incr 7	19,000		19,000
TMA	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Dental Clinic	18,100		18,100
TMA	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	71,023		71,023
TMA	NEW YORK	FORT DRUM, NEW YORK	Soldier Specialty Care Clinic	17,300		17,300
TMA	NORTH CAROLINA	CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA	Medical Clinic Replacement	21,200		21,200
TMA	NORTH CAROLINA	SEYMOUR JOHNSON AFB	Medical Clinic Replacement	53,600		53,600
TMA	SOUTH CAROLINA	SHAW AFB	Medical Clinic Replacement	57,200		57,200
TMA	TEXAS	FORT BLISS	Hospital Replacement Incr 4	207,400	–100,000	107,400
TMA	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Ambulatory Care Center Phase 3 Incr	80,700		80,700
TMA	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	Veterinary Facility Replacement	8,500		8,500
TMA	GERMANY	RHINE ORDNANCE BARRACKS	Medical Center Replacement Incr 2	127,000		127,000
TMA	KOREA	KUNSAN AIR BASE	Medical/Dental Clinic Addition	13,000		13,000
TMA	KOREA	OSAN AFB	Hospital Addition/Alteration	34,600		34,600
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,254		7,254
DODEA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,091		4,091
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Milcon	3,000		3,000
SOCOM	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Const	10,000		10,000
TJS	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Exercise Related Minor Construction	6,440		6,440

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
TMA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Minor Construction	5,000		5,000
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	47,978		47,978
DIA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	2,919		2,919
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PLANNING & DESIGN	5,000		5,000
DODEA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	105,569		105,569
MDA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	4,548		4,548
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	8,300		8,300
SOCOM	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	27,620		27,620
TMA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	105,700		105,700
WHS	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	7,928		7,928
Milcon,Def-Wide—SUBTOTAL				**3,654,623**	**–219,500**	**3,435,123**
Services MILCON—TOTAL				**7,668,131**	**–663,914**	**7,004,217**
MCon,Army NG						
ARMY, NG	ALABAMA	FORT MCCLELLAN	Live Fire Shoot House	5,400		5,400
ARMY, NG	ARKANSAS	SEARCY	Field Maintenance Shop	6,800		6,800
ARMY, NG	CALIFORNIA	FORT IRWIN	Maneuver Area Training & Equipment Site Ph3	25,000		25,000

ARMY, NG	CONNECTICUT	CAMP HARTELL	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	32,000	32,000
ARMY, NG	DELAWARE	BETHANY BEACH	Regional Training Institute Ph1	5,500	5,500
ARMY, NG	FLORIDA	CAMP BLANDING	Combined Arms Collective Training Fac	9,000	9,000
ARMY, NG	FLORIDA	MIRAMAR	Readiness Center	20,000	20,000
ARMY, NG	HAWAII	KAPOLEI	Army Aviation Support Facility Ph1	28,000	28,000
ARMY, NG	IDAHO	ORCHARD TRAINING AREA	ORTC(Barracks)Ph2	40,000	40,000
ARMY, NG	INDIANA	SOUTH BEND	Armed Forces Reserve Center Add/Alt	21,000	21,000
ARMY, NG	INDIANA	TERRE HAUTE	Field Maintenance Shop	9,000	9,000
ARMY, NG	IOWA	CAMP DODGE	Urban Assault Course	3,000	3,000
ARMY, NG	KANSAS	TOPEKA	Taxiway, Ramp & Hangar Alterations	9,500	9,500
ARMY, NG	KENTUCKY	FRANKFORT	Army Aviation Support Facility	32,000	32,000
ARMY, NG	MASSACHUSETTS	CAMP EDWARDS	Unit Training Equipment Site	22,000	22,000
ARMY, NG	MINNESOTA	CAMP RIPLEY	Scout Reconnaissance Range	17,000	17,000
ARMY, NG	MINNESOTA	ST PAUL	Readiness Center	17,000	17,000
ARMY, NG	MISSOURI	FORT LEONARD WOOD	Regional Training Institute	18,000	18,000
ARMY, NG	MISSOURI	KANSAS CITY	Readiness Center Add/Alt	1,900	1,900
ARMY, NG	MISSOURI	MONETT	Readiness Center Add/Alt	820	820
ARMY, NG	MISSOURI	PERRYVILLE	Readiness Center Add/Alt	700	700
ARMY, NG	MONTANA	MILES CITY	Readiness Center	11,000	11,000
ARMY, NG	NEW JERSEY	SEA GIRT	Regional Training Institute	34,000	34,000
ARMY, NG	NEW YORK	STORMVILLE	Combined Support Maint Shop Ph1	24,000	24,000
ARMY, NG	OHIO	CHILLICOTHE	Field Maintenance Shop Add/Alt	3,100	3,100
ARMY, NG	OHIO	DELAWARE	Readiness Center	12,000	12,000
ARMY, NG	OKLAHOMA	CAMP GRUBER	Operations Readiness Training Complex	25,000	25,000
ARMY, NG	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	BEQ Facility (Regional Training Institute)	15,000	15,000
ARMY, NG	UTAH	CAMP WILLIAMS	Regional Training Institute Ph2	21,000	21,000
ARMY, NG	WASHINGTON	FORT LEWIS	Readiness Center	35,000	35,000
ARMY, NG	WEST VIRGINIA	LOGAN	Readiness Center	14,200	14,200
ARMY, NG	WISCONSIN	WAUSAU	Field Maintenance Shop	10,000	10,000
ARMY, NG	GUAM	BARRIGADA	JFHQ Ph4	8,500	8,500
ARMY, NG	PUERTO RICO	CAMP SANTIAGO	Readiness Center	3,800	3,800
ARMY, NG	PUERTO RICO	CEIBA	Refill Station Building	2,200	2,200

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
ARMY, NG	PUERTO RICO	GUAYNABO	Readiness Center (JFHQ)	15,000		15,000
ARMY, NG	PUERTO RICO	GURABO	Readiness Center	14,700		14,700
ARMY, NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,057		15,057
ARMY, NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	26,622		26,622
MCon,Army NG—Subtotal				**613,799**		**613,799**
MCon,Air NG						
AF, NG	CALIFORNIA	FRESNO YOSEMITE IAP ANG	F–15 Conversion	11,000		11,000
AF, NG	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	TFI—F–22 Combat Apron Addition	6,500		6,500
AF, NG	NEW MEXICO	KIRTLAND AFB	Alter Target Intelligence Facility	8,500		8,500
AF, NG	WYOMING	CHEYENNE MAP	C–130 Flight Simulator Training Facility	6,486		6,486
AF, NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,900		5,900
AF, NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	4,000		4,000
MCon,Air NG—Subtotal				**42,386**		**42,386**
NG MILCON—TOTAL				**656,185**		**656,185**
MCon,A Res						
ARMY, RESERVE	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	ORTC	64,000		64,000
ARMY, RESERVE	CALIFORNIA	FORT HUNTER LIGGETT	UPH Barracks	4,300		4,300

ARMY, RESERVE	CALIFORNIA	TUSTIN	Army Reserve Center	27,000	27,000
ARMY, RESERVE	ILLINOIS	FORT SHERIDAN	Army Reserve Center	28,000	28,000
ARMY, RESERVE	MARYLAND	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND	Army Reserve Center	21,000	21,000
ARMY, RESERVE	MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	Add/Alt Army Reserve Center	10,000	10,000
ARMY, RESERVE	MASSACHUSETTS	DEVENS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	Automatic Record Fire Range	4,800	4,800
ARMY, RESERVE	MASSACHUSETTS	DEVENS RESERVE FORCES TRAINING AREA	Combat Pistol/MP Firearms Qualification	3,700	3,700
ARMY, RESERVE	NEVADA	LAS VEGAS	Army Reserve Center/AMSA	21,000	21,000
ARMY, RESERVE	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	Automated Infantry Squad Battle Course	7,400	7,400
ARMY, RESERVE	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis-McChord	Army Reserve Center	40,000	40,000
ARMY, RESERVE	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	Central Issue Facility	12,200	12,200
ARMY, RESERVE	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	Dining Facility	8,600	8,600
ARMY, RESERVE	WISCONSIN	FORT MCCOY	ECS Tactical Equip. Maint. Facility (TEMF)	27,000	27,000
ARMY, RESERVE	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	10,895	10,895
ARMY, RESERVE	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	15,951	15,951
MCon,A Res—Subtotal				**305,846**	**305,846**

Milcon, Naval Res

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
NAVY, RESERVE	ARIZONA	YUMA	Reserve Training Facility—Yuma AZ	5,379		5,379
NAVY, RESERVE	IOWA	FORT DES MOINES	Joint Reserve Center—Des Moines IA	19,162		19,162
NAVY, RESERVE	LOUISIANA	NEW ORLEANS	Transient Quarters	7,187		7,187
NAVY, RESERVE	NEW YORK	BROOKLYN	Vehicle Maint. Fac.—Brooklyn NY	4,430		4,430
NAVY, RESERVE	TEXAS	FORT WORTH	Commercial Vehicle Inspection Site	11,256		11,256
NAVY, RESERVE	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	2,118		2,118
Milcon, Naval Res—Subtotal				**49,532**		**49,532**
MCon,AF Res						
AF, RESERVE	NEW YORK	NIAGARA FALLS IAP	Flight Simulator Facility	6,100		6,100
AF, RESERVE	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
AF, RESERVE	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	2,879		2,879
MCon,AF Res—Subtotal				**10,979**		**10,979**
Reserve Milcon—TOTAL				**366,357**		**366,357**
MILCON Major Accounts—TOTAL				**8,690,673**	**–663,914**	**8,026,759**
Chem-Demil						
Chem Demil	COLORADO	PUEBLO DEPOT	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph XIV	36,000		36,000
Chem Demil	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	Ammunition Demilitarization Ph XIII	115,000		115,000
ChemDemil / NSIP—Total				**151,000**		**151,000**
NSIP						

NSIP	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	NATO Security Investment Program	254,163	254,163
NATO Security Investment Program				**254,163**	**254,163**
Army Fam Housing					
FH Const,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Family Housing P&D	4,641	4,641
Army Fam Hsg Construction—Subtotal				**4,641**	**4,641**
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Utilities Account	88,112	88,112
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Services Account	13,487	13,487
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Management Account	56,970	56,970
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Miscellaneous Account	620	620
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Furnishings Account	31,785	31,785
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Leasing	203,533	203,533
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Maintenance of Real Property	109,534	109,534
FH Op&Dt,A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Privatization Support Costs	26,010	26,010
Army Fam Hsg O&M—Subtotal				**530,051**	**530,051**
Army Fam Hsg—TOTAL				**534,692**	**534,692**
Navy Fam Housing					

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
FH Const,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Improvements	97,655		97,655
FH Const,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Design	4,527		4,527
Navy Fam Hsg Construction—Subtotal				**102,182**		**102,182**
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Utilities Account	80,860		80,860
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Furnishings Account	17,697		17,697
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Management Account	62,741		62,741
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Miscellaneous Account	491		491
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Services Account	19,615		19,615
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Leasing	83,774		83,774
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Maintenance of Real Property	85,254		85,254
FH Op&Dt,N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Privatization Support Costs	27,798		27,798
Navy Fam Hsg O&M—Subtotal				**378,230**		**378,230**
Navy Fam Hsg—TOTAL				**480,412**		**480,412**
AF Fam Housing						

FH Con,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Improvements	79,571	79,571
FH Con,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Planning and Design	4,253	4,253
AF Fam Hsg Construction—Subtotal				**83,824**	**83,824**
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Utilities Account	75,662	75,662
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Management Account	55,002	55,002
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Services Account	16,550	16,550
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Furnishings Account	37,878	37,878
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Miscellaneous Account	1,943	1,943
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Leasing	62,730	62,730
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Maintenance (RPMA RPMC)	201,937	201,937
FH Op&Dt,AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Housing Privatization	46,127	46,127
AF Fam Hsg O&M—Subtotal				**497,829**	**497,829**
AF Fam Hsg—TOTAL				**581,653**	**581,653**
Def-Wide Fam Housing					
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Utilities Account	283	283
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Utilities Account	12	12

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Furnishings Account	4,660		4,660
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Furnishings Account	20		20
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Services Account	31		31
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Management Account	371		371
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Furnishings Account	66		66
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Leasing	35,333		35,333
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Leasing	10,822		10,822
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Maintenance of Real Property	567		567
FH Op&Dt,D-W	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Maintenance of Real Property	73		73
DefWide Fam Hsg O&M—Subtotal				**52,238**		**52,238**
DoD FH Imprv Fd						
DoD FH Imprv Fd	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,786		1,786
DoD Fam Hsg Imprv Fd—Subtotal				**1,786**		**1,786**
FAM HSG—TOTAL				**1,650,781**		**1,650,781**

BRAC IV					
BRAC, A	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, ARMY	Base Realignment & Closure	79,893	79,893
BRAC, N	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, NAVY	Base Realignment & Closure	146,951	146,951
BRAC, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, AF	Base Realignment & Closure	122,552	122,552
BRAC IV—TOTAL				**349,396**	**349,396**
2005 BRAC					
ARMY BRAC					
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–121: FORT GILLEM, GA	4,976	4,976
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–222: FORT MCPHERSON, GA	6,772	6,772
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	20,453	20,453
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–223: FORT MONMOUTH, NJ	9,989	9,989
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–36: RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	1,385	1,385
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–113: FORT MONROE, VA	12,184	12,184
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–236: RC TRANSFORMATION IN CT	557	557
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–242: RC TRANSFORMATION IN NY	172	172
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–253: RC TRANSFORMATION IN PA	100	100
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–212: USAR CMD & CNTRL—NEW ENGLAND	222	222

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Agreement
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	USA–167: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—NE	175		175
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–112: RIVER BANK ARMY AMMO PLANT, CA	22,431		22,431
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–119: NEWPORT CHEMICAL DEPOT, IN	197		197
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–106: KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, KS	7,280		7,280
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–110: MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMO PLANT, MS	160		160
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	IND–122: LONE STAR ARMY AMMO PLANT, TX	11,379		11,379
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MED–2: WALTER REED NMMC, BETHESDA, MD	7,787		7,787
BRAC—Army—Subtotal				**106,219**		**106,219**
NAVY BRAC						
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–172: NWS SEAL BEACH, CONCORD, CA	2,129		2,129
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–138: NAS BRUNSWICK, ME	4,897		4,897
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–157: MCSA KANSAS CITY, MO	39		39
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–84: JRB WILLOW GROVE & CAMBRIA REG AP	189		189
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–168: NS NEWPORT, RI	1,742		1,742

BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–100: PLANNING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT	5,038		5,038
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	DON–101: VARIOUS LOCATIONS	4,176		4,176
BRAC—Navy—Subtotal				**18,210**		**18,210**
AF BRAC						
BRAC—Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	605		605
BRAC—Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	MED–57: BROOKS CITY BASE, TX	326		326
BRAC—Air Force	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE LOCATIONS	COMM ADD 3: GALENA FOL, AK	1,337		1,337
BRAC—Air Force—Subtotal				**2,268**		**2,268**
BRAC 2005—TOTAL				**126,697**		**126,697**
BRAC IV + BRAC 2005—TOTAL				**476,093**		**476,093**
MILCON GRAND TOTAL				**11,222,710**	**–663,914**	**10,558,796**

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
Electricity delivery and energy reliability	6,000	–6,000	0
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	7,577,341	25,000	7,602,341
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	2,458,631	0	2,458,631
Naval reactors	1,088,635	37,986	1,126,621
Office of the administrator	411,279	–25,000	386,279
Total, National nuclear security administration	**11,535,886**	**37,986**	**11,573,872**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup	5,472,001	–463,000	5,009,001
Other defense activities	735,702	0	735,702
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,207,703**	**–463,000**	**5,744,703**

Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,743,589**	**–425,014**	**17,318,575**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**17,749,589**	**–431,014**	**17,318,575**
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Infrastructure security & energy restoration	6,000	–6,000	0
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	369,000		369,000
W76 Life extension program	174,931		174,931
Total, Life extension programs	**543,931**	**0**	**543,931**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	72,364		72,364
W76 Stockpile systems	65,445	25,000	90,445
W78 Stockpile systems	139,207		139,207
W80 Stockpile systems	46,540		46,540
B83 Stockpile systems	57,947		57,947
W87 Stockpile systems	85,689		85,689
W88 Stockpile systems	123,217		123,217
Total, Stockpile systems	**590,409**	**25,000**	**615,409**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	51,265		51,265
Stockpile services			
Production support	365,405		365,405
Research and development support	28,103		28,103
R&D certification and safety	191,632		191,632

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Management, technology, and production	175,844		175,844
Plutonium sustainment	141,685		141,685
Total, Stockpile services	**902,669**	**0**	**902,669**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**2,088,274**	**25,000**	**2,113,274**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	44,104		44,104
Primary assessment technologies	94,000		94,000
Dynamic materials properties	97,000		97,000
Advanced radiography	30,000		30,000
Secondary assessment technologies	85,000		85,000
Total, Science campaign	**350,104**	**0**	**350,104**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	46,421		46,421
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	18,983		18,983
Nuclear survivability	21,788		21,788
Enhanced surveillance	63,379		63,379
Total, Engineering campaign	**150,571**	**0**	**150,571**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	81,942		81,942
Ignition	84,172		84,172
Support of other stockpile programs	14,817		14,817
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	6,044		6,044
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,334		8,334

Facility operations and target production	264,691		264,691
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**460,000**	**0**	**460,000**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	600,000		600,000
Readiness Campaign			
Nonnuclear readiness	64,681		64,681
Tritium readiness	65,414		65,414
Total, Readiness campaign	**130,095**	**0**	**130,095**
Total, Campaigns	**1,690,770**	**0**	**1,690,770**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	163,602		163,602
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	89,048		89,048
Los Alamos National Laboratory	335,978		335,978
Nevada National Security Site	115,697		115,697
Pantex	172,020		172,020
Sandia National Laboratory	167,384		167,384
Savannah River Site	120,577		120,577
Y–12 National security complex	255,097		255,097
Total, Operations of facilities	**1,419,403**	**0**	**1,419,403**
Science, technology and engineering capability support	166,945		166,945
Nuclear operations capability support	203,346		203,346
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,789,694**	**0**	**1,789,694**
Construction:			
13–D–301 Electrical infrastructure upgrades, LANL/LLNL	23,000		23,000
12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	24,204		24,204
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project, LANL	8,889		8,889
10-D–501 Nuclear facilities risk reduction Y–12 National security complex, Oakridge, TN	17,909		17,909
09–D–404 Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	11,332		11,332

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	24,800		24,800
06–D–141 PED/Construction, UPFY–12, Oak Ridge, TN	340,000	–340,000	0
06–D–141 PED/Construction, UPFY–12, Phase I, Oak Ridge, TN	0	340,000	340,000
Total, Construction	**450,134**	**0**	**450,134**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**2,239,828**	**0**	**2,239,828**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	114,965		114,965
Program direction	104,396		104,396
Total, Secure transportation asset	**219,361**	**0**	**219,361**
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	247,552		247,552
Site stewardship			
Operations and maintenance	90,001		90,001
Total, Site stewardship	**90,001**	**0**	**90,001**
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	643,285		643,285
NNSA CIO activities	155,022		155,022
Legacy contractor pensions	185,000		185,000
National security applications	18,248		18,248
Subtotal, Weapons activities	**7,577,341**	**25,000**	**7,602,341**
Total, Weapons Activities	**7,577,341**	**25,000**	**7,602,341**

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance	398,186		398,186
Domestic Enrichment R&D	150,000		150,000
Subtotal, Nonproliferation and verification R&D	**548,186**		**548,186**
Nonproliferation and international security	**150,119**		**150,119**
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	**311,000**		**311,000**
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			
Operations and maintenance			
U.S. plutonium disposition	498,979		498,979
U.S. uranium disposition	29,736		29,736
Total, Operations and maintenance	**528,715**	**0**	**528,715**
Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	388,802		388,802
Total, Construction	**388,802**	**0**	**388,802**
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	**917,517**	**0**	**917,517**
Russian surplus fissile materials disposition	3,788		3,788
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**921,305**	**0**	**921,305**
Global threat reduction initiative	466,021		466,021
Legacy contractor pensions	62,000		62,000
Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,458,631**	**0**	**2,458,631**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,458,631**	**0**	**2,458,631**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development	418,072		418,072
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	89,700	37,986	127,686
S8G Prototype refueling	121,100		121,100
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	366,961		366,961
Construction:			
13–D–905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL	8,890		8,890
13–D–904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	2,000		2,000
13–D–903, KS Prototype Staff Building, KSO	14,000		14,000
10-D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	19,000		19,000
08–D–190 Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station,Naval Reactor Facility, ID	5,700		5,700
Total, Construction	**49,590**	**0**	**49,590**
Program direction	43,212		43,212
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	**1,088,635**	**37,986**	**1,126,621**
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,088,635**	**37,986**	**1,126,621**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	411,279	–25,000	386,279
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**411,279**	**–25,000**	**386,279**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			

Closure sites administration	1,990		1,990
Hanford site:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations	389,347		389,347
Central plateau remediation	558,820		558,820
Richland community and regulatory support	15,156		15,156
Total, Hanford site	**963,323**	**0**	**963,323**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	396,607		396,607
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,000		3,000
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**399,607**	**0**	**399,607**
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,484		1,484
Nuclear facility D&D Separations Process Research Unit	24,000		24,000
Nevada	64,641		64,641
Sandia National Laboratories	5,000		5,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	239,143		239,143
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**334,268**	**0**	**334,268**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Building 3019	67,525		67,525
OR cleanup and disposition	109,470		109,470
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,500		4,500
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**181,495**	**0**	**181,495**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01–D–416 A–E/ORP–0060/Major construction	690,000		690,000

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	482,113		482,113
Total, Office of River protection	**1,172,113**	**0**	**1,172,113**
Savannah River sites:			
Savannah River risk management operations	444,089		444,089
SR community and regulatory support	16,584		16,584
Radioactive liquid tank waste:			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	698,294		698,294
Construction:			
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	22,549		22,549
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**720,843**	**0**	**720,843**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,181,516**	**0**	**1,181,516**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	198,010		198,010
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**198,010**	**0**	**198,010**
Program direction	323,504		323,504
Program support	18,279		18,279
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	18,817		18,817
Paducah	8,909		8,909
Portsmouth	8,578		8,578
Richland/Hanford Site	71,746		71,746

Savannah River Site	121,977		121,977
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,977		4,977
West Valley	2,015		2,015
Total, Safeguards and Security	**237,019**	**0**	**237,019**
Technology development	20,000		20,000
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000	–463,000	0
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,494,124**	**–463,000**	**5,031,124**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	–12,123		–12,123
Use of unobligated balances	–10,000		–10,000
Total, Adjustments	**–22,123**	**0**	**–22,123**
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,472,001**	**–463,000**	**5,009,001**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	139,325		139,325
Program direction	106,175		106,175
Total, Health, safety and security	**245,500**	**0**	**245,500**
Specialized security activities	188,619		188,619
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	164,477		164,477
Program direction	13,469		13,469
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**177,946**	**0**	**177,946**
Defense-related activities			
Defense related administrative support	118,836		118,836
Office of hearings and appeals	4,801		4,801

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2013 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Subtotal, Other defense activities	735,702	0	735,702
Total, Other Defense Activities	735,702	0	735,702

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

Seven separate legislative proposals on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 were submitted as executive communications to the President of the Senate by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs of the Department of Defense and subsequently referred to the committee. Information on these executive communications appears below. All of these executive communications are available for review at the committee.

Executive Communication No.	Dated	Received in the Committee on Armed Services
EC–5400	March 14, 2012	March 20, 2012
EC–5605	April 6, 2012	April 18, 2012
EC–5606	March 28, 2012	April 18, 2012
EC–5753	April 9, 2012	April 19, 2012
EC–5813	April 18, 2012	April 26, 2012
EC–6018	April 25, 2012	April 30, 2012
EC–6016	May 4, 2012	May 8, 2012

Committee Action

The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 passed by roll call vote, 26–0, as follows: In favor: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson, Webb, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Brown, Portman, Ayotte, Collins, Graham, Cornyn, and Vitter. Opposed: None.

The 6 other roll call votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the full committee markup are as follows:

1. MOTION: To conduct Full Committee markups in closed session because classified information will be discussed.

VOTE: Passed on a roll call vote, 18–8.

In Favor: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson, Webb, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Manchin, Blumenthal, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Portman, and Graham.

Opposed: Senators McCaskill, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Brown, Ayotte, Collins, Cornyn, and Vitter.

2. MOTION: To authorize the use of Department of Defense funds for abortion in cases of rape and incest.

VOTE: Passed on a roll call vote, 16–10.

In Favor: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Webb, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, McCain, Brown, and Collins.

Opposed: Senators Nelson, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Portman, Ayotte, Graham, Cornyn, and Vitter.

3. MOTION: To make certain alternative fuel procurement requirements, as required by Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, inapplicable to the Department of Defense.

VOTE: Failed on a roll call vote, 13–13.

In Favor: Senators Webb, Manchin, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Brown, Portman, Ayotte, Graham, Cornyn, and Vitter.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, and Collins.

4. MOTION: To include a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense in FY 2013 from being obligated or expended for the production or sole purchase of an alternative fuel if the cost exceeds the cost of traditional fossil fuels used for the same purpose, except for continued testing purposes.

VOTE: Passed on a roll call vote, 13–12.

In Favor: Senators Webb, Manchin, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Brown, Portman, Ayotte, Graham, Cornyn, and Vitter.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Shaheen, Gillibrand, and Blumenthal.

5. MOTION: To prohibit the construction of a biofuels refinery or any other facility or infrastructure used to refine biofuels unless the requirement is specifically authorized by law.

VOTE: Passed on a roll call vote, 13–12.

In Favor: Senators Webb, McCaskill, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Brown, Portman, Ayotte, Graham, Cornyn, and Vitter.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson, Manchin, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Shaheen, Gillibrand, and Blumenthal.

6. MOTION: To include sense of the Senate language providing notice to Congress on unfunded priorities.

VOTE: Passed on a roll call vote, 14–10.

In Favor: Senators Levin, Akaka, Nelson, Webb, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Chambliss, Wicker, and Portman.

Opposed: Senators Lieberman, Reed, Begich, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Brown, Ayotte, Collins, and Cornyn.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during Senate floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2013.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. BEGICH

I am pleased the committee included a legislative provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 entitled "Criteria for decisions involving certain base closure and realignment activities." This legislative provision includes a one-year moratorium on any action that would result in a military installation covered under paragraph (1) of section 2687(a) of title 10, United States Code, to no longer be covered by that section.

As stated in the February 2012 document sent to Congress titled, "Force Structure Changes: Sustaining Readiness and Modernizing the Total Force," the Air Force is proposing to "relocate our F–16 Aggressor Squadron in Alaska from Eielson AFB to Elmendorf AFB, allowing us to achieve savings in base support at Eielson beginning in FY15." Subsequent documentation provided to Congress, including an April 2012 Alaska Congressional Delegation brief and May 14, 2012 letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, confirms the proposed action entails a reduction of approximately 345 of the 406 civilian personnel at Eielson AFB. The proposed action would clearly result in Eielson AFB being no longer covered under paragraph (1) of section 2687(a) of title 10, United States Code, and therefore subject to the one-year moratorium included in the bill.

The one-year moratorium will allow Congress to fully understand the national security implications of this proposed action. The proposed action would result in the "warming" of one our nation's most strategically advantageous air bases, the wisdom of which must further be questioned by Congress. The Air Force acknowledges the high military value of Eielson's location. The base will become more strategic as we renew our focus on the Asia-Pacific and the Arctic becomes increasingly important. Eielson AFB is critical to the joint forces ability to project power into the Pacific Theater and rapidly deploy forces in support of contingencies and other events in the region. The drastic reduction at an installation in the Pacific Air Force's area of operations is contrary to the new Defense Strategic Guidance.

Additionally, the one-year moratorium will provide the Congress an opportunity to further examine the affordability and feasibility of implementation of the proposed action. This is especially important since no comprehensive analysis through the future years' defense program has been conducted on this action. In fact, recent information suggests the proposed action at Eielson AFB will actually cost money in Fiscal Year 2013. The cost was unanticipated and will require the reprogramming of already constrained resources. This leads to questions of affordability since the Department of Defense must reduce spending in the near-term per the

Budget Control Act. In these fiscally constrained times we can no longer afford to make costly decisions we hope, but have not validated, will produce a return on investment.

I am also pleased the legislative provision requires the Comptroller General to report Congress on the objective criteria used by the Department of Defense to make decisions relating to realignments of units employed at military installations that are not covered by the requirements of section 2687 of title 10, United States Code. The Air Force has determined the proposed action at Eielson AFB is not subject to the requirements of that law because civilian personnel layoffs are reductions-in-force and civilian personnel are only being reduced, not reduced and relocated. However, it is imperative proposed action at military bases falling below the requirements of section 2687 of title 10 are also unbiased, objective decisions in the best interest of national security and the taxpayer dollar. Those actions are also subject to Congressional oversight.

The proposed action at Eielson AFB is an action that was rejected by the BRAC Commission in 2005 because of Eielson AFB's high military value and because the Air Force overestimated cost savings. To date, the Air Force has not validated their proposed action or produced the objective criteria by which the decision was made. While Congress is mindful of budget constraints, force restructuring and reductions must not be used as a guise to conduct a BRAC without a formal BRAC Commission or process, which this committee did not authorize.

MARK BEGICH.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. McCAIN

I voted in favor of the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization bill approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee. This bill represents a truly bipartisan effort to support our warfighters and maintain the readiness of the Armed Forces of the United States in difficult budget circumstances. While it is not perfect, I still unreservedly support it and will work for improvements when the bill is considered on the Senate floor and in conference with the House of Representatives.

The Committee met under the threat of 'sequestration' mandated by last year's Budget Control Act. Pentagon leadership has repeatedly warned that these additional cuts, totaling almost half a trillion dollars over the next decade, would devastate the Department's ability to provide for the nation's defense. Sequestration would undermine the readiness of the armed services, dramatically reduce our ability to project power and defend our interests, jeopardize the livelihood of civilian and uniformed personnel alike, and increase risk to national security - not to mention the shattering impact on our fragile economy with the potential for hundreds of thousands of layoffs. Furthermore, the way in which these automatic cuts would be applied to the Department of Defense would likely require that thousands of contracts be terminated and renegotiated, at a huge cost to the taxpayer. I am pleased that this bill includes my amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a detailed report on the specific impacts of sequestration. But this provision is only a first step. We cannot wait until a 'lame duck' session to deal with this looming disaster. We must begin to negotiate a solution to the problem now.

Recognizing the difficult budget realities facing our nation, the Committee passed a bill that is consistent with the level of funding requested by the President. In addition, the bill requires the Department to reduce funding for civilian personnel and service contractors by five percent each over five years, saving over $5 billion—an important first step in eliminating the massive growth in overhead costs over the past several years and reducing the civilian workforce concurrently with the military personnel reductions proposed by the Secretary of Defense.

While the Committee accepted most of the proposed reductions in military personnel end strengths, I have serious concerns with the Committee's decision to freeze for one year proposed Air Force aircraft retirements and transfers and reverse personnel reductions proposed by the Air Force, pending the recommendations of a new commission. This is a decision that will cost the Air Force at least $1.4 billion in Fiscal Year 2013 alone. Secretary of Defense Panetta recently said that My concern is that if Congress now tries to reverse many of the tough decisions that we reached by adding several billion dollars to the president's budget request, then they risk

not only potential gridlock—[but] they could force the kind of tradeoffs that could jeopardize our national defense.' This action subjects the military judgment of our senior leaders on difficult matters affecting national security to a commission's review, simply because some states may lose jobs.

I am also concerned about the cost of the new Defense Clandestine Service. I support the Department's efforts to provide human intelligence collection support to the warfighter, but the Department must do this within existing resources and not grow the size of the federal payroll. Chairman Levin and I worked together to add a provision in the bill that would prohibit the use of military intelligence program funding for additional personnel for the Defense Clandestine Service. We also asked the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office in the Department of Defense to provide the Congress with an independent cost estimate for the Defense Clandestine Service.

The bill continues the Committee's aggressive pursuit of acquisition process improvements and management reforms by including provisions that prohibit the use of cost-type contracts for the production of major weapon systems; require the Department to revise its 'profit policy' to ensure a link between profit and actual performance; require the Department to notify Congress of potential termination liability on contracts for major weapon systems; and require the Department to implement recommendations by the General Accountability Office to eliminate duplicative programs and functions.

Several provisions in the bill continue the Committee's strong oversight of troubled programs. The bill would fence 50 percent of the funding for the second Ford-class aircraft carrier until the Navy recertifies the current $8.1 billion cost cap on CVN–79 and requires that the Navy report on how it will control its construction costs. Other provisions accelerate developmental testing of Littoral Combat Ships and enhance oversight of its Mission Modules; subject how the Air Force maintains and modernizes F–22A aircraft to greater oversight and monitors the aircraft's oxygen supply problem; and continues strong oversight of the F–35 program, including concurrency, software development, production, and testing.

I am also pleased that the Committee adopted an amendment to prohibit funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). This provision will ensure that not another dollar is wasted on this persistently underperforming program that the Army never intended to procure and has no direct benefit to the warfighter.

In addition, the Committee imposed restrictions on DOD expenditures to develop a commercial biofuels industry. There are many areas of research that are wholly appropriate to the Department of Defense mission, such as efforts to extend the life and reduce the weight of batteries, adapt solar technologies to battlefield conditions, and reduce fuel consumption through more efficient engines and weapon systems. But defense funds should not be used to invigorate a commercial industry that cannot provide an affordable product without heavy government subsidies. This is not a core defense need and should be left to the Department of Energy, which received over $4 billion last year for energy research and develop-

ment and related programs, or to the private sector to take the lead. In a tough budget climate for the Defense Department, we need every dollar to protect our troops on the battlefield with energy technologies that reduce fuel demand and save lives. Spending $26 per gallon of biofuel is not consistent with that goal. The Committee's action corrects this misplacement of priorities.

Unfortunately, this bill once again authorizes hundreds of millions of dollars in unnecessary and unrequested projects. Some have argued that the Department of Defense does not have a 'monopoly on good ideas.' While this is certainly a valid statement, the Committee has an obligation to ensure that added funds, such as $30 million for supplemental impact aid to local educational agencies, result in tangible value to military families. And I do not believe the Committee should use terms like 'Committee initiative' to disguise additions to the budget that are earmarks by any other name.

Two perennial additions that highlight the problem of unrequested authorizations are the Industrial Base Innovation Fund (IBIF) and the Defense Rapid Innovation Program (DRIP), which together are earmarked for $230 million in unrequested funds. I am pleased to note, however, that the Committee finally saw fit to quit authorizing the Metals Affordability Initiative—another perennial earmark (now termed a 'Committee initiative' since earmarks are officially banned). I have consistently said that, if the Department of Defense believes programs like IBIF and DRIP are worthwhile, they need to start expressing that sentiment by including them in the budget request. When our men and women in uniform are being asked to sacrifice so much, this Committee should reassess our priorities and stop pushing our special interests.

There is another new form of earmark—what our critics have come to call 'phone-marks.' I intend to offer an amendment during Senate floor consideration of the bill that will 'make them famous' by requiring the Administration to publish a record of any calls, emails, or other correspondence from Members or their staff who seek to direct funding from any program that should be awarded on the basis of competition or merit-based processes to non-competitive, non-merit-based activities.

Modernization is essential to the future viability of the nuclear weapons complex and was a key condition for the Senate's ratification of the New START Treaty. However, it has been just over a year since the treaty entered into force, and the President has already failed to honor his 10-year commitment to nuclear modernization. I am pleased the Committee adopted language reaffirming Congress' rejection of the President's decision to undermine nuclear modernization and restating our commitment to ensuring the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons enterprise. The bill also provides the Department of Defense authority to transfer a limited amount of funding to the Department of Energy to fulfill this important commitment.

I believe that cyber warfare will be the key battlefield of the 21st century, and I am concerned about our ability to fight and win in this new domain. I authored a provision in the bill that requires the commander of U.S. Cyber Command to provide a strategy for the development and deployment of offensive cyber capabilities. I

am very concerned that our strategy is too reliant on defensive measures in cyber space, and believe we need to develop the capability to go on the offense as well. This provision to craft a comprehensive strategy should spur U.S. Cyber Command to develop this offensive capability effectively and at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer.

Again this year, the Committee restricted further construction on Guam related to the realignment of U.S. Marines in the Pacific theater until Congress has a clear understanding of the costs and strategic implications of the proposed force realignments on our strong allies in the region. The bill also contains no funding for Office of Economic Adjustment activities on Guam and requires future requests for the construction of public facilities and infrastructure to be specifically authorized by law.

Another provision in this bill puts restrictions on reimbursements to Pakistan from Coalition Support Funds. Before making any such reimbursements, the Secretary of Defense must certify to Congress that Pakistan is maintaining open supply lines through Pakistan into Afghanistan for coalition forces, is not supporting or providing safe haven to militant extremist groups such as the Haqqani Network and the Afghan Taliban Quetta Shura, is committed to a strategy to counter the production and use of improvised explosive devices, and is not detaining, prosecuting, or imprisoning citizens of Pakistan as a result of their cooperation with U.S. counterterrorism operations. This last condition is a clear statement of the Committee's outrage at the 33-year prison sentence given to Dr. Shakil Afridi, the Pakistani doctor who assisted us in our search for Osama bin Laden. Rather than being charged with treason and imprisoned, Dr. Afridi should be commended for his courageous and patriotic efforts to help locate the most wanted terrorist in the world. And while it is of great importance that the United States and Pakistan work constructively together, Dr. Afridi's treatment as a criminal will only do further harm to U.S.-Pakistani relations, including diminishing the willingness of Congress to provide financial and security assistance to Pakistan.

In light of the new political and security challenges facing Egypt, the bill also includes a provision that encourages the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to consult with Egypt's civilian and military leaders as part of a comprehensive review of the U.S. security relationship with Egypt.

Finally, at a time when our armed forces are still engaged in operations in Afghanistan and deployed elsewhere around the world, the defense authorization bill addresses vitally important policy, programmatic, and personnel issues. The Congress must give priority to completing action on this legislation in a timely fashion. I am pleased to support this bill and look forward to a spirited discussion on the floor of the Senate this summer and in conference with the House Armed Services Committee in the fall."

JOHN MCCAIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. INHOFE

I voted in favor of the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization bill approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee. The reporting out of the 51st consecutive National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) by the Senate Armed Services Committee comes at a critical time for our national security and our military. This bill represents a bipartisan effort to support our war fighters and maintain the readiness of the best military in the world.

The bill includes language reaffirming this nation's need to continue nuclear modernization and for this Administration to uphold the commitments it made to Congress and the American people to modernize our entire nuclear enterprise when it ratified the New START Treaty. It authorizes an increase of $100 million for additional Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) interceptors. The bill also provides our military heroes with a well-deserved 1.7% across the board pay raise and addresses long-term TRICARE sustainability issues. The bill does not allow proposed increases in TRICARE fees proposed in fiscal year 2013. Simply increasing fees to keep pace with medical inflation will make TRICARE too expensive for beneficiaries to afford. Eligible TRICARE beneficiaries opting out of the program due to cost or inconvenience is as great a threat as rising medical costs.

The bill also includes language that will improve the care of our military personnel suffering the effects of Traumatic Brain Injury and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. The measure urges the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) to continue to make improvements in the management, mission, and programs of the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury and to include evaluating organization changes that could improve the centers' leadership and strategic direction.

The Senate took a significant step to rein in the radical green agenda that President Obama is attempting to impose on our military. As Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works and a Senior Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been committed to stopping the Administration from forcing the Department of Defense (DOD) to spend enormous amounts of scarce resources on pointless global warming efforts and unjustified alternative fuels, all while the President is gutting our military, drastically reducing DOD's budget, and cutting core programs that are vital to our troops' safety. This committee came together in a bipartisan fashion to prevent President Obama from achieving many aspects of his war on affordable energy in the Defense Department. I was disappointed that a measure making certain provisions in Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 inapplicable to the DOD was not included. The Department of Defense should have the flexi-

bility to use oil sands and the nation's large supply to coal to meet energy needs while renewable solutions are being developed.

I was extremely disappointed that this bill fails to contain language included in the FY12 bill that prohibits the transfer of detainees from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States—something that I will ensure is corrected when this bill comes to the floor. Additionally, an amendment was included that will permit taxpayer-funded abortions on military installations. For the past several years, social issues ranging from hate crimes to gay marriage have been attached to this bill. Playing politics with this annual legislation does a disservice to our service members, and I will fight to remove these provisions as the bill moves to the Senate floor for debate.

International partnerships are critically important. As we have less men and women deployed around the world the standards of good practice, techniques and skills learned during various partnership exercises with nations will continue to pay dividends. I applaud the Committee for funding our International Military Education and Training program and train and equip programs, such as the 1206 Global Train and Equip program, and providing funding for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance assets in Central Africa. I am, however, disappointed with the funding provided to Israel for their missile defense, specifically increased funding for their Arrow, Arrow 3, David's Sling and Iron Dome missile defense systems.

Our nation faces significant fiscal challenges. Every agency must wring the most use out of every dollar spent. DOD is no exception, and I support principled decisions to make the DOD more efficient and effective. Nevertheless, a significant cut to the defense budget lead to decreased military capabilities and increased risk to our national security. Accepting more risk in a world where security threats are increasing is unacceptable because increased risk means putting the lives of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines in increased danger. It is difficult to maintain our current capabilities with flat defense budget growth. For some time, I have been an advocate for maintaining the defense budget at a minimum of 4% of the U.S. GDP. This amount will not only allow us to defend our nation and fulfill our commitments to our allies, it will also allow us to procure defense assets efficiently, research and develop new technologies and maintain our defense industrial base.

Many threats exist in the world today and we should maintain force levels that allow us to continue the ability to fight two wars simultaneously should that be necessary. I disagree with the force structure cuts included in this bill and the $660 million cut from the President's budget for military construction and family housing projects. The Air Force's "strategic pause" in Military Construction funding forestalls necessary infrastructure investments. We continue to ask our Armed Forces to do more with less, when they are already stretched too thin. This legislation postpones many of the cuts proposed by the Air Force requires a commission to review the cuts proposed in the FY13 budget request. Furthermore, the bill prevents a Base Realignment and Closure round in 2013 and 2015. The bill also repeals dangerous changes made in the Fiscal Year 2012 bill that affect DOD depots.

Year after year, President Obama's cuts have disarmed our nation's military. As with years past, President Obama's budget for military spending is too low. On top of that, the threat of sequestration and the shift in national security strategy that focuses on the Asia-Pacific at the detriment of other vital areas comes close to breaking our commitment to the troops, to their commanders, and to protecting our nation. The threat of over one trillion dollars in cuts to national security programs required by the sequestration mechanism of the Budget Control Act of 2011 will make it impossible to recapitalize and reset our aging fleet of military equipment while maintaining the force structure required ensuring our national security.

Congress must act quickly to provide the support necessary to our men and women in uniform.

JAMES M. INHOFE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. CHAMBLISS

I am pleased that the Committee adopted my amendment expressing the Sense of the Senate that the Navy's FY14 procurement of F–35 aircraft should not be reduced if the Navy chooses to procure additional F–18 aircraft in FY14, beyond what they are currently planning. The intention of my amendment is simply to express the fact that 4th generation aircraft like the F–18 cannot substitute for 5th generation aircraft like the F–35. The Department of Defense has acknowledged that some money taken from the F–35 program in recent years went to procure additional, less capable F–18s, and I am concerned this may continue. This Committee authorized a $5 billion, multi-year contract for 124 F–18s which will be in service for the next twenty years, will require an additional $10 billion to sustain over their service life if they are typical of other major weapon systems, but which are increasingly able to be used in fewer and fewer environments due to the proliferation of advanced air defense systems and the F–18's inability to penetrate contested airspace. The Navy has stated that they have and will continue to have a "strike fighter gap" partly due to the delay in fielding the F–35, and this has been used to justify additional F–18 purchases. I am skeptical of this justification for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, the F–18 cannot perform the F–35 mission and the number of environments in which the F–18 can operate freely is diminishing. Second, in the present budget environment, every military service is accepting gaps in force structure as well as accepting strategic risk, and I am not yet convinced that the Navy's strike fighter gap is more of a strategic risk than other gaps the military services are currently accepting. Much of the discussion about the strike fighter gap revolves around the number of tactical aircraft necessary to fill the Navy's carrier air wings, rather than the number of tactical aircraft needed to meet real warfighter requirements. Former Secretary of Defense Gates raised this two years ago when he said in relation to this issue, "Before making claims of requirements not being met or alleged 'gaps'—in ships, tactical fighters, personnel or anything else—we need to evaluate the criteria upon which requirements are based in the wider, real-world context." I believe we need to better scrutinize the strike fighter gap to make sure that the gap is tied to meeting clearly articulated Combatant Commander requirements. Also, as always, I believe we need to make wise use of taxpayer dollars and not over invest in equipment and technology whose use is increasingly constrained by other countries' ability to counter it.

SAXBY CHAMBLISS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MS. AYOTTE

Building on its well-deserved reputation for bipartisanship in support of our men and women in uniform and American national security, the Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) voted unanimously to approve its version of the fiscal year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). In today's partisan climate in Washington, this act of bipartisanship is worth celebrating. While this bill is not perfect, there are several praiseworthy components in areas related to sequestration, financial stewardship at the Pentagon, and military readiness that are worth highlighting. There are also a few omissions that I hope to address when the NDAA is considered on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Sequestration

I applaud Senator McCain's successful effort to include a provision in the NDAA approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee to require the Secretary of Defense to provide a detailed report on the specific impacts of sequestration. I believe these details will further demonstrate the need for Congress to act now—and not wait until the 'lame duck' session—in order to replace the cuts associated with defense sequestration.

However, to be clear, the testimony we have already received from the Secretary of Defense and other military leaders provides all the information we should need to warrant urgent action to prevent defense sequestration by coming together to find alternative reductions. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta has said that cuts under sequestration would be "devastating" and "catastrophic" and would "inflict severe damage to our national defense for generations."

The testimony of the service chiefs regarding defense sequestration makes it clear why these cuts will be so damaging. In addition to the proposed reduction of 72,000 soldiers in the size of the Army, General Odierno, the Army Chief of Staff, has testified that defense sequestration would force the Army to cut an additional 100,000 soldiers—with about half coming from the National Guard and Reserve. Given the magnitude of these reductions, it is inevitable that tens of thousands of soldiers—most of them with more than one deployment—will be forced to leave the Army involuntarily. Such a step would not only break faith with service members who have sacrificed so much for our country, but could also have a damaging effect on the morale of those who continue to serve.

The damage defense sequestration will inflict on the Marine Corps is equally concerning. Under sequestration, the Marine Corps will likely face a reduction of approximately 18,000 Marines—on top of a pending force cut of 20,000. Faced with that daunting prospect, the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Dunford, recently testified that the Marines would

not be able to conduct a "single major contingency operation." That is alarming testimony coming from our nation's 9–1–1 military force.

Likewise, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Greenert, has testified that defense sequestration would force the Navy to cut 50 to 55 more ships from a fleet that is already about 30 short of the required 313 vessels. Such a reduction would endanger our ability to protect critical shipping lanes that are the lifeblood of the U.S. economy. A dramatically smaller naval fleet caused by defense sequestration would also make a mockery of the President's recently announced focus in the Asia-Pacific region and cause destabilizing concerns among allies in the region who face an ascendant China.

According to testimony by senior Air Force officials, sequestration would threaten the Joint Strike Fighter program and the KC–46A supertanker—next generation aircraft that are critical to the future of U.S. air supremacy and mobility.

Unfortunately, the cuts associated with defense sequestration will not just damage the individual services. These cuts will also inflict severe and irreversible damage to the nation's defense industry—depriving our warfighters of the advanced technologies and weapons they need to accomplish their missions. Due to the already planned reductions and in anticipation of defense sequestration cuts, many defense contractors will not be able to wait until January to start laying-off employees. At a minimum, defense companies will have to start notifying their workers in October or November of mass layoffs and closures. For research and development and procurement cuts alone, one study estimates that over one million jobs within the defense industrial base will be lost.

In addition to an enormous quantity of lay-offs that will undercut our tepid economic recovery, defense sequestration will force many small defense companies out of business. Many essential weapons systems rely on a large network of subcontractors and suppliers. For key components, prime contractors often have only one small business supplier. While large defense companies may be able to weather defense sequestration by laying-off employees, many small companies will be forced to go out of business. When these vendors go out of business, it is unlikely that they will come back—eliminating irreplaceable expertise and leaving the American military increasingly reliant on foreign suppliers.

We cannot wait until after the elections to stop draconian defense sequestration cuts and find alternative spending reductions. Every day that action is delayed brings us one step closer to irreversible damage to our national defense. Failure to stop the sweeping, automatic defense sequestration cuts will diminish our military readiness, damage America's defense industrial base, and result in massive lay-offs of defense workers. To prevent the catastrophic damage that defense sequestration cuts will inflict on our nation's military, Congress needs to act now.

Stewardship of Taxpayer Dollars

As our nation confronts a severe fiscal crisis, I believe spending must be scrutinized across the entire federal government, including spending at the Pentagon. As the defense budget tightens in the coming years, we must use every defense dollar wisely. For these

reasons, I am pleased that the NDAA approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee includes many of the provisions that I have promoted to improve the Pentagon's financial stewardship, reduce waste, and help bring greater transparency to the defense budget.

Audit Readiness

Last year, I introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill that would have required the Pentagon to complete a full statement of budget resources by 2014. This amendment passed the Senate unanimously, but was not included in the final bill. I am pleased to see that this year's bill includes this requirement. In order to distinguish between necessary defense budget cuts and cuts that would harm our troops and damage military readiness, we must have reliable financial data and effective business processes and systems in place at the Pentagon. I look forward to working to ensure this important audit requirement is included in the final bill.

Acquisition Reform

I am also pleased that the NDAA approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee includes language that Senator McCain and I developed to prohibit the use of cost-type contracts for the production of major weapons systems in most cases. Cost-type contracts have a role to play in the development of some major weapons systems. However, in most cases, the use of cost-type contracts for the production of major weapons systems only facilitates spiraling acquisition costs that waste taxpayer dollars and deprive our warfighters of the resources they need. We can neither afford nor tolerate such wasteful acquisition habits going forward. I congratulate the department on their efforts to rein-in out of control acquisition costs, and I believe our provision in the NDAA regarding the use of cost-type contracts represents an important contribution in this effort.

MEADS

I am also encouraged that the Senate Armed Services Committee adopted the amendment I introduced, along with Senators Begich and McCain and others, to prohibit any funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), a troubled weapons program that the Pentagon has said it does not plan to procure. The Department of Defense (DOD) chose to ignore both current law and congressional direction and requested $400.9 million for MEADS in the FY 2013 budget. Yet, the inclusion of our prohibition in this year's bill sends a clear message to the Pentagon and to the appropriators: our nation must not waste any more money on MEADS.

Military Construction Reform

As the Department of Defense struggles to fund key readiness priorities within a tightening budgetary environment, it is imperative that contracts for the construction of DOD facilities comply with the law by not exceeding the scope of work authorized by Congress. Several recent Army and Air Force projects have exceeded the size specifically authorized by Congress in prior NDAAs. For

this reason, I believe the inclusion of my provision to amend Section 2853 is essential to ensure the department provides unambiguous and comprehensive guidance to prevent human errors in military construction projects that have resulted in a violation of the law.

Readiness

Nuclear Modernization

A reliable and modern nuclear deterrent is central to American national security. A credible nuclear arsenal deters potential enemies from launching a nuclear attack against our country or our allies. A strong and dependable U.S. nuclear deterrent also helps prevent nuclear proliferation by assuring friendly nations that a nuclear program is unnecessary. When the U.S. fails to maintain a reliable and modern nuclear deterrent we undermine these objectives which are central to the security of our country.

The Senate's ratification of the New START Treaty was contingent on the administration's commitment to modernize the United States nuclear complex and strategic delivery systems. Section 1251 of the fiscal year (FY) 2010 NDAA required that the administration submit a 10-year modernization plan. In response to this statutory requirement, in November 2010, the administration pledged to provide sufficient funding over the next five years relative to the initial plan provided to Congress in May 2010.

While our nation's fiscal crisis demands that we make difficult budget decisions, reductions to nuclear force levels mandated by New START cannot be made without unacceptable risk unless the arsenal and the weapons complex are modernized. For these reasons, I believe the inclusion of the nuclear modernization provision that I developed, along with Senator Lieberman, in the Senate Armed Services Committee version of the NDAA represents a positive step. This provision will require the president to annually certify whether plans to modernize or replace strategic nuclear delivery systems are fully funded. If the president does not fully fund modernization plans, he must report to Congress on the impact this lack of funding will have on U.S. military capability and provide a plan to address this capability shortfall.

Maritime Prepositioning

Last year, the Navy announced plans to place six of 16 ships from the three squadron Maritime Prepositioning Forces (MPF) for the Marine Corps into "reduced operating status" beginning in fiscal year (FY) 13. This year, the Navy wants to go a step further and actually wants to eliminate one of the three maritime prepositioning squadrons and to reduce the number of maritime prepositioning ships to 12 in FY 13. The maritime prepositioning squadron that would be eliminated is the squadron in the Mediterranean Sea. Eliminating this squadron in the Mediterranean region would slow the Marine Corps' response time in the Mediterranean region, as well as along the west coast of Africa.

While the Navy and Marine Corps have made a reasonable effort to identify risk mitigation strategies for this budget-driven decision, important questions remain. For example, the Marines have

cited the Marine Corps Prepositioning Program-Norway (MCPP–N) as a key way of mitigating the risk associated with the elimination of a maritime prepositioning squadron. Yet, significant questions remain regarding MCPP–N, including the kind of equipment stored there, the maintenance status of this equipment, shortfalls in the equipment, as well as how long it will take to load this equipment on ships and deliver it to the contingency location. I believe it is important to fully understand the strategic risk associated with the Navy's plan before it moves forward in order to ensure the U.S. military maintains its readiness and can continue to respond quickly to contingencies. I am pleased that my amendment to the NDAA was included, requiring the Navy and Marine Corps to answer these questions before proceeding with the retirement of one of the maritime prepositioning squadrons.

Army Dwell Time and Involuntary Separations

As the Army implements end strength reductions in the coming years, it is essential to closely monitor the impact of these reductions on dwell time and the use of involuntary separations. The U.S. Army is currently planning to implement a 72,000 soldier reduction in the overall size of the Army between now and fiscal year 2017. Depending on the future demand for U.S. ground forces, this reduction may exacerbate dwell times for many units that are struggling to give their soldiers sufficient time at home between deployments. This time at home allows units to train for the full spectrum of potential missions, to repair equipment, and to recuperate with their families. When time between deployments is cut short, all three areas suffer. Short dwell times undermine our military's readiness for future contingencies.

I am also concerned about the Army's planned use of involuntary separations in order to achieve end strength reduction goals. Thomas Lamont, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, testified that approximately 23,000–24,000 enlisted soldiers and 4,500–5,000 officers may have to be involuntarily separated from the Army to achieve the end strength reduction. I am pleased that the NDAA passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee includes my provision that will require the Army and Marine Corps to provide periodic reports regarding their use of involuntary separations. I believe involuntarily separating some of our best soldiers—many of whom will have deployed overseas multiple times—represents an unacceptable breach of faith with service members and their families who have sacrificed much for our country. Forcing pink slips into the hands of thousands of battle-hardened soldiers as they return home from deployments in order to meet an arbitrary and budget-driven reduction in the size of the Army could also endanger the morale of those who continue to serve.

Using my reporting requirement included in this year's NDAA, I plan to monitor Army dwell times carefully over the coming years to ensure our soldiers have sufficient time at home between deployments to recuperate with their families, repair their equipment, and train for full spectrum operations. I also plan to monitor the Army's use of involuntary separations to ensure we treat our serv-

ice members justly and that we do not take personnel actions that could damage the morale and readiness of the all-volunteer force.

Naval Fleet

The Chief of Naval Operations testified last year that the Navy needs 313 ships and submarines to meet its strategic requirements. The Navy currently has about 285 ships and subs. As a result, the Navy cannot meet many combatant commander requirements. For example, the Navy can only meet 61 percent of combatant commander requirements for attack submarines. Despite being approximately 30 ships short of the requirement and the inability of the Navy to meet combatant commander requirement, there are reports that the Navy may soon drop the requirement from 313 to 300 ships and submarines. In light of the President's strategy and the new focus on the Asia-Pacific, current operational requirements, and the emergence of competitors challenging U.S. naval dominance, it is difficult to understand why the Navy's requirement for ships would be potentially declining. I am pleased that the SASC-approved NDAA includes my provision that will require the Navy to confirm the current requirement for ships and submarines and justify any change to the Navy's requirement.

Detainees

I am pleased that the NDAA passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee includes provisions to extend the prohibition on the use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the U.S. for use by detainees transferred from Guantanamo. I am also pleased that the NDAA extends to 2013 the requirements for certifications on transfers of detainees to foreign countries and entities.

However, I was disappointed this year's NDAA did not extend the prohibition on the transfer or release to or within the U.S. of Guantanamo detainees. We have a top-rate facility at Guantanamo that allows for the secure and humane detention and interrogation of foreign terrorist detainees. It is unclear why this prohibition against bringing Guantanamo detainees to the U.S. would not have been extended into 2013, and I worry that it may signal an effort by the administration to bring Guantanamo detainees to the U.S.

When the NDAA goes to the floor later this year, I plan to introduce an amendment to extend this prohibition on the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to the U.S. through 2013.

I am also perplexed that the NDAA does not address the fact that our military still does not have a designated facility for the detention and interrogation of foreign terrorists. President Obama has sought to close Guantanamo and has refused to put new detainees there despite the repeated testimony of our military leaders that a designated detention facility for the long-term detention and interrogation of foreign terrorists would be very helpful. This refusal has put our military leaders in a difficult and dangerous situation. The lack of a designated long-term detention facility has forced our military to use sub-standard, ad-hoc workarounds as they did in the case of Abdul Kadir Warsarme.

For the last year and a half, witness after witness has come before the Senate Armed Services Committee, including the Commander of Special Operations Command, Admiral McRaven, and

testified that there is no plan for where we would detain and interrogate someone like Ayman al-Zawahiri if we were to capture him.

In April 2011, I questioned General Carter Ham, the Commander of Africa Command, about what we would do if we captured a member of al Qaeda in Africa. He said he would need, "some lawyerly help on answering that one." That is testimony we should never hear from a combatant commander.

The lack of a designated long-term detention facility also encourages the release of former Guantanamo detainees. Yet, almost 28% of detainees who have been released from Guantanamo have reengaged or are suspected of having reengaged in terrorist activity. Former Guantanamo detainees are conducting suicide bombings, recruiting radicals, and training them to kill Americans and our allies. Said al Shihri and Abdul Zakir represent two examples of former Guantanamo detainees who returned to the fight and assumed leadership positions in terrorist organizations dedicated to killing Americans and our allies. Said al Shihri has worked as the No. 2 in al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Abdul Zakir now serves as a top Taliban military commander and a senior leader in the Taliban Quetta Shura.

In February 2011, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Michael Vickers, said, "The administration is in the final stages of establishing its detention policy." More than a year later, we are still waiting. On March 6, 2012, during a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, I asked the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command, Admiral McRaven, whether anything had changed in the last year and whether we had a designated facility for the long-term detention and interrogation of foreign terrorist detainees. Admiral McRaven responded, "No, ma'am, nothing has changed since then."

This absence of a designated long-term detention and interrogation facility for foreign terrorists, consistent with the laws of war, represents a major national security shortcoming. I look forward to addressing this issue when the NDAA goes to the floor of the U.S. Senate for consideration.

KELLY AYOTTE.

○