

**Union Calendar No. 852**

115th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Report 115-1100

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
FOR THE  
ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS



DECEMBER 21, 2018.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

33-917

WASHINGTON : 2018

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	ADAM SMITH, Washington
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
ROB BISHOP, Utah	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	RICK LARSEN, Washington
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	JACKIE SPEIER, California
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
MO BROOKS, Alabama	BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
PAUL COOK, California	DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama	RUBEN GALLEGO, Arizona
SAM GRAVES, Missouri	SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii
MARTHA McSALLY, Arizona	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	JACKY ROSEN, Nevada
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma	A. DONALD McEACHIN, Virginia
SCOTT DesJARLAIS, Tennessee	SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California
RALPH LEE ABRAHAM, Louisiana	ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland
TRENT KELLY, Mississippi	STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida
MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin	RO KHANNA, California
MATT GAETZ, Florida	TOM O'HALLERAN, Arizona
DON BACON, Nebraska	THOMAS R. SUOZZI, New York
JIM BANKS, Indiana	JIMMY PANETTA, California
LIZ CHENEY, Wyoming	
JODY B. HICE, Georgia	
PAUL MITCHELL, Michigan	

JEN STEWART, *Staff Director*

ZACH STEACY, *Director, Legislative Operations*

**LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, December 21, 2018.*

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. HAAS: Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present herewith the report on the activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 115th Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, *Chairman.*



# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Powers and Duties .....	1
Committee Rules .....	04
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services .....	17
Committee Staff .....	23
Committee Meetings and Hearings .....	25
Legislative Activities .....	26
Oversight Activities .....	35
Publications .....	127



## Union Calendar No. 852

115TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
115-1100

---

---

### REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

---

DECEMBER 21, 2018.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

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

### R E P O R T POWERS AND DUTIES

#### Background

The House Committee on Armed Services, a standing committee of Congress, was established on January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812), by merging the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. The Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs were established in 1882. In 1885, jurisdiction over military and naval appropriations was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and given to the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, respectively. This practice continued until July 1, 1920, when jurisdiction over all appropriations was again placed in the Committee on Appropriations.

In the 93rd Congress, following a study by the House Select Committee on Committees, the House passed H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to be effective January 3, 1975. As a result of those amendments, the jurisdictional areas of the Committee on Armed Services remained essentially unchanged. However, oversight functions were amended to require each standing committee to review and study on a continuing basis all matters and jurisdiction of the committee. Also, the Committee on Armed Services was to review and study on a continuing basis all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with or involv-

ing international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in school.

The rules changes adopted by the House (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1977, placed new responsibilities in the field of atomic energy in the Committee on Armed Services. Those responsibilities involved the national security aspects of atomic energy previously within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Public Law 95-110, effective September 20, 1977, abolished the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

With the adoption of H. Res. 658 on July 14, 1977, which established the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Service over intelligence matters was changed. That resolution gave the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence oversight responsibilities for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs of the U.S. Government. Specifically, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has exclusive legislative jurisdiction regarding the Central Intelligence Agency and the director of Central Intelligence, including authorizations. Also, legislative jurisdiction over all intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs was vested in the permanent select committee except that other committees with a jurisdictional interest may request consideration of any such matters. Accordingly, as a matter of practice, the Committee on Armed Services shared jurisdiction over the authorization process involving intelligence-related activities.

The committee continues to have shared jurisdiction over military intelligence activities as set forth in rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

With the adoption of House rules (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1995, the Committee on National Security was established as the successor committee to the Committee on Armed Services, and was granted additional legislative and oversight authority over merchant marine academies, national security aspects of merchant marine policy and programs, and interoceanic canals. Rules for the 104th Congress also codified the existing jurisdiction of the committee over tactical intelligence matters and the intelligence related activities of the Department of Defense.

On January 6, 1999, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 106th Congress, in which the Committee on National Security was redesignated as the Committee on Armed Services.

On January 5, 2012, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 112th Congress, which clarified the Committee on Armed Services jurisdiction over Department of Defense administered cemeteries.

#### Constitutional Powers and Duties

The powers and duties of Congress in relation to national defense matters stem from Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides, among other things that Congress shall have power:

- To raise and support Armies;
- To provide and maintain a Navy;
- To make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
- To provide for calling forth the Militia;



To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States;

To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over all Places purchased . . . for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; and

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

#### House Rules on Jurisdiction

Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives established the jurisdiction and related functions for each standing committee. Under the rule, all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall be referred to such committee. The jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule X is as follows:

(1) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; and Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.

(2) Common defense generally.

(3) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

(4) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, generally.

(5) Interoceanic canals generally, including measures relating to the maintenance, operation, and administration of interoceanic canals.

(6) Merchant Marine Academy and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

(8) Tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense.

(9) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference, and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security.

(10) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

(11) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

(12) Selective service.

(13) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

(15) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

(16) Cemeteries administered by the Department of Defense.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction and general oversight function, the Committee on Armed Services has special oversight functions with respect to international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in schools.

### Investigative Authority and Legislative Oversight

H. Res. 988 of the 93rd Congress, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, amended clause 1(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to provide general authority for each committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That amendment established a permanent investigative authority and relieved the committee of the former requirement of obtaining a renewal of the investigative authority by a House resolution at the beginning of each Congress. H. Res. 988 also amended rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by requiring, as previously indicated, that standing committees are to conduct legislative oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, and by establishing specific oversight functions for the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee derives its authority to conduct oversight from, among other things, clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to general oversight responsibilities), clause 3(b) of rule X (relating to special oversight functions), and clause 1(b) of rule XI (relating to investigations and studies).

## COMMITTEE RULES

The committee held its organizational meeting on January 12, 2017, and adopted the following rules governing rules and procedure for oversight hearings conducted by the full committee and its subcommittees.

(H.A.S.C. 115–1; Committee Print No. 1)

### RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the “Committee”) and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Chairman”), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to

it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee Chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee Chairmen, and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

#### RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

##### (a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. In addition, the committee will be responsible for intelligence policy (including coordination of military intelligence programs), national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements that are part of the Intelligence Community. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of seven standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, and Department of Energy national security programs.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations; and the Cooperative Threat Reduction program.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Membership of the Subcommittees

(1) Subcommittee memberships, with the exception of membership on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively. Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all other Majority members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all other Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(4) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

## RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

### (a) Committee Panels

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

### (b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces

(1) The Chairman of the Committee, or a Chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as Chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall similarly appoint the Ranking Minority Member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee whose Chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

## RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred

thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

#### RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three days before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

## RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee or subcommittee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject

to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the



foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may be recognized by a subcommittee chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

#### RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee

or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:  
 “Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

#### RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or the most senior Minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, Minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter. (c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)(B)(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

#### RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Confidential or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information that is received which is classified as Confidential or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

#### RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or chairmen

of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

#### RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than January 2nd of each odd-numbered year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.



## COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

### FULL COMMITTEE

Pursuant to H. Res. 6 (agreed to on January 3, 2017), H. Res. 34 (agreed to on January 9, 2017), H. Res. 36 (agreed to on January 10, 2017), H. Res. 45 (agreed to on January 11, 2017), H. Res. 95 (agreed to on February 7, 2017), H. Res. 412 (agreed to on June 27, 2017), H. Res. 439 (agreed to on July 12, 2017), H. Res. 685 (agreed to on January 11, 2018), and H. Res. 844 (agreed to on April 25, 2018), the following Members have served on the Committee on Armed Services in the 115th Congress:

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina  
 JOE WILSON, South Carolina  
 FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey  
 ROB BISHOP, Utah  
 MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio  
 MIKE ROGERS, Alabama  
 TRENT FRANKS,<sup>8</sup> Arizona  
 BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania  
 K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas  
 DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado  
 ROBERT WITTMAN, Virginia  
 DUNCAN HUNTER,<sup>13</sup> California  
 MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado  
 VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri  
 AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia  
 MO BROOKS, Alabama  
 PAUL COOK, California  
 JIM BRIDENSTINE,<sup>10</sup> Oklahoma  
 BRAD R. WENSTRUP,<sup>12</sup> Ohio  
 BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama  
 SAM GRAVES, Missouri  
 ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York  
 MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona  
 STEPHEN KNIGHT, California  
 STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma  
 SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee  
 RALPH LEE ABRAHAM, Louisiana  
 TRENT KELLY, Mississippi  
 MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin  
 MATT GAETZ, Florida  
 DON BACON, Nebraska  
 JIM BANKS, Indiana  
 LIZ CHENEY, Wyoming  
 JODY HICE,<sup>9</sup> Georgia  
 PAUL MITCHELL,<sup>11</sup> Michigan

ADAM SMITH, Washington, *Ranking Member*  
 ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania  
 SUSAN A. DAVIS, California  
 JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island  
 RICK LARSEN, Washington  
 JIM COOPER, Tennessee  
 MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam  
 JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut  
 NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts  
 JOHN GARAMENDI, California  
 JACKIE SPEIER, California  
 MARC A. VEASEY, Texas  
 TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii  
 BETO O'ROURKE, Texas  
 DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey  
 RUBEN GALLEGU, Arizona  
 SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts  
 COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii  
 CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire  
 JACKY ROSEN, Nevada  
 A. DONALD McEACHIN, Virginia  
 SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California  
 ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland  
 STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida  
 RO KHANNA, California  
 SCOTT H. PETERS,<sup>1</sup> California  
 PETE AGUILAR,<sup>2</sup> California  
 JOAQUIN CASTRO,<sup>3</sup> Texas  
 TOM O'HALLERAN,<sup>4</sup> Arizona  
 THOMAS R. SUOZZI,<sup>5</sup> New York  
 TIMOTHY J. WALZ,<sup>6</sup> Minnesota  
 JIMMY PANETTA,<sup>7</sup> California

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Peters resigned from the committee on February 6, 2017.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Aguilar resigned from the committee on February 6, 2017.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Castro resigned from the committee on February 6, 2017.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. O'Halleran was elected to the committee on February 7, 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Mr. Suozzi was elected to the committee on February 7, 2017.

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Walz was elected to the committee on June 27, 2017, and resigned from the committee on July 12, 2017.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. Panetta was elected to the committee on July 12, 2017.

<sup>8</sup> Mr. Franks resigned from the House of Representatives on December 8, 2017.

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Hice was elected to the committee on January 11, 2018.

<sup>10</sup> Mr. Bridenstine resigned from the House of Representatives on April 23, 2018.

<sup>11</sup> Mr. Mitchell was elected to the committee on April 25, 2018.

<sup>12</sup> Mr. Wenstrup resigned from the committee on May 16, 2018.

<sup>13</sup> Mr. Hunter resigned from the committee on August 24, 2018.



## SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following subcommittees were established at the committee's organizational meeting on January 12, 2017.

### Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations; and the Cooperative Threat Reduction program.

ELISE M. STEFANIK, *New York, Chairwoman*

BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, <sup>3</sup> Ohio	RICK LARSEN, Washington
RALPH LEE ABRAHAM, Louisiana	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
LIZ CHENEY, Wyoming, <i>Vice Chair</i>	JACKIE SPEIER, California
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
TRENT FRANKS, <sup>1</sup> Arizona	BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	
JODY HICE, <sup>2</sup> Georgia	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Franks resigned from the House of Representatives on December 8, 2017.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Hice was assigned to the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on January 11, 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Wenstrup resigned from the committee on May 16, 2018.

### Subcommittee on Military Personnel

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

MIKE COFFMAN, *Colorado, Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	JACKIE SPEIER, California
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, <sup>1</sup> Ohio, <i>Vice Chair</i>	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
DON BACON, Nebraska	RUBEN GALLEGUO, Arizona
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
RALPH LEE ABRAHAM, Louisiana	JACKY ROSEN, Nevada
TRENT KELLY, Mississippi	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Wenstrup resigned from the committee on May 16, 2018.

### Subcommittee on Readiness

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure

process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

JOE WILSON, South Carolina, *Chairman*

ROB BISHOP, Utah	MADELINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	A. DONALD McEACHIN, Virginia
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California
MARTHA McSALLY, Arizona, <i>Vice Chair</i>	ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee	STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida
TRENT KELLY, Mississippi	RO KHANNA, California
MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin	

### Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia, *Chairman*

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama, <i>Vice Chair</i>	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee	MADELINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
DUNCAN HUNTER, <sup>3</sup> California	DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
PAUL COOK, California	SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
JIM BRIDENSTINE, <sup>1</sup> Oklahoma	COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California	A. DONALD McEACHIN, Virginia
RALPH LEE ABRAHAM, Louisiana	
PAUL MITCHELL, <sup>2</sup> Michigan	

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bridenstine resigned from the House of Representatives on April 23, 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Mitchell was assigned to the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on April 25, 2018.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Hunter resigned from the committee on August 24, 2018.

### Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, and Department of Energy national security programs.

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*TRENT FRANKS,<sup>1</sup> Arizona, *Vice Chair*

DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado

DUNCAN HUNTER,<sup>5</sup> California

MO BROOKS, Alabama

JIM BRIDENSTINE,<sup>3</sup> Oklahoma

MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio

MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado

BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama

SAM GRAVES, Missouri

JODY HICE,<sup>2</sup> GeorgiaPAUL MITCHELL,<sup>4</sup> Michigan

JIM COOPER, Tennessee

SUSAN A. DAVIS, California

RICK LARSEN, Washington

JOHN GARAMENDI, California

BETO O'ROURKE, Texas

DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey

COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii

RO KHANNA, California

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Franks resigned from the House of Representatives on December 8, 2017.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Hice was assigned to the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on January 11, 2018.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Bridenstine resigned from the House of Representatives on April 23, 2018.<sup>4</sup> Mr. Mitchell was assigned to the Subcommittees on Strategic Forces on April 25, 2018.<sup>5</sup> Mr. Hunter resigned from the committee on August 24, 2018.

## Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey

PAUL COOK, California, *Vice Chair*

SAM GRAVES, Missouri

MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona

STEPHEN KNIGHT, California

TRENT KELLY, Mississippi

MATT GAETZ, Florida

DON BACON, Nebraska

JIM BANKS, Indiana

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina

ROB BISHOP, Utah

ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia

MO BROOKS, Alabama

NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts

JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island

JIM COOPER, Tennessee

MARC A. VEASEY, Texas

RUBEN GALLEGU, Arizona

JACKY ROSEN, Nevada

SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California

ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland

TOM O'HALLERAN,<sup>1</sup> ArizonaTHOMAS R. SUOZZI,<sup>2</sup> New YorkJIMMY PANETTA,<sup>3</sup> California<sup>1</sup> Mr. O'Halleran was assigned to the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on February 7, 2017.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Suozzi was assigned to the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on February 7, 2017.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Panetta was assigned to the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on July 12, 2017.

## Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri, *Chairwoman*

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas  
MATT GAETZ, Florida  
JIM BANKS, Indiana  
LIZ CHENEY, Wyoming  
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia

SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts  
TOM O'HALLERAN,<sup>1</sup> Arizona  
THOMAS R. SUOZZI,<sup>2</sup> New York  
JIMMY PANETTA,<sup>3</sup> California

---

<sup>1</sup>Mr. O'Halleran was assigned to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on February 7, 2017.

<sup>2</sup>Mr. Suozzi was assigned to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on February 7, 2017.

<sup>3</sup>Mr. Panetta was assigned to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on July 12, 2017.

## COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 12, 2017, or by authority of the chairman, the following persons have been appointed to the staff of the committee during the 115th Congress:

Jen Stewart, *Staff Director (appointed September 5, 2017)*  
Bob Simmons, *Staff Director (resigned June 8, 2017)*  
Jenness Simler, *Deputy Staff Director (resigned November 9, 2017)*  
Andrew Peterson, *Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel (resigned September 14, 2018)*  
Betty B. Gray, *Executive Assistant*  
John F. Sullivan, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jesse D. Tolleson, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*  
Paul Arcangeli, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jeanette S. James, *Professional Staff Member (resigned April 7, 2017)*  
Rebecca A. Ross, *Professional Staff Member*  
Heath R. Bope, *Professional Staff Member*  
John Wason, *Professional Staff Member (resigned September 21, 2018)*  
Douglas Bush, *Professional Staff Member*  
Vickie Plunkett, *Professional Staff Member (resigned August 2, 2017)*  
Kevin Gates, *Professional Staff Member (resigned December 1, 2017)*  
David Sienicki, *Professional Staff Member*  
Zach Steacy, *Director, Legislative Operations*  
Everett Coleman, *Professional Staff Member*  
Craig Greene, *Professional Staff Member*  
Phil MacNaughton, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jack Schuler, *Professional Staff Member*  
John N. Johnson, *Staff Assistant*  
William S. Johnson, *Counsel*  
Jaime Cheshire, *Professional Staff Member (resigned March 9, 2017)*  
Peter Villano, *Professional Staff Member*  
Leonor Tomero, *Counsel*  
Catherine Sendak, *Professional Staff Member (resigned October 19, 2018)*  
Christopher J. Bright, *Professional Staff Member*  
Brian Garrett, *Professional Staff Member*  
Elizabeth Conrad, *Professional Staff Member (resigned October 12, 2018)*  
Andrew T. Walter, *Professional Staff Member (resigned October 4, 2018)*  
Claude Chafin, *Communications Director*  
Tim Morrison, *Counsel (resigned July 6, 2018)*  
Stephen Kitay, *Professional Staff Member (resigned June 9, 2017)*  
Katie Thompson, *Security Manager*  
Alexander Gallo, *Professional Staff Member (resigned February 10, 2017)*  
David Giachetti, *Professional Staff Member*  
Kari Bingen, *Professional Staff Member (resigned June 2, 2017)*  
Lindsay Kavanaugh, *Professional Staff Member*  
Candace Wagner, *Executive Assistant (resigned December 31, 2017)*  
Alison Lynn, *Spokesman and Director of Member Initiatives (resigned June 22, 2018)*  
Mark Morehouse, *Professional Staff Member*  
Nick Mikula, *Press Secretary (resigned October 19, 2018)*  
Craig Collier, *Professional Staff Member (resigned November 30, 2017)*  
Daniel Sennott, *Professional Staff Member*  
Bruce Johnson, *Professional Staff Member*  
Mike Gancio, *Clerk (resigned May 11, 2018)*  
Nevada Schadler, *Clerk*  
Andrew "Drew" Warren, *Professional Staff Member*  
Margaret Dean, *Professional Staff Member*

Bob Daigle, *Professional Staff Member (resigned August 2, 2017)*  
 Alexis Lasselle Ross, *Professional Staff Member (resigned February 2, 2018)*  
     Katy Quinn, *Professional Staff Member*  
     Britton Burkett, *Clerk (resigned March 16, 2018)*  
     Barron Young Smith, *Counsel*  
     Matthew Sullivan, *Counsel*  
     Emily Murphy, *Counsel (resigned January 23, 2017)*  
 Anna Waterfield, *Research Assistant (resigned April 30, 2018)*  
     Jodi Brignola, *Clerk (resigned July 28, 2017)*  
     Brian Greer, *Professional Staff Member*  
     Jason Schmid, *Professional Staff Member*  
     Megan Handal, *Clerk*  
     Andy Schulman, *Professional Staff Member*  
     Danielle Steitz, *Clerk*  
 Jennifer Bird, *Professional Staff Member (appointed February 21, 2017)*  
 Thomas Hawley, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 1, 2017)*  
 Ari Zimmerman, *Professional Staff Member (appointed April 10, 2017)*  
 Sarah Mineiro, *Professional Staff Member (appointed June 12, 2017)*  
     Shenita White, *Clerk (appointed June 28, 2017)*  
     Hannah Scheenstra, *Executive Assistant (appointed June 28, 2017)*  
     Eric Mellinger, *Professional Staff Member (appointed July 10, 2017)*  
     Glen Diehl, *Professional Staff Member (appointed October 1, 2017)*  
     Maria Vastola, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 2, 2018)*  
     Kimberly Lehn, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 19, 2018)*  
     Jamie Jackson, *Counsel (appointed February 19, 2018)*  
 Stephanie Halcrow, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 12, 2018)*  
 Hannah Thoburn, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 12, 2018)*  
     Eric Snelgrove, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 19, 2018)*  
     Justin Lynch, *Clerk (appointed April 9, 2018)*  
 Katherine Sutton, *Professional Staff Member (appointed April 10, 2018, resigned  
     December 2, 2018)*  
     Caroline Kehrli, *Clerk (appointed June 4, 2018)*  
     Zachary Taylor, *Clerk (appointed August 4, 2018)*

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

A total of 271 meetings and hearings have been held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees during the 115th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings and hearings follows:

FULL COMMITTEE .....	79
SUBCOMMITTEES:	
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	36
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	28
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	34
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces .....	28
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	26
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces .....	25
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	15

## LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

## PUBLIC LAWS

Public Law 115–2 (S. 84)—A Bill to Provide for an Exception to a Limitation Against Appointment of Persons as Secretary of Defense within Seven Years of Relief from Active Duty as a Regular Commissioned Officer of the Armed Forces

S. 84, “A bill to provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces”, was introduced on January 10, 2017, by Senator John McCain and read twice and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

On January 12, 2017, the Senate Committee on Armed Services held a markup session of S. 84. The committee ordered the bill to be reported without amendment favorably. The same day, S. 84 was reported by Senator McCain and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 2. On January 12, 2017, S. 84 was laid before the Senate by motion and that same day, the bill passed the Senate without amendment by a yea-nay vote, 81–17 (Record Vote Number: 27). The bill was received in the House and held at the desk.

Pursuant to H. Res. 48, S. 84 was considered in the House under a closed rule on January 13, 2017. The text of S. 84 was identical to the text of H.R. 393 which was reported favorably to the House by the Committee on Armed Services by a recorded vote of 34–28 on January 12, 2017. H. Res. 48 provided for 90 minutes of debate on S. 84 equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. On January 13, 2017, S. 84 was passed in the House by recorded vote, 268–151–1 (Roll no. 59). On January 20, 2017, S. 84 was presented to the President and signed into law as Public Law 115–2.

Public Law 115–91 (H.R. 2810)—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018

On June 7, 2017, H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, was introduced by Chairman William M. “Mac” Thornberry and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On June 28, 2017, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 2810. The committee ordered the bill H.R. 2810, as amended, favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a recorded vote of 60–1, a quorum being present. The bill passed the House, as amended, on July 14, 2017, by recorded vote, 344–81 (Roll no. 378). On July 18, 2017, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 175.

On September 13, 2017, the measure was laid before the Senate by motion. On September 18, 2017, the Senate passed H.R. 2810 with an amendment by a yea-nay vote, 89–8 (Record Vote Number: 199). On October 12, 2017, Chairman Thornberry requested that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference with the Senate by unanimous consent. On October 17,



2017, the Senate insisted on its amendment and agreed to the request for a conference. On November 9, 2017, the conference report to accompany H.R. 2810 (H. Rept. 115–404) was filed in the House. On November 14, 2017, the conference report was agreed to in the House by the yeas and nays, 356–70 (Roll no. 631). On November 16, 2017, the conference report was agreed to in the Senate by voice vote. The President signed the legislation on December 12, 2017, and it became Public Law 115–91.

Public Law 115–91 did the following: (1) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) authorized for fiscal year 2018 the personnel strength for each Active Duty component of the military departments, and the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (4) modified various elements of compensation for military personnel and imposed certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military construction and family housing; (6) authorized appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for the Maritime Administration.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common defense, to raise and support an Army, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides the House Committee on Armed Services with jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally and over the military application of nuclear energy. The bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities, conducted through hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions with Department of Defense and Department of Energy civilian and military officials, intelligence analysts, outside experts, and industry representatives, and informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

Public Law 115–232 (H.R. 5515)—John S. McCain National  
Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019

On April 13, 2018, H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, was introduced by Chairman William M. “Mac” Thornberry and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On May 9, 2018, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 5515. The committee ordered the bill H.R. 5515, as amended, favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a recorded vote of 60–1, a quorum being present. The bill passed the House, as amended, on May 24, 2018, by recorded vote, 351–66 (Roll no. 230). On June 4, 2018, the bill

was received in the Senate, read twice, and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 442.

On June 11, 2018, the measure was laid before the Senate by motion. On June 18, 2018, the Senate passed H.R. 5515 with an amendment by a yea-nay vote, 85–10 (Record Vote Number: 128). The short title of the bill, as passed in the Senate, was amended to the “John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019”.

On June 27, 2018, Chairman Thornberry requested that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and request a conference with the Senate by unanimous consent. On July 10, 2018, the Senate insisted on its amendment and agreed to the request for a conference by a yea-nay vote, 97–2 (Record Vote Number: 148). On July 23, 2018, the first conference report to accompany H.R. 5515 (H. Rept. 115–863) was filed in the House. However, it was determined that the conference report contained a provision that constituted a revenue measure and thus there was an origination problem with the conference report. Therefore, on July 24, 2018, pursuant to H. Res. 1019, the House recommitted the conference report back to the conference committee. On July 25, 2018, a revised version of the conference report (H. Rept. 115–874) was filed in the House that modified the provision to fix the origination problem. On July 26, 2018, the revised conference report was agreed to in the House by the yeas and nays, 359–54 (Roll no. 379). On August 1, 2018, the conference report was agreed to in the Senate by a yea-nay vote, 87–10 (Record Vote Number: 181). The President signed the legislation on August 13, 2018, and it became Public Law 115–232.

Public Law 115–232 did the following: (1) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) authorized for fiscal year 2019 the personnel strength for each Active Duty component of the military departments, and the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (4) modified various elements of compensation for military personnel and imposed certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military construction and family housing; (6) authorized appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) authorized appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for the Maritime Administration.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common defense, to raise and support an Army, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides the House Committee on Armed Services with jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally and over the military application of nuclear energy.

The bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities, conducted through hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions with Department of Defense and Department of Energy civilian and military officials, intelligence analysts, outside experts, and industry representatives, and informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

#### PRIVATE LAWS

Private Law 115–1 (H.R. 4641)—To Authorize the President to Award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for Acts of Valor during the Vietnam War while a Member of the Marine Corp

H.R. 4641, “To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps”, was introduced on December 13, 2017, by Representative Julia Brownley and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel on December 14, 2017. On December 21, 2017, Representative Mike Coffman asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill and asked for its immediate consideration in the House. There was no objection to the request, and H.R. 4641 was passed in the House by unanimous consent on December 21, 2017. The same day, the bill was received in the Senate and read twice. On January 11, 2018, H.R. 4641 passed the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent. H.R. 4641 was present to the President on January 17, 2018. It was signed into law on January 29, 2018, and became Private Law 115–1.

#### LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

##### H.R. 2052—PRIVATE Act

H.R. 2052, the PRIVATE Act, was introduced on April 6, 2017, by Representative Martha McSally and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and subsequently to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the full committee waived consideration of H.R. 2052. On May 23, 2017, Representative McSally moved to consider H.R. 2052 under suspension of the rules of the House of Representatives. On May 24, 2017, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 418–0 (Roll no. 277). On May 25, 2017, H.R. 2052 was received in the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken on H.R. 2052.

##### H.R. 3897—Gold Star Family Support and Installation Access Act of 2017

H.R. 3897, the Gold Star Family Support and Installation Access Act of 2017, was introduced on October 2, 2017, by Representative Don Bacon and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and subsequently to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel. On

November 7, 2017, Representative Bacon asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill and for its immediate consideration in the House. There was no objection to the request, and H.R. 3897 was passed in the House by unanimous consent. On November 8, 2017, H.R. 3897 was received in the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken on H.R. 3897.

H.R. 5649—Navy SEAL Chief Petty Officer William “Bill” Mulder (Ret.) Transition Improvement Act of 2018

H.R. 5649, the “Navy SEAL Chief Petty Officer William “Bill” Mulder (Ret.) Transition Improvement Act of 2018”, was introduced on April 27, 2018, by Representative Jodey C. Arrington and referred to the Committee Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs and the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. The bill was subsequently referred to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel on April 30, 2018. The Committee on Armed Services waived consideration of H.R. 5649, and on July 24, 2018, Representative David P. Roe, chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, moved to consider H.R. 5649, as amended, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended, was agreed to by a voice vote. On July 25, 2018, H.R. 5649 was received in the Senate and read twice and referred to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs. No further action has been taken on the bill.

H. CON. RES. 43—Providing Official Recognition of the Massacre of 11 African-American Soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion of the United States Army who had been Captured in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge on December 17, 1944

H. Con. Res. 43, “Providing official recognition of the massacre of 11 African-American soldiers of the 333rd Field Artillery Battalion of the United States Army who had been captured in Wereth, Belgium, during the Battle of the Bulge on December 17, 1944”, was introduced on April 4, 2017, by Representative David B. McKinley and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and subsequently to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel. On November 1, 2017, Representative Austin Scott asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the resolution and for its immediate consideration in the House. There was no objection to the request, and H. Con. Res. 43 was agreed to in the House by unanimous consent. On November 2, 2017, H. Con. Res. 43 was received in the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken on H. Con. Res. 43.

H. RES. 994—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Marine Corps Faces Significant Readiness Challenges and that Budgetary Uncertainty Impedes the Corps' Ability to Meet Ongoing and Unexpected National Security Threats, Putting United States National Security at Risk

H. Res. 994, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Marine Corps faces significant readiness challenges and that budgetary uncertainty impedes the Corps’ ability to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national security at risk”, was introduced on July 16, 2018, by Representative Mike Gallagher and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Committee on Armed Services waived consideration of H. Res. 994, and on July 17, 2018, Representative Liz Cheney moved to consider H. Res. 994, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution was agreed to by voice vote in the House on July 17, 2018.

H. RES. 995—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that the Nation Now Faces a More Complex and Grave Set of Threats than at Any Time since the End of World War II, and that the Lack of Full, On-time Funding Related to Defense Activities Puts Servicemen and Servicewomen at Risk, Harms National Security, and Aids the Adversaries of the United States

H. Res. 995, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Nation now faces a more complex and grave set of threats than at any time since the end of World War II, and that the lack of full, on-time funding related to defense activities puts servicemen and servicewomen at risk, harms national security, and aids the adversaries of the United States”, was introduced on July 16, 2018, by Representative Liz Cheney and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived consideration of H. Res. 995, and on July 17, 2018, Representative Cheney moved to consider H. Res. 995, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution was agreed to by voice vote in the House on July 17, 2018.

H. RES. 998—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy’s Total Readiness Remains in a Perilous State due to High Operational Demands, Increased Deployment Lengths, Shortened Training Periods, and Deferred Maintenance all While the Navy is Asked to “Do More with Less” as Financial Support for Critical Areas Waned in the Era of Sequestration and Without Consistent Congressional Funding

H. Res. 998, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Navy’s total readiness remains in a perilous state due to high operational demands, increased deployment lengths, shortened training periods, and deferred maintenance all while the Navy is asked to “do more with less” as financial support for critical areas waned in the era of sequestration and without consistent Congressional funding”, was introduced on July 16, 2018, by Representative Robert J. Wittman and was referred to

the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived consideration of H. Res. 998, and on July 17, 2018, Representative Liz Cheney moved to consider H. Res. 998, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution was agreed to by voice vote in the House on July 17, 2018.

H. RES. 1007—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that not Fully Resourcing the United States Army in a Timely Manner Erodes the Army’s Ability to Maintain Readiness and Poses Risk to the Army’s Ability to Conduct Military Operations

H. Res. 1007, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that not fully resourcing the United States Army in a timely manner erodes the Army’s ability to maintain readiness and poses risk to the Army’s ability to conduct military operations”, was introduced on July 23, 2018, by Representative Steve Russell and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived consideration of H. Res. 1007, and on July 25, 2018, Representative Liz Cheney moved to consider H. Res. 1007, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution was agreed to by voice vote in the House on July 25, 2018.

H. RES. 1009—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that the Lack of Timely and Predictable Funding Unnecessarily Undermines the Mission of the United States Special Operations Command and Jeopardizes the Security of the United States

H. Res. 1009, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the lack of timely and predictable funding unnecessarily undermines the mission of the United States Special Operations Command and jeopardizes the security of the United States”, was introduced on July 23, 2018, by Representative Richard Hudson and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived consideration of H. Res. 1009, and on July 25, 2018, Representative Liz Cheney moved to consider H. Res. 1009, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution was agreed to by voice vote in the House on July 25, 2018.

H. RES. 1010—Expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Air Force faces Significant Readiness Challenges due to Insufficient Personnel Levels, a Shrinking and Depleted Aircraft Fleet, and Maintenance Deferrals, All of which are Affected by Budgetary Uncertainty and Impede the Air Force’s Ability to Meet Ongoing and Unexpected National Security Threats, Putting United States National Security at Risk

H. Res. 1010, “Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Air Force faces significant readiness challenges due to insufficient personnel levels, a shrinking and depleted aircraft fleet, and maintenance deferrals, all of which are affected by budgetary uncertainty and impede the Air Force’s ability

to meet ongoing and unexpected national security threats, putting United States national security at risk”, was introduced on July 23, 2018, by Representative Jodey C. Arrington and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived consideration of H. Res. 1010, and on July 25, 2018, Representative Liz Cheney moved to consider H. Res. 1010, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House. The motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution was agreed to by voice vote in the House on July 25, 2018.

#### LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

H.R. 393—To Provide for an Exception to a Limitation Against Appointment of Persons as Secretary of Defense within Seven Years of Relief from Active Duty as a Regular Commissioned Officer of the Armed Forces

H.R. 393, “To provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces”, was introduced on January 10, 2017, by Chairman William M. “Mac” Thornberry and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

On January 12, 2017, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 393. No amendments were offered to the bill. The committee ordered the bill H.R. 393 favorably reported to the House of Representatives by a recorded vote of 34–28, a quorum being present. On February 16, 2017, H.R. 393 was placed on the Union Calendar, Calendar No. 1. No further action was taken on H.R. 393.

For further action on similar legislation, please see Public Law 115–2.





## OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

### OVERVIEW

Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, described below are actions taken and recommendations made with respect to specific areas and subjects that were identified in the oversight plan for special attention during the 115th Congress, as well as additional oversight activities not explicitly enumerated by the oversight plan.

### POLICY ISSUES

#### National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy, and Related Defense Policy Issues

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its focus on the readiness, capability, and capacity of the U.S. Armed Forces to defend national interests, on supporting the authorities and resources necessary for ongoing military operations, and on improving the agility and efficiency of the Department of Defense. The committee fulfilled its constitutional responsibilities primarily through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232).

The committee recognizes that threats to national security are ever changing. As characterized by the National Defense Strategy published in January 2018, the threat environment is “more complex and volatile than any we have experienced in recent memory”. The threat of terrorism, whether by the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria or emergent groups, will continue. In addition, the United States must not only defend her interests on land, sea, and air, but also in the continually contested new operational domains of cyber and space, adding complexity to all operations. Further, instability in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, regional aggression by the Russian Federation, destabilizing actions by the People’s Republic of China in the South and East China Seas and elsewhere, developments in nuclear and missile capabilities by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the continued spread of lethal and disruptive technologies will continue to threaten U.S. national security interests. These events and other security developments across the globe also serve to highlight the continued need for the U.S. military to be postured and ready to defend national interests and address security challenges, wherever and whenever they may arise.

The committee reviewed both the new National Security Strategy and National Defense Strategy, submitted as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328). The National Defense Strategy asserts that the “central

challenge to U.S. prosperity and security is the reemergence of long-term, strategic competition . . . by revisionist powers”, particularly Russia and China. The committee agrees with that assessment and reviewed the ability of the Department to execute this strategy during the Second Session of the 115th Congress. The committee reviewed the adequacy of the force structure, readiness of the force, supporting installation infrastructure, industrial base concerns, and resources to support the strategy. The committee evaluated the Department’s plans for readiness recovery under the increased funding provided by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123) and the risks associated with executing the National Defense Strategy with such funding. The committee sought to understand the impacts of repeated continuing resolutions on defense programs and readiness, as well as the Department’s ability to execute the National Defense Strategy if funding substantially beyond limits imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) is not sustained.

The committee continued its oversight of: ongoing military operations where U.S. forces are in harm’s way, including ongoing global counterterrorism operations; strategic reassurance and deterrence activities in Europe and the Indo-Asia-Pacific; and Department of Defense investments in readiness, capabilities, and infrastructure to ensure the U.S. Armed Forces remain capable of addressing current and emerging conventional and unconventional challenges. The committee accomplished this oversight through the conduct of hearings and briefings; engagements with defense leaders, military commanders, diplomats, academics, and private sector experts; and congressional delegation visits to military installations and U.S. forces serving abroad.

#### Readiness and Posture of the Force

The committee believes that, as a matter of principle, the military should be fully ready, trained, and equipped for the missions it is asked to do. These missions range from conducting counterterrorism and low intensity operations across the globe to possessing a credible conventional and nuclear deterrent against near-peer challengers. According to the January 2018 National Defense Strategy, the United States must achieve 11 objectives, including defending the homeland from attack; deterring adversaries from aggression against our vital interests; and ensuring common domains remain open and common. To attain these objectives, a robust, ready Joint Force is necessary. Indeed, the Department states its first line of effort is “rebuilding military readiness as we build a more lethal Joint Force”.

During the 115th Congress, the committee conducted a variety of oversight activities to assess the military services’ progress in achieving full spectrum military readiness. These activities included hearings, classified briefings, individual discussions with the military service chiefs, and travel to military training events. In addition, the committee included several provisions in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) to improve readiness and readiness reporting. Those provisions will improve oversight of full spectrum readiness through all warfighting domains, including space and cyber,

and will provide for an independent assessment by the Comptroller General of the United States. Particular attention was provided to the readiness of Forward Deployed Naval Forces following 2 collisions that killed 17 sailors in 2017, and the Navy surface fleet in general. Military aviation readiness was also the subject of several hearings, as aviation readiness showed little improvement and mishap rates increased. In general, the committee found some improvement in full spectrum readiness in the ground forces, with the naval and air forces lagging.

#### Russian Federation

The revanchist Russian Federation continues to maintain an aggressive global influence campaign, particularly evident in Ukraine and the Syrian Arab Republic. Russian military activity and its employment of unconventional and conventional tactics, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe and in Syria, were primary areas of concern for the committee in the 115th Congress. After 15 years of focus on counterterrorism operations in the greater Middle East, the committee recognizes that a greater emphasis on addressing near-peer capabilities and deterrence is necessary. The committee's oversight has concentrated on the U.S. military capabilities, capacity, posture, and readiness needed to effectively counter and deter Russia.

The Department of Defense's European Deterrence Initiative, and the resources associated with it, was a significant area of oversight for the committee. The committee sought to ensure that the increased resources were being effectively applied. The committee also maintained oversight of Department of Defense resources and tools allocated to ensure our force posture in Europe is appropriate and continued work on building the capacity of Ukraine and other NATO allies and partners to deter and defend against Russian aggression.

During the 115th Congress, the committee received several intelligence briefings on Russia's military modernization programs, its combat actions and objectives in Syria, Russia's global influence operations, including those aimed at disrupting elections, democratic institutions, and military partnerships and alliances, as well as its ongoing aggression in Ukraine. The committee held a hearing on March 22, 2017, with outside experts discussing other nations' use of hybrid warfare including Russia entitled "The Evolution of Hybrid Warfare and Key Challenges". On March 28, 2017, the Commander of U.S. European Command, General Curtis "Mike" Scaparrotti, testified to inform the committee on the fiscal year 2018 budget request as it relates to the European theater's priorities and missions. On March 15, 2018, the Commander of U.S. European Command, General Scaparrotti again testified to inform the committee on the fiscal year 2019 budget request as it relates to the European theater including missions, resources, threats, and authorization for the European Deterrence Initiative.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) contained several provisions to bolster the deterrence and defense capabilities of the United States and its allies and partners in Europe, to include authorizing \$4.65 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative, \$350.0 million for security assist-

ance, lethal defensive equipment, and training to Ukrainian forces, and additional types of training for Eastern European partners. Further, Public Law 115–91 directed the Department of Defense, in coordination with relevant departments and agencies, to develop and implement comprehensive strategies to counter threats and malign influence by the Russian Federation. Public Law 115–91 prohibits funding related to the use of Open Skies overflights and includes authorization for \$50.0 million to combat Russia’s violations of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty. Public Law 115–91 also limited military cooperation between the United States and Russia, prohibits funds for activities recognizing the sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, required the Department to examine U.S. troop requirements and the posturing of defense materiel in Europe, provided \$100.0 million in aid for joint-defense capabilities to the Baltic nations of the Republic of Lithuania, the Republic of Latvia, and the Republic of Estonia, and required a 5-year strategy for the European Deterrence Initiative.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) contained several provisions to increase deterrence measures, defense capabilities, and reassure U.S. partners and allies in Europe including authorizing \$6.3 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative, \$250.0 million for security assistance, lethal defensive equipment, and training to Ukrainian forces, and additional types of training for Eastern European partners and allies. Further, Public Law 115–232 limited military cooperation between the United States and Russia, prohibits funds for activities for recognizing the sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea, directed the Department of Defense to report to Congress on the stationing of U.S. troops in the Republic of Poland, labeled Russia a violator of the Chemical Weapons Convention, requested an assessment from the Secretary of Defense of the U.S. armed forces operational capacity in the Russian language, and expressed a sense of Congress on the importance of U.S. partners and allies in deterring Russian aggression. In addition, Public Law 115–232 directed the President to designate a member of the National Security Council to coordinate the U.S. response to malign foreign influence operations and campaigns and to submit to Congress a strategy to counter malign foreign influence operations and campaigns.

#### People’s Republic of China

The People’s Republic of China continues its efforts to assert regional and global influence; to acquire advanced technology to advance its security interests; and to modernize its military in various areas, including the development of capabilities for anti-access and area denial and power projection, and nuclear, space, and cyber capabilities. The current National Defense Strategy designates China as a strategic competitor and as a priority for the Department of Defense, and the committee’s oversight focused on the Department’s strategy, force posture, forward pre-positioning, infrastructure realignments, training and exercises, and security cooperation programs to ensure that U.S. forces are properly resourced and postured to protect U.S. national security interests

against China and are prepared to keep pace to protect U.S. national security interests.

During the 115th Congress, the committee received several member and staff intelligence briefings on China from the intelligence community and the Department of Defense. The committee held several hearings with outside experts including, “China’s Pursuit of Emerging and Exponential Technologies”, “Strategic Competition with China”, and “The Evolution of Hybrid Warfare and Key Challenges”. The committee held hearings and briefings in 2017 and 2018 with the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, Admiral Harry Harris, to inform its deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) concerning China and Indo-Pacific issues. The committee also engaged with defense and economic experts from the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission regarding their annual report to Congress.

Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232 contained several provisions regarding China and the Indo-Pacific region, requiring a strategy on China and the Indo-Pacific region, an assessment on the U.S. defense implications of China’s expanding global access, and highlighting and condemning China’s actions in the South China Sea. Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232 also strengthened key partnerships and allies, including support for Taiwan’s defense capabilities and U.S.-Taiwan senior-level engagement, joint training, military sales, and security cooperation.

Additionally, Public Law 115–232 highlighted U.S. concerns regarding China’s actions to acquire access to sensitive U.S. defense systems and technology. It revised foreign investment and export controls, specifically the number and types of transactions reviewed by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. Public Law 115–232 also prohibited the Federal Government from using or procuring certain telecommunications services or equipment of components that are manufactured by an entity controlled by the Chinese government or contracting with an entity that does, including Huawei Technologies or ZTE; required the Secretary of Defense to implement an initiative to work with academic institutions that perform defense research to limit undue influence and protect information about critical technologies, including through foreign talent programs; prohibited the use of Department of Defense funds to be used for Chinese language instruction provided by a Confucius Institute; prohibited the Department of Defense’s acquisition of sensitive materials from China; and directed the President and the Department of Defense to counter influence operations.

#### Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea remains a threat to stability on the Korean peninsula and to the United States. North Korea has advanced its nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities, to include the firing of a submarine-launched ballistic missile, taking steps towards fielding its road-mobile intercontinental ballistic missile, and expanding its asymmetric capabilities. According to the National Defense Strategy, North Korea seeks a mixture of nu-

clear, biological, chemical, conventional, and unconventional weapons and a growing ballistic missile capability. The committee monitored and oversaw the Department of Defense's strategy, force posture, capability needs, and readiness, to ensure that U.S. forces are properly resourced and postured to protect U.S. national security interests, particularly against North Korea.

During the 115th Congress, the committee received several member and staff briefings on North Korea from the intelligence community and the Department of Defense. The committee held several hearings on countering weapons of mass destruction and on issues related to cyber warfare, service readiness, and missile defense and nuclear forces, and held a classified briefing with the Commander, United States Forces of Korea, General Vincent Brooks, on the security situation on the Korean Peninsula. The committee also held hearings and briefings in 2017 and 2018 with the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, Admiral Harry Harris, to inform its deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232), on North Korea and Indo-Pacific issues. Additionally, the committee led several congressional member and staff delegations to the Republic of Korea and Japan.

Public Law 115-91 and Public Law 115-232 contained provisions that required a strategy on North Korea from the President and directed the Department of Defense, in coordination with other agencies, to report on the status of North Korea's nuclear, missile, and other weapons of mass destruction. It reaffirmed our security commitments to the Governments of Japan and South Korea and that the United States stands behind its treaty obligations and extended deterrence commitments. Public Law 115-232 also prohibited the use of Department of Defense funds to reduce the number of Armed Forces deployed to South Korea below 22,000 unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that it is in the national security interest of the United States, the reduction will not significantly undermine the security of U.S. allies, and that allies have been appropriately consulted. Public Law 115-91 and Public Law 115-232 strengthened U.S. military capability to ensure U.S. forces are ready to defend themselves and U.S. allies on the Korean peninsula and bolstered the Department of Defense's efforts to plan for and provide the necessary forces, military infrastructure, basing, logistics, and missile defense capabilities.

### Iran

The committee conducted oversight of U.S. national security policy and strategy with respect to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, placing emphasis on Iran's destabilizing activities in the Middle East region. The committee also monitored the threat posed by Iran's ballistic missile capabilities and its nuclear ambition. Additionally, the committee continued to monitor the capabilities and intentions of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps. The committee focused on Iran's military activities in the Syrian Arab Republic, the Republic of Iraq, and the Republic of Yemen.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) took steps to review U.S. military posture

within the Arabian Gulf region and increase understanding of Iran's use of commercial entities for illicit military activities.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) called on the Department of Defense to develop a strategy to counter Iran through bolstering bilateral and multilateral relationships in the Middle East region. Public Law 115-232 also modified the Annual Report on the Military Power of Iran to include consideration of Iranian support to the Houthis and cooperation with the Russian Federation. Public Law 115-232 also extended the authorization for the Counter-Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) train and equip fund to assist the Iraqi security forces and central government maintain pressure against ISIS.

#### Countering Terrorism, At-Risk and Failing States, Countering Violent Extremism and Illicit Trafficking

Since the September 11, 2001 attacks, countering the threat posed by terrorist groups has been a central mission of the Department of Defense. U.S. Armed Forces are currently deployed to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Republic of Iraq, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Republic of Yemen, the Horn of Africa, and elsewhere around the globe to maintain pressure on groups that threaten U.S. interests and such deployments will remain a priority for the Department.

The committee conducted extensive oversight on threat prioritization and counterterrorism policy, strategy, and operations. In conjunction with the National Defense Strategy released in January 2018, the committee focused on posture, special operations forces capabilities and readiness, the roles of allies and partners, and intelligence issues relevant to counterterrorism to ensure U.S. resourcing is commensurate to the threat posed by such groups. The committee recognized that a whole-of-government approach is necessary to counter the threat posed by terrorist groups. As such, the committee examined the role of the Department of Defense and how it works with other U.S. departments and agencies to achieve counterterrorism goals.

The committee also recognized that terrorist groups leverage at-risk and failing states to expand their presence, conduct operational planning, and serve as launch points for attacks against the United States and its allies and partners. The committee also focused on improving efforts to build partner nation capabilities to counter terrorism at home. Improving the capabilities of partners fighting terrorism, particularly in places like Iraq, Yemen, Afghanistan and the Federal Republic of Somalia, has been a priority for the committee.

#### *Operation Freedom's Sentinel*

The committee conducted robust oversight of the U.S. military effort in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, concentrating on the two primary U.S. military missions associated with Operation Freedom's Sentinel (OFS): conducting counterterrorism operations against al-Qaida and other terrorist groups that threaten U.S. interests; and training, advising, and assisting the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF). Through hearings and intel-

ligence briefings, the committee assessed the authorities, resources, equipment, basing, and personnel to support the OFS missions and policy objectives, including under the new South Asia strategy. Additionally, the committee examined the regional security environment, and the efforts by the Government of Afghanistan and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to deny safe havens to al-Qaida, the Haqqani Network, and other jihadist organizations.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) authorized the Afghan Security Forces Fund to support the ANDSF, including the Afghan Air Force and the Afghan Special Operations Forces. The committee will continue to monitor critical efforts in Afghanistan, such as the effectiveness of the ANDSF and its ability to sustain operations and institutional requirements.

#### *Islamic Republic of Pakistan*

The committee recognizes that Pakistan is an important, albeit imperfect, counterterrorism partner to the United States. The committee continued to conduct oversight on the broad range of security issues involving the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, including the security of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons, Pakistan’s on-going and future nuclear weapon projects, and its willingness and operational capacity to combat key terrorist groups, such as al-Qaida, the Afghan and Pakistan Taliban, the Haqqani Network, and other terrorist organizations. Moreover, the committee evaluated the terrorist activity emanating from the border area between Pakistan and Afghanistan and conducted oversight of the Department of Defense’s efforts to combat the threat.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91), the committee took steps to update the Coalition Support Fund (CSF). Specifically, CSF was revised downward such that only \$700.0 million (\$350.0 million under a waiver) was authorized to reimburse Pakistan’s investment in counterterrorism efforts. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) further revised the CSF such that Pakistan will no longer be eligible for reimbursement under the fund. Public Law 115–232, however, expanded the Border Security Fund to make Pakistan eligible for reimbursements on counterterrorism-related border projects. The committee will continue to scrutinize reimbursements to Pakistan in accordance with the law.

The committee also held a hearing on the Administration’s new South Asia Strategy that included a new approach to the bilateral relationship with Pakistan.

#### *Operation Inherent Resolve*

The United States and coalition forces have been successful in liberating nearly all of the territory held by the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS), but these forces continue to work with partners to conduct stability operations against ISIS to maintain security and to invest in long-term stability in the region. During the 115th Congress, U.S. and coalition operations conducted an air



campaign that was focused against ISIS in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic; training, equipping, advising, and assisting of Iraqi Security Forces and partnered forces on the ground in Syria; and force protection of U.S. forces and facilities deployed. Through classified briefings and an open hearing, the committee focused its oversight activity on ensuring the Department had the appropriate authorities, resources, equipment, basing, and personnel to support the defeat of ISIS.

In conjunction with the National Defense Strategy, the committee also examined the presence and influence exerted by other states in Syria, particularly the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Republic of Turkey. Finally, through the National Defense Authorization Act for 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) the committee provided authorization and full funding for the Iraq Train and Equip Fund, the Syria Train and Equip Fund, and extended the authorization for the Office of Security Cooperation. Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232 also required the Department of Defense to draft and submit a strategy for U.S. involvement in Syria and a strategy to normalize U.S. security assistance programming in Iraq.

#### *Republic of Yemen*

The security situation in the Republic of Yemen, including counterterrorism objectives and the Yemeni civil war, was a significant focus for the committee. The committee maintained its oversight of the U.S. military's counterterrorism activities in Yemen, U.S. support to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in Yemen, and the status of the Saudi-led coalition efforts to counter the Houthi militia.

The committee also monitored the capability and intent of Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) to conduct transnational terrorist attacks and associated U.S. counterterrorism efforts against AQAP. The committee held numerous briefings on Yemen and engaged with allies and partners in the region to better understand anti-Houthi effort in Yemen. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) required the Department of Defense to submit a report on Saudi Arabia's military action in Yemen and to detail Saudi Arabia's compliance with international law and human rights standards. Separately, the committee required the President to submit a comprehensive military and diplomatic strategy for Yemen.

In the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) the committee required the Secretary of State to certify that Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates are making a good faith effort to resolve the conflict through diplomatic channels, are contributing to and facilitating access for humanitarian assistance missions in Yemen, and are working toward reducing civilian casualties or to grant a waiver if the Secretary deems it to be in the national security interest of the United States. Public Law 115–232 also expanded a border security authority such that the Department of Defense may reimburse the Sultanate of Oman for projects intended to shore up the Omani border against AQAP.

*Africa*

The committee maintained its oversight of Department of Defense activities in Africa during the 115th Congress. Additionally, the committee continued to examine the Department's coordination within the interagency to ensure the range of the Department's activities occurring in Africa contributed to U.S. national security objectives. As the Department's efforts to train and equip African partners to provide regional security continue, the committee increased its focus on the Department's execution of the programs, the development of defense institutions in African nations, and the ability of African partner nations to absorb and sustain the assistance provided. The committee paid particular attention to the effect that security cooperation reform measures adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) have on the Department's programs and activities in Africa. Further, the committee continued to monitor the Department's efforts, in coordination with other U.S. Government agencies, to develop the security conditions necessary to advance governance and stability on the continent.

The committee continued to express its concern about the ability of the Department of Defense to respond to crises on the continent of Africa. In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted that personnel recovery and casualty evacuation are critical enablers to U.S. Africa Command's (AFRICOM) conduct of operations. Additionally, the committee noted that international partners such as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic, Japan, and the United Arab Emirates, plus multinational organizations such as the European Union and African Union, and many others, conduct programs to build partner capacity in Africa, and that U.S. programs may be duplicative or in conflict with international partners' activities, or that gaps in capabilities may exist. The committee therefore directed the Department to provide a briefing on the steps being taken to coordinate security cooperation activities in Africa with international partners.

On February 15 and 16, 2017, the committee received a classified briefing entitled "Trends in Global Terrorism" and held an open hearing entitled "The Evolving Threat of Terrorism and Effective CT Strategies", which both addressed threats in Africa. Committee members received an update from General Thomas D. Waldhauser, the Commander, U.S. Africa Command, at a closed roundtable on March 30, 2017. In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee noted its concern about the ability of the Department of Defense to provide rapid response to crises in Africa. The Department provided a staff-level briefing on the issue on December 13, 2017. On March 6, 2018, the committee held a hearing entitled "National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in Africa", followed by a closed, classified briefing, with General Waldhauser. The committee conducted member and staff travel to Africa and to AFRICOM headquarters in Germany and England to gain additional insight into issues related to security on the continent. Additionally, the committee received numerous staff-level

briefings on security threats and other developments across the continent.

In North Africa, the committee continued to conduct oversight of outside influences in the region and the evolving security situation caused primarily by the tenuous political environment in the State of Libya and the effect of Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, the Islamic State, and other jihadist groups in this region. The committee paid particular attention to the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria's (ISIS) presence in the region. In H. Rept. 115-676, the committee noted the importance of the Trans-Saharan Counterterrorism Partnership (TSCTP), and directed the Department of Defense to provide a briefing on the TSCTP, including any activities or partner engagement related to military, counter-terrorism, and law-enforcement capacity-building, as well as public diplomacy and information operations.

In East Africa, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's efforts to counter threats and to prevent transnational attacks on the United States, its allies and partners, or its interests. In particular, the committee remained focused on the security situation in the Federal Republic of Somalia, U.S. support to African Union in Somalia (AMISOM) forces, inter-agency coordination, and the development of Somali forces to provide for Somalia's security. Moreover, the committee continued to monitor the ideological, strategic, and operational coordination and conflict between Horn of Africa groups, such as Al Shabaab, and other terrorist organizations. In March 2018, Chairman William M. "Mac" Thornberry visited the region to conduct oversight of Department of Defense activities. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) specifically required the President to provide a strategy to achieve long-term security and stability in Somalia. The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa's (CJTF-HOA) ability to execute assigned missions and taskings. In H. Rept. 115-676, the committee directed the Department to monitor and evaluate the impact of CJTF-HOA's activities to counter violent extremism in Africa and provide a report to Congress. Additionally, in the conference report (H. Rept. 115-874) accompanying the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the conferees directed the Department to provide a briefing on the Chinese military installation in the Republic of Djibouti.

In West Africa, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's efforts to counter threats throughout the region. In particular, the committee focused on threats emanating from the Republic of Mali and in the Lake Chad Basin region. Following the October 4, 2017, attack resulting in the death of four American soldiers, the committee received an update on military operations in Niger, and received a classified briefing from Department of Defense officials on May 7, 2018, entitled "Investigation of the October 4, 2017 Attack in Niger." The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) required the Department to submit a report on its missions, operations, and activities in Niger. The committee also paid attention to the continuing ideological, strategic, and operational evolution of organizations such as Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, Boko

Haram, and the Islamic State West Africa Province, and also explored the geographic overlap and operational interaction with other terrorist groups on the continent. Public Law 115–91 specifically required the President to provide a strategy to improve defense institutions and security sector forces in Nigeria.

In Central Africa, the committee conducted oversight of the Department of Defense’s activities to transition its support of the Uganda Peoples’ Defense Force and other national militaries to counter the Lord’s Resistance Army and apprehend or remove Joseph Kony.

#### *Central and South America*

The committee continued to oversee the programs and policies of the Department of Defense related to Central and South America. In particular, the committee maintained oversight of programs relating to the Republic of Colombia and the Northern Triangle of Central America, including the Republic of Honduras, the Republic of Guatemala and the Republic of El Salvador. The committee paid particular attention to how violence related to transnational organized crime affected security and stability in the region. The committee hosted discussions with U.S. military commanders and foreign ambassadors to better understand the regional security environment, the budget and priorities of U.S. Southern Command, and key regional developments including the implementation of the peace process in Colombia.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included the re-authorization of Department of Defense counter narcotics authorities for Colombia and authorized additional funding for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and resources for U.S. Southern Command.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) required a report on U.S. Government programs relating to security cooperation with and assistance to the United Mexican States and a report on Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador regarding narcotics trafficking corruption and illicit activities.

#### *Detainee policy and related matters*

The committee continued its oversight of detainee policy, including detainees held at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO), as well as detainees held in areas of operations.

With respect to detainees held at GTMO, the committee continued to monitor transfer and release policies and practices, as well as the application of the Military Commissions Act (Public Law 109–366; Public Law 111–84) that established the current legal framework governing the operation of military tribunals to try detainees for war crimes and codified some of the procedural rights of GTMO detainees. The chairwoman of the Subcommittee for Oversight and Investigation led a congressional delegation of nine other committee members to Joint Task Force-Guantanamo on April 3, 2017, to observe the detention operations first-hand and to be briefed on the detention facility’s operations. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91)

extended until December 31, 2018, prohibitions on the transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States, the construction or modification of facilities in the United States to house GTMO detainees, and the transfer of GTMO detainees to Libya, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, and the Republic of Yemen. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) further extended these provisions until December 31, 2019. Public Law 115–91 also required a new report on the feasibility and advisability of expanding the availability of military commissions proceedings that are made open to the public, and expressed the sense of Congress that military judges overseeing GTMO military commissions should consider making arrangements to take recorded testimony from victims and their families.

The committee received staff-level briefings on the policies and practices regarding detainees held in areas of operations.

### Cyberwarfare

The committee continued to oversee the changing policy and authority framework to ensure that cyberwarfare capabilities can be executed as a standalone capability, or fully integrated into an operational plan in concert with other conventional capabilities. The committee worked to ensure that there is a clear understanding of rules of engagement, as well as how international legal frameworks, like the laws of war, apply in these instances. In addition to developing proper funding authorities that may be required for offensive operations, the committee oversaw interagency coordination and deconflicting areas of overlap. The committee increased its oversight on evolving deterrence concepts and the ways in which cyber may be changing the traditional understanding of the escalation ladder. The committee monitored the development of international norms of behavior and international regulatory regimes. The committee also increased oversight on clarifying authorities for use of cyber operations as a traditional military activity.

### Technology Erosion, Technological Superiority, and the Third Offset Strategy

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued its examination of technology trends by nation-states and non-state actors, the diffusion of technology, and the impact and risk to U.S. superiority in key warfare domains. The committee recognizes that U.S. military technological superiority is no longer assumed, and that investments in new and advanced capabilities, development of new operating concepts, and improvements in the agility and adaptability of the Department of Defense, are required to maintain this superiority.

Through its oversight at the full committee level, and within the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, the committee evaluated the Department's technology initiatives and investments, including those within the Strategic Capabilities Office and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. The publication of the National Defense Strategy effectively superseded the

Third Offset Strategy. Further, the departmental reorganization required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) resulted in the Strategic Capabilities Office reporting to the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, rather than directly to the Secretary of Defense. The committee remains committed to fostering innovative operational concepts of warfighting throughout the Department. To that end, the committee included section 217 in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) to require the Department to retain the key functions of the Strategic Capabilities Office in the event the office is terminated.

Additionally, the committee made legislative improvements to the defense acquisition process and to the organization of the Department in both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and Public Law 115–232 to get new capabilities deployed to the warfighter that better match the speed of technological change.

#### Addressing Emerging Threats

Terrorism, unconventional warfare, insurgency, adversarial use of technology, and weapons of mass destruction proliferation are some of the emerging threats that challenge national security, and global peace and stability. These threats require the Department of Defense to work effectively and efficiently with other Federal agencies and the governments of other nations. The committee conducted oversight of numerous cross-cutting Department of Defense activities central to addressing these emerging and unforeseen threats, including the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, security force assistance, and building partnership capacity.

The committee focused considerable attention on how the Department of Defense addresses these broad threats in its strategic planning processes, how resources are arrayed to meet these threats, and how existing authorities are consistent with operational requirements and authorized uses of military force. This included oversight of various unconventional warfare and sensitive activities authorities and related intelligence activities. The committee paid particular attention to these areas during closed, classified briefings, as well as numerous congressional delegations with members and professional staff. The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities paid particular oversight attention to these areas given the key role special operations forces play in this area.

#### *Intelligence*

In the 115th Congress, the committee examined the organization, functions, operations, intelligence collection, and analysis output of the defense intelligence community to ensure the highest possible quality intelligence support to the warfighter. The committee considered the organization and management of the elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the intelligence community and their roles in the defense and national intelligence enterprise. In the course of examining defense intelligence plans, programs and policies, the committee balanced current threats with the need

to rebuild intelligence capabilities to address potential threats, reform the defense intelligence enterprise organization to better meet current and future warfighter requirements, and restore the decisive advantage defense intelligence provides to commanders and the policy community. The committee held numerous briefings on the departmental intelligence requirements, oversight processes, and resources.

The committee coordinated, when appropriate, with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on intelligence and counterintelligence matters of the Department of Defense, and intelligence and counterintelligence activities of the Department of Energy in the course of oversight of the intelligence community and the authorization of appropriations for intelligence activities shared by the two committees. The committee held numerous briefings on current intelligence, including briefings on counterintelligence operations and current intelligence topics such as the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

#### *Security cooperation*

The committee conducted oversight of security cooperation and building partner capacity (BPC) programs in the 115th Congress. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) contained comprehensive reform of the authorities, funding, programs, and oversight of security cooperation. The committee monitored and evaluated the implementation of these security cooperation reforms, both during the development of guidance through the initial congressional notification process and while the programs were in progress, to ensure they were properly executed and consistent with national security objectives. An area of particular interest was the Department of Defense's adoption of best practices for monitoring and evaluation. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) increased the funding for assessment, monitoring, and evaluation programs from \$6.0 million to \$12.0 million, demonstrating the committee's continued interest in the proper execution of security cooperation programs.

In Public Law 115–232, the committee required a report on the use of security cooperation authorities to counter malign influence campaigns by strategic competitors and other state actors that are directed at allied and partner countries and that pose a significant threat to the national security of the United States, and required the Department to conduct a legal and policy review of advise, assist, and accompany missions.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and Public Law 115–232 continued to advance the reforms initiated in Public Law 114–328, including provisions to require the Department of Defense to update relevant guidance for the use of the security cooperation information system. Public Law 115–232 also increased the threshold for small-scale construction under security cooperation activities to \$1.5 million and required additional notification for small-scale construction over \$750,000. The committee will continue to conduct oversight of security cooperation programs and funding to ensure the Department

of Defense appropriately institutes the reforms included in Public Law 114–328.

Related to security cooperation, the committee also conducted oversight of the parts of the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program that are executed by the Department of Defense. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations aided efforts to evaluate the Foreign Military Sales process. On March 9, 2017, the subcommittee convened in closed session for a briefing titled “Update on the Defense Security Cooperation Agency’s Initiatives to Improve the Foreign Military Sales Process”. Subjects covered included the status of improvements being implemented by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of foreign military sales. In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted concerns raised by U.S. military leaders, the defense industry, and foreign partners that the FMS process is slow, cumbersome, and overly complicated, and directed the Department to conduct an audit regarding Department of Defense implementation of FMS programs. The committee report also noted the committee’s concern that FMS is not coordinated holistically across the Department to prioritize resources and effort in support of U.S. national security objectives and the defense industrial base, and required the Department to provide a briefing on the procedures instituted by the Department to integrate FMS and other security cooperation activities into the planning process for defense acquisition. The committee report further noted the need for the Department to support foreign partners’ acquisition of non-standard articles. Additionally, the committee received numerous other staff-level briefings on the FMS program.

#### *Countering unmanned aircraft systems*

The committee continued to assess the threat posed by the growing concern and numerous documented incidents regarding the nefarious and illicit use of unmanned aircraft systems against Department of Defense personnel, facilities, and assets at locations within the continental United States.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91), the committee leveraged section 1697 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) which established initial Counter Unmanned Aircraft System (CUAS) authority for the Department in section 130(i) of title 10, United States Code. In Public Law 115–91, the committee expanded which security force officials within the Department are authorized to employ CUAS capabilities (i.e., Government civilians employed with responsibility for providing security); bolstered Department and Federal Aviation Administration collaboration for National Airspace deconfliction and operations related to the employment of CUAS capabilities; integrated constitutional 4th amendment protections to protect the privacy of U.S. citizens; expanded Department of Defense mission areas by six categories in which the Department could deploy and employ CUAS capabilities; and increased congressional oversight mechanisms by requiring the annual submission of detailed budget justification and for Depart-



ment officials to provide semi-annual briefings to the relevant committees of jurisdiction pertaining to CUAS authority.

The committee continued rigorous oversight of how CUAS authority is implemented and executed through semi-annual mandated briefings with the Department of Defense and all relevant stakeholders. The committee continued to ensure that the Department's CUAS authority is sufficient, relevant, and appropriately scoped to defend against the growing threat that nefarious and illicit use of unmanned aircraft systems pose against Department of Defense personnel, facilities, and assets both at home and abroad.

## AGILITY, EFFICIENCY, AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

### Overview

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued to emphasize defense reform to create greater agility, accountability, and responsiveness within the Department of Defense and to get more value for the taxpayer dollar. The committee monitored the implementation of the significant body of legislation contained in both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) covering: acquisition; compensation and benefits (including healthcare and commissaries); the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and personnel, organization and management. This oversight resulted in further refinements to these reforms, contained in both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232).

In addition, the committee reformed the management of most Defense Agencies and Field Activities, known as the “Fourth Estate”, primarily by empowering the Chief Management Officer of the Department to rationalize backroom functions of these agencies. The committee also made further improvements in defense acquisition. The Fourth Estate reforms were contained in Public Law 115–232 while acquisition reforms were contained in both Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232.

The committee conducted numerous hearings and briefings; engaged experts from across defense, academia, and the private sector; traveled to military installations, industry facilities, and other relevant sites; and conducted independent research and analysis to develop these reforms.

### Organization and Management of the Department of Defense

As part of the committee's emphasis on defense reform, it continued its pursuit of improved management within the Department of Defense through oversight and legislative action in the 115th Congress, initially by monitoring the implementation of legislation contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) requiring the Department to streamline its management headquarters and reduce headquarters activities and personnel and in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328). Public Law 114–328 re-

quired significant organizational changes to the Office of the Secretary of Defense that would elevate research and engineering, better focus acquisition and sustainment activities, and improve oversight and management of the Department's "Fourth Estate." The committee found that adjustments to these organizational changes were needed and included them in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91). The committee made further adjustments in Public Law 115–91 to streamline bureaucracy by requiring reduction in the numbers of Assistant Secretaries of Defense and Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Public Law 115–91 also included provisions that would provide greater responsibilities to both the Chief Information Officer and the Chief Management Officer (CMO) of the Department. In addition, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) provided the CMO direct responsibility for managing the common backroom enterprises of the "Fourth Estate" to drive efficiencies in these common functions.

Finally, the committee addressed the ever increasing backlog and delay in processing background investigations necessary for security clearances by requiring that the Department of Defense assume responsibility for all defense background investigations in Public Law 115–91. Before the transfer of responsibility, that function was performed by the Office of Personnel Management.

#### Acquisition and Regulatory Reform

##### *Acquisition reform overview*

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued its ongoing effort to improve the agility of the Department of Defense acquisition system and the environment driving program choices in the Department, industry, and Congress. In undertaking this effort, the committee continued to solicit input from industry, academia, the Department, and others. During the 115th Congress, the committee conducted several hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions to receive testimony from key acquisition leaders and experts, including travel to military installations, industry facilities, and other relevant sites. Committee staff traveled to industry and Government locations in and around Seattle, Washington, to discuss a range of acquisition policy issues including test and evaluation, workforce, industrial base, and e-commerce. Committee staff traveled to Boston, Massachusetts, to visit the Defense Innovation Unit and other innovation centers. Committee staff traveled to Arizona State University to discuss innovation and national security research and training, and to Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, to gain awareness of F–35 maintenance and supply issues.

The committee held a hearing entitled "Assessing Progress and Identifying Future Opportunities in Defense Reform" on April 4, 2017. Witnesses provided their thoughts and perspectives on future defense reform priorities. The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations assisted in defense reform by convening a hearing on April 6, 2017, entitled "Evaluating the Defense Contract Auditing Process." Witnesses assessed various topics associated with defense contract auditing, including the pace and schedule of audits, costs, and the Defense Contract Audit Agency standards and processes.

The committee held a hearing on May 17, 2017, to receive the initial report of the Section 809 Panel on “Streamlining and Improving Defense Acquisition.” Witnesses during this hearing provided greater insights on how current acquisition processes and regulations could be improved.

The committee held a hearing on March 7, 2018, with the three military service acquisition executives on “Assessing Military Service Acquisition Reform.” Witnesses described how the military services have employed the authorities recently enacted to streamline acquisition and increase innovation. The full committee held a hearing on March 20, 2018, with the secretaries of the military departments on “Assessing the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request and Acquisition Reform Progress.” Witnesses addressed the use by the services of the reforms enacted in statute to delegate additional acquisition authorities to the military services. The committee held a hearing on April 17, 2018, entitled “Promoting the Department of Defense’s Culture of Innovation.” Witnesses provided insights into how the Department, faced with complex threats to the nation’s security and rising peer competitors, can remain on the cutting edge of rapidly evolving technologies and tap into innovative solutions.

The committee addressed several identified systemic weaknesses and sponsored other acquisition reform initiatives in a stand-alone reform bill, H.R. 2511, “Defense Acquisition Streamlining and Transparency Act”, which contained several provisions ultimately enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91). The committee detailed additional measures to increase statutory streamlining, acquisition agility, and private sector participation in a discussion draft entitled “Accelerating the Pace of Acquisitions Reform Act of 2018.” Provisions from this draft were ultimately enacted in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232).

#### *Acquisition policy and issues*

The committee believes that modern procurement practices offer opportunities to greatly streamline the way the Government buys goods. The Department of Defense is statutorily required to conduct market research, competition, and price comparisons prior to purchasing products. The resultant processes, however, are onerous and time consuming. Even procuring simple products often entails market research, issuing requests for information, detailed requirements development, and evaluation of in-depth proposals. Extensive auditing further delays contracting, with the Defense Contract Audit Agency taking an average of 885 days to complete the incurred cost audits they finalized in fiscal year 2016.

The committee also noted that enhanced incentives are needed in the planning for acquisition of major weapon systems and contracted services. It is widely acknowledged that the defense acquisition system incentivizes near-term cost, schedule, and performance tradeoffs. However, engineering decisions that reduce early program costs often result in higher sustainment expenses over the long term. Seeking to acquire broad intellectual property rights to mitigate sustainment costs can be cost-prohibitive and deter some

of the most innovative contractors from bidding on defense programs. Not acquiring enough technical data, however, can reduce subsequent competition and increase sustainment costs. The Department is typically disadvantaged in negotiations for technical data, as it possesses too few people who fully understand intellectual property laws and often negotiates for technical data too late to use competition to secure better pricing. Similarly, requirements for contracted services often are specified too late, which impedes the acquisition community from designing cost-effective contracts before the date of need. Subsequent contracting reviews typically focus on contract actions rather than underlying requirements, which precludes more thorough strategic acquisition and workforce planning. Attempts to make cost-effective, strategic decisions regarding the procurement of services are limited further by a lack of available information. While the Department currently obligates more than half of its total contract obligations on contracted services, there is little awareness at the enterprise level of the services being acquired and even less insight into the services that may need to be acquired in the future.

The committee has long supported a highly skilled and accountable workforce as a cornerstone of the acquisition system. While the Department has made substantial strides in increasing the size of its acquisition workforce, concerns remain across several key career fields. Challenges persist in recruiting, developing, and retaining experienced program managers for major defense acquisition programs. Program manager training focuses more on the acquisition process than on technical expertise, business acumen, or knowledge of industry operations. Program manager progression is impaired by a lack of clear career paths and incentives. Military program managers continue to fall short of tenure requirements due to military promotion processes. Workforce shortages and potential skill gaps also remain in other acquisition career fields, including contracting, business, and auditing—three priority career fields that have not met growth goals in recent years. The committee continues to believe that maintaining flexibility for the Department's utilization of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund would help address these shortages.

The committee is concerned over a lack of transparency because the Department lags well behind the private sector in effectively incorporating enterprise-wide data analyses into decision-making and oversight. Indeed, RAND found in 2015 that “institutional structure and bureaucratic incentives to restrict data access are exacerbated by policy and guidance to protect information. The result is a strong conservative bias in labeling and a reluctance to share.” The committee therefore believes that a statutory requirement that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military departments be given access to business system data is necessary to overcome institutional and cultural barriers to information sharing. The committee further believes that to bring about this significant culture change, it is necessary to assign responsibility at the highest levels of the Department for creating and maintaining common enterprise data.

The committee continued its work to improve various elements of the current acquisition system and incorporated several provi-

sions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) aimed at addressing the above issues. Provisions of note in Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232 include:

(1) Use of commercial e-commerce portals: Public Law 115–91 authorized the U.S. Government (to include the Department of Defense) to buy commercial-off-the-shelf-items through the same online marketplaces that businesses use to acquire goods. Marketplaces would provide a dynamic selection of products from numerous suppliers, ensure the Department receives competitive market prices for products, provide procurement oversight controls and near real-time transparency into items purchased, and enable screening of vendors and products to ensure compliance with suspension and debarment, domestic sourcing, and related statutes. The General Services Administration was directed to manage this program.

(2) Commercial item procurement reform: The definition of commercial items throughout the United States Code has become inconsistent, with 40 disparate definitions. In addition, commercial item definitions do not appropriately take into account the differences between products and services. Public Law 115–232 separated the definition of commercial items into commercial products and commercial services to increase clarity and consistency.

(3) Repeal of outdated and obsolete procurement statutes: Based on the initial report of the Section 809 Panel (“Streamlining and Codifying Acquisition Regulations”), overly restrictive regulations were identified as potential candidates for repeal as they often impede the Department’s ability to acquire goods and services in an agile and efficient manner. Two statutes (the 20-year limitation on defense fuel storage contracts and the requirement to accept/dispense dollar coins at government business operations) were repealed in Public Law 115–91 and established the precedent for future streamlining efforts in the acquisition code.

(4) Restructure of the United States Code: The body of law that establishes the acquisition code in title 10, United States Code, has become cumbersome and overly complex. Public Law 115–232 provided for a historic clarification of the acquisition process by restructuring the United States Code to logically assemble all acquisition-related statutes in one place for the first time since 1947. It also repealed dozens of additional obsolete provisions of law, prescriptive statutory requirements for positions and offices, and outdated reporting requirements.

(5) Reform of the defense contract audit process: Two primary types of audits are used to ensure that the prices contractors charge the Government are fair and reasonable: forward-pricing (before the work is performed); and incurred cost (after the work is performed). The current Defense Contract Audit Agency’s audits of incurred costs are slow, time-consuming, and often generate little value to the taxpayer. Public Law 115–91 raised materiality standards for incurred cost audits to avoid spending time and resources on low-value auditing and allowed acquisition officials to choose either the Defense Contract Audit Agency or a qualified pri-

vate auditor to conduct incurred cost audits, which would be required to be completed within 1 year.

(6) Empowerment of better decision making: The Department lags well behind the private sector in using enterprise-wide data analyses for decision-making and in sharing information among stakeholders to ensure effective program management and oversight. To move the Department forward in this area, several provisions were included in Public Law 115–91 to reform the acquisition of services and empower data-driven decisions through common enterprise data and increasing transparency.

(7) Early Investments in Acquisition programs: The defense acquisition system incentivizes near-term cost, schedule, and performance tradeoffs to the detriment of long-term sustainment costs. However, more than 70 percent of the life-cycle costs of a weapon system are incurred in the operation and sustainment of the weapon. To alter these incentives, provisions in Public Law 115–91 emphasized reliability and maintainability early in the process, required earlier intellectual property decisions, and increased the focus on developmental testing.

(8) Strengthening the Accountability and Professionalization of the Acquisition Workforce: A highly-skilled and accountable workforce is a cornerstone of the acquisition system. While the Department has made substantial strides in increasing the size of its acquisition workforce, concerns remain across several key career fields. Public Law 115–91 included provisions intended to improve career paths and incentives for civilian program managers and enhance training of the acquisition workforce.

#### Financial Management

The Comptroller General of the United States has consistently identified the Department of Defense’s financial management as a high-risk area since 1995. The Department’s inability to track and account for taxpayer dollars and tangible assets continues to undermine its financial management systems. It also creates a lack of transparency that significantly limits congressional oversight.

In recognition of the Department deeming itself ready for audit by the statutory deadline of September 30, 2017, as mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) modified the reporting requirements to no longer focus on audit readiness. Instead, the Department must be prepared to act upon future audit findings. Therefore, future requirements will focus on the remediation of those audit findings. The Department is well aware that problems exist within financial management and is looking to the audit to determine where those shortfalls exist so that they may correct those internal processes. The committee will review the results of the execution of this initial Department-wide audit of full financial statements. These results will be provided to Congress no later than March 31, 2019, as mandated by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

### Civilian Personnel

The committee continued oversight of the Department of Defense's human capital program, with particular emphasis on Federal civilian personnel. The Department employs more Federal civilians than any other agency, performing disparate and essential missions across the globe. The committee sought continued authority for various workforce shaping measures, such as direct hire authority and personnel flexibility for organic industrial base and major test and range facilities.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) included several new authorities intended to address workforce gaps. These included direct hire authority for child care employees; business transformation and management innovation experts; financial management experts; and a pilot program to assess better ways to manage cyber security and legal professionals.

Concerned about skill depletion in public shipyards and aviation depots and the consequent effect on readiness, the committee provided the Secretary of Defense expanded direct hire authority for these facilities in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232). Public Law 115-232 also provided direct hire authority for cybersecurity positions, science and engineering positions in major test and range facilities, and many positions in the acquisition workforce, as well as expanded the Department's direct hire authority for new graduates. These new authorities are temporary, expiring in 2025. Public Law 115-232 contained several provisions streamlining civilian personnel management across the Federal Government, and included a provision that would provide the Department the authority to appoint up to 50 executives per year to Senior Executive Service positions without reference to the Office of Personnel Management.

### READINESS

#### Manpower Sufficient in Quantity and Quality to Meet Global Commitments

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued to assess the basic question: What does the Nation need in terms of the quantity and quality of manpower to meet its current and future global military commitments and defense strategy without undue risk to the Nation? In this context, the fiscal year 2018 budget request proposed to stop the reductions to the end strengths of the Army and the Marine Corps while increasing the end-strengths of the Air Force and Navy. During the second session of the 115th Congress, the intense oversight of the increased end strength requests and the quality of the accessed manpower continued as the President's budget request for fiscal year 2019 put all the military services on a path of manpower growth to meet the new National Defense Strategy. The committee expressed its concern with personnel retention and recruiting efforts in light of the fact that the military services remain fully engaged in stability operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, advisory and training missions in

the Republic of Iraq, engaged with the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and in numerous smaller engagements throughout the world. Reflecting that concern, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) not only stopped the personnel reductions but reversed the downward trend by increasing end strength beyond the 2018 budget request for the Army Active and Reserve components and the Marine Corps, based on unfunded requirement requests from the Army and the Marine Corps. As the Administration requested increased service end strength to meet the National Defense Strategy, the committee supported the increased growth. Accordingly, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) authorized continued end strength growth for all the military services. The committee remained concerned with the recruiting efforts, especially by the Army, and the quality of the recruits needed to fulfill the increased end-strength requirements, and maintained close scrutiny of the increased accessions.

The committee also provided oversight of military manpower levels and force structure to ensure the quantity and quality continue to meet service requirements in support of the National Military Strategy. On May 17, 2017, and April 13, 2018, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held hearings on military personnel posture to express these concerns and question the military service personnel chiefs on their plans for the personnel end-strength increases for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, respectively. The ability of the Army to recruit sufficient numbers of qualified individuals continued to be of concern to the committee in light of the fiscal year 2018 recruiting shortfalls. Further, aggressive oversight of Army marketing and recruiting continued throughout calendar year 2018. This oversight is expected to continue into the 116th Congress.

The Air Force pilot shortage persisted as a long-term concern of the committee, and on March 29, 2017, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on the Air Force pilot shortage with testimony from the military service personnel chiefs. Regular briefings to the subcommittee staff by the Air Force Aircrew Crisis Task Force continued through the second session of the 115th Congress.

Subcommittee staff also visited multiple Air Force and Navy aviation units throughout 2017 and 2018 to garner direct feedback from aircrew and supporting service members on their views of their service attempts to stem the pilot shortages. The committee expects this extensive oversight of service pilot shortages to continue through the 116th Congress. The committee oversight focused on whether the Active, Guard, and Reserve Forces have sufficient manpower levels to sustain varying scales of activation, while maintaining deployment ratios at or above Department of Defense objectives. Within this focus, the committee examined trends in overall total force structure requirements, end strength, recruiting, retention, morale, benefits, and compensation to maintain necessary end strength levels.

#### Force Readiness

The committee continued its emphasis on force readiness as one of its highest priorities. The committee reviewed the Department of Defense's early assessment of the poor state of readiness across the



military services and conducted numerous hearings and briefings to understand specific readiness problems, underlying causes, solutions, and time needed to remediate. Witnesses emphasized that the readiness picture will not improve without a lessening of global demand for forces; an increase in high demand capabilities; and increased, sustained, predictable funding. Ongoing conflicts and the continued pace of deterrence and assurance operations continued to stress all elements of the force and major weapons systems.

The committee took particular interest in the operation of the Navy's forward deployed naval forces, after 4 accidents involving ships of the Seventh Fleet, based in Yokosuka, Japan, occurred in 2017, killing 17 Sailors in 2 of the collisions. The committee conducted several oversight hearings and briefings in an effort to learn the causes of these failures and how they can be avoided in the future.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) directed that the Department of Defense resume responsibility for background investigations for Department of Defense personnel and defense contractors. The committee conducted several hearings and briefings to monitor progress and ensure that Department of Defense management of the program will improve processing time.

The committee also devoted considerable attention to the backlogs existing in the four public naval shipyards, requiring an extensive review by the Navy and receiving multiple briefings. The committee remains concerned that inadequate shipyard capacity needlessly extends a ship's time in the yard, further stressing the operational fleet. Further, the committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense's efforts to restore readiness in key combat support areas such as logistics, prepositioned stocks, and contracted service support.

The committee included several provisions to improve readiness oversight in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232). These provisions addressed deficiencies in naval surface forces; required reporting of readiness by the military services to operate in the cyber and space domains; required regular assessments by the combatant commanders of their ability to conduct operations across the domains of air, ground, sea, cyber, and space; and required the Comptroller General of the United States to provide periodic assessments of the Department's readiness across these five warfighting domains.

#### *Maintenance and training*

Both maintenance and training have suffered in each of the military services under the funding limits imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) and sustained high operational tempo. The committee appreciated that readiness recovery across the Department has commenced with the increased funding provided by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-123), with a focus on improving readiness in capabilities needed to execute the National Defense Strategy. As noted in the discussions below, the committee examined relevant training and maintenance issues in each of the military services, with special emphasis on aviation readiness and surface ship maintenance and repair. Both

of these areas have fallen far behind in necessary maintenance and will take some years to recover. The added funds provided during the 115th Congress allowed readiness recovery to begin in all military services, but sustained effort and funding is needed to complete the task. In addition, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) established a National Commission on Military Aviation Safety to review military aviation mishaps, provide an assessment of causal factors, and make recommendations aimed at reducing the number of aviation mishaps.

#### *Marine Corps readiness*

The committee remains concerned that sustained high operational tempo over the course of the past decade, as well as a lack of consistent and adequate funding levels from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), have resulted in insufficient time and resources to adequately repair and refit Marine Corps aircraft and combat vehicles to achieve required readiness. Therefore, the committee provided oversight to Marine Corps personnel end strength requirements, skill set densities, equipment modernization, and operation and maintenance accounts as they each contribute significantly to the overall service readiness recovery plans. The committee assessed whether the Marine Corps readiness recovery efforts were realistic, adequately manned and resourced, and focused on adversarial pacing threats. In particular, the committee looked closely at the readiness of deployed forces as well as the next-to-deploy units, whose readiness is often sacrificed in order to prepare and properly man, train, and equip the deployed force. Finally, committee oversight of Marine Corps aviation readiness, maintenance, and training plans was a top priority. Marine Corps aviation mishap trends generate recurring concern that multiple readiness causal factors are contributing to these unfortunate and costly incidents. Of particular concern was the lack of cumulative flying time for Marine Corps aviators, whose skills were in danger of atrophying due to lack of flight training hours caused in large part by the lack of availability of aircraft due to maintenance backlogs residing both at the operational squadron level as well as at the Fleet Readiness Center depot level. The committee conducted several hearings and briefings which addressed Marine Corps amphibious readiness, aviation readiness, and training readiness issues. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) as well as the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) directed specific resources for training opportunities, spare parts, and ground and aircraft depot maintenance in an attempt to address the backlog of maintenance requirements.

#### *Army readiness*

In repeated testimony and in roundtable discussions with the committee, senior Army leaders outlined both the importance and challenges associated with returning to integrated, combined arms, full spectrum readiness following years of preparing primarily for counterinsurgency operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Army leaders testified that full

spectrum readiness would not be achieved prior to 2021 and monitoring this steady, continued progress was a significant focus of committee oversight during the 115th Congress. The lack of adequate and consistent funding resulting from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) and routinely delayed appropriations caused the Army to defer equipment maintenance and some collective skills training opportunities. Accounting for these impacts and aligned mitigation strategies were part of the committee’s oversight actions.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) as well as the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) directed specific resources for training, spare parts, and ground and aircraft maintenance, at both the unit level as well as the depot level in an attempt to address the backlog of maintenance requirements. In addition, both Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232 funded the maximum number of Army brigade combat team rotations, for both the Active Duty and National Guard, feasible through its Combat Training Centers. This is a crucial requirement for returning to full spectrum combat operations. In response to committee questions about the backlog of maintenance requirements, Army leaders noted the Army’s extremely high operational tempo with fewer available forces. To begin to alleviate this shortfall, Public Law 115–91 authorized higher end strength in each Army component. The committee continued oversight of both the notable increase in presence as well as partner capacity through training opportunities in Eastern Europe as a result of European Deterrence Initiative. The committee received briefings and provided oversight on other Army-led training initiatives such as Pacific Pathways and the Regionally Aligned Force in U.S. Africa Command. The committee remained particularly interested in oversight of the manning, training, equipping, and inaugural deployment of the Army’s Security Force Assistance Brigade to Afghanistan.

#### *Navy readiness*

The committee held 10 briefings and hearings during the 115th Congress on the readiness of the Navy, the enabling capabilities that support readiness, and the tragic collisions of 2017 that killed 17 sailors. The Navy continues to struggle to rebuild readiness in aviation, amphibious operations, submarines, and surface ships for several reasons.

Naval operations are hampered by a lack of spare parts, insufficient manning, and inexperienced manning. Aircraft availability continues to be a problem, caused by lengthy repair time in the depot or delay in receiving parts from the supply chain. To meet the operational demand for deployed air wings, serviceable aircraft are taken from the Fleet Replacement Squadron’s training aircraft fleet, affecting pilot training. Submarine availability is similarly limited by years of deferred maintenance, an aging and shrinking fleet, and a lack of available spare parts. The surface warfare fleet has similar challenges, exacerbated by the long-term loss of the USS Fitzgerald and USS John S. McCain.

The committee remained concerned that the Navy does not utilize all available authorities to rebuild readiness nor utilize capacity in the commercial shipyard sector when funding is available. The committee requested two Congressional Budget Office studies to review specific concerns in Naval Readiness including, “Comparing the Costs of Submarine Maintenance at Public and Private Shipyard” and “An Analysis of the Navy’s Fiscal Year 2019 Shipbuilding Plan” to assess the loss of operational days for naval assets awaiting planned maintenance and schedule repair. The committee received the Navy’s shipyard infrastructure report, which was directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91). That report identified over \$21.0 billion of investment in infrastructure and capital equipment required to restore the public shipyards’ ability to meet operational needs.

In 2017, the Navy experienced four significant incidents involving surface ships in the Western Pacific: the USS Antietam (January 2017), USS Lake Champlain (May 2017), USS Fitzgerald (June 2017), and the USS John S. McCain (August 2017). Collectively these events illustrated the erosion of readiness in naval surface warfare and challenges with the organizational culture of the surface warfare community. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) directed the Navy to implement a number of changes to training, career paths, inspections, and force management. Specifically, Public Law 115–232 sought to increase transparency with respect to Navy readiness by requiring the Navy’s Board of Inspection and Survey inspections to be conducted on a no-notice basis with unclassified versions of the report being made available to the public. Public Law 115–232 also directed reviews on whether the Navy should establish separate career paths for Surface Warfare Officers and directed the Navy to provide a plan that provides for clear chains of command for operations, for building readiness, and for shipyard maintenance.

#### *Air Force readiness*

Air Force readiness recovery factors are a product of pilots, aircraft availability, and timing; only when squadrons have sufficient pilots, aircraft and time to train can they build a cohesive fighting formation. The Air Force is challenged in each of these areas. Consequently, readiness recovery remains difficult. Low aircraft availability is driven by shortfalls in spare parts, inexperienced maintenance personnel, and increased global demand for Air Force squadrons. Low aircraft availability creates a domino effect on Air Force readiness and prevents pilots and trainees from completing necessary training, qualification, and certification milestones. Despite continued attention, the Air Force pilot shortfall has persisted at approximately 2,000 pilots for the last 2 years. The committee remains concerned that the Air Force has been unable to halt pilot attrition. Although the Air Force is making strides in improving aircraft availability and mission capability rates across the force, the insufficient number of pilots affects all levels of Air Force operations including training squadron instructors, major staff support, and maintenance planning.

During the 115th Congress, the committee conducted several hearings on Air Force readiness and military aviation readiness across all military services addressing these issues. In addition, the committee conducted a number of member and staff briefings on Air Force readiness, including a briefing on F-35 sustainment.

In support of Air Force readiness recovery efforts, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) included additional resources for key readiness accounts connected with weapon system sustainment. In addition, Public Law 115-232 included a reporting requirement on specialized undergraduate pilot training production, resourcing, and locations related to Air Force efforts to generate additional qualified pilots.

#### *Weapon systems life-cycle sustainment and reset*

Design decisions made during weapons system development can create sustainment problems that drive costly depot-level maintenance once the system is fielded. The committee focused on reducing the total-ownership costs of weapon systems and equipment by ensuring the Department of Defense is developing, procuring, and modernizing weapon systems and equipment with consideration of life-cycle support and sustainment requirements and cost. In its oversight of the Department's life-cycle sustainment efforts, the committee monitored the implementation of section 2337 of title 10, United States Code, which requires that each major weapon system be supported by a product support manager and section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), which requires additional visibility of the operation and support of major weapon systems.

The committee also held the Department accountable for improving its estimations of total weapon system life-cycle costs to better inform sustainment strategies, such as the cost effectiveness of acquiring technical data from original equipment manufacturers to allow future changes in sustainment path. Furthermore, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's corrosion control efforts and monitored resourcing of corrosion prediction and prevention efforts with a focus on increasing the service life of weapon systems while reducing long-term sustainment costs. Finally, the committee examined the military services' reset strategies to repair, recapitalize, and replace equipment used in ongoing operations, and also monitored progress toward reconstitution of prepositioned stocks.

The committee focused on two major areas of particular concern during the 115th Congress. The first, aviation readiness and sustainment, continued as a recurring problem in all military services, hampering readiness. Sustainment costs for the F-35 were carefully reviewed. The second, Navy surface ship maintenance and repair, was also a major concern, with deficiencies in the amphibious fleet affecting Marine Corps readiness.

#### Depot, Shipyard, and Arsenal Capability

Our Nation's organic industrial base is vital to achieving and maintaining warfighting readiness across all domains. The military services' arsenals, depots, air logistics complexes, and shipyards

provide long-term sustainment through programmed maintenance and conduct repair and modernization upgrades. These facilities and their skilled workforce provide a national-level insurance policy against unforeseen national strategic contingencies.

The committee held a series of hearings addressing depot policy and growing concerns related to facilities, personnel recruitment and retention, work process flow, and equipment necessary to operate modern industrial facilities. The committee remains concerned about the current state and future health of the organic industrial base as a result of an extended period of fiscal uncertainty and increasing maintenance and sustainment requirements.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) as well as the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included several legislative provisions related to oversight and focused on increasing efficiency within the organic industrial base. These included a provision that improves existing biennial reporting requirements on core depot-level maintenance and repair capabilities and a section that requires updated guidance for future biennial core reports. Public Law 115–232 included language that highlighted the need for improvements relative to additive manufacturing capabilities and the start of each military service having an “Additive Manufacturing Center of Excellence” capability. Public Law 115–91 included a provision that directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on a comprehensive plan for the sharing of best practices for depot-level maintenance among the military services.

Through hearings and oversight, the four public shipyards operated by the Department of the Navy were found suffering a shortage of experienced artisans, limitations on industrial capacity, gaps in infrastructure improvements and a management strategy to holistically address these gaps. Public Law 115–91 included a provision directing the Department of the Navy to report its plan to address workload and infrastructure requirements, a plan to monitor progress, and both workload and funding management plans for the shipyards.

The committee prioritized organic industrial base oversight efforts on capital investment in facilities and equipment, the implementation methodology and use of sustainment concepts such as performance-based logistics, the role of public-private partnerships, the use of working capital funds for timely product improvement, and the military services’ logistics enterprise resource planning systems. The committee emphasized a greater need and implementation of emerging technologies to improve management and accountability of spares inventory and supply chain operations. The committee continued work in both Public Law 115–91 and Public Law 115–232 to oversee carryover management at the depots and arsenals, to include the review of what levels should be acceptable for sufficient continuation of operations on an annual basis. Finally, the committee included a provision in Public Law 115–232 that requires carryover calculations to reflect the usual timing of the receipt of funding and the disparate repair cycles of supported equipment. This provision is effective for 3 years.

### National Guard and Reserves

The debate regarding force structure mix of Active and Reserve Components, the proper roles and missions of the Reserve Components, whether they should be an operational or strategic reserve, and the affordability of the required force to meet national security requirements, continued during the 115th Congress. Competition among the Active and Reserve Components for resources and missions served as a catalyst for that debate.

During the 115th Congress, the committee reviewed various recommendations and proposals regarding the National Guard and Reserves and provided oversight to proposed changes to ensure the recommendations met the National Military Strategy requirements, as well as homeland security and disaster requirements. The committee remained concerned about benefit parity and included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) to equally treat service members called to Active Duty under the authority of sections 12304a and 12304b of title 10, United States Code, with regard to pre-mobilization healthcare. To begin to address other authorization inequities, on December 12, 2017, the staff of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel received a briefing on the Department’s major plan to reform the Reserve Component duty statuses and began to socialize this plan for inclusion in the fiscal year 2020 defense authorization bill.

In addition, the committee continued to provide oversight of military technicians. Public Law 115–91 further refined the plan to convert dual-status technicians to title 5 civilians by reducing the total percentage of conversions from 20 percent to 10 percent. Given the uncertainty of the projected fiscal environment, the availability of equipment needed to sustain and modernize the National Guard and Reserve Components for their operational reserve and domestic support missions remains a concern. This concern extends to legacy aircraft as part of the Aerospace Control Alert mission.

The committee also focused oversight efforts on current equipment investment strategies for the National Guard and Reserve Components with particular emphasis on affordability and modernization of critical dual-use equipment platforms that are essential to the National Guard’s title 32, United States Code, mission and defense support to civil authorities. Finally, the committee continued to monitor and evaluate the obligation and execution rates of funds provided as part of a separate procurement account, entitled the “National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account,” that addresses equipment shortfalls for the National Guard and Reserve Components.

### Energy and Environment

The committee reviewed the energy strategies promulgated by the Department of Defense and monitored the Department’s energy use on military installations. Reduction of energy demand through cost-effective investments was a priority. The committee urged the military services to avoid proposed investments that demonstrated a simple return on investment but failed to enhance mission assur-

ance, readiness, or combat capability. To that end, the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included legislative changes to increase the Department of Defense’s efforts to address energy resiliency and energy security of military installations in the United States and overseas. Public Law 115–91 also included legislative changes to strengthen the Department of Defense’s ability to assess off-installation energy projects through the existing Siting Clearinghouse process and better collaborate with the Federal Aviation Administration to mitigate potential encroachment and impacts to military testing, training, and operations.

In addition, the committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense and military services’ environmental programs and monitored Department of Defense funding and adherence to Federal, State, and local requirements for cleanup, compliance, and pollution prevention. To address the challenges posed by emergent contaminants, such as Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFOS/PFOA), Public Law 115–91 authorized \$72.0 million above the budget request to support environmental response at current and former military installations affected by PFOS/PFOA, required the Department of Defense to work with the Department of Health and Human Services on a study on the health implications of PFOS/PFOA, and required a report on alternatives to firefighting foam that contain PFOS/PFOA. Public Law 115–91 also included a provision expressing the sense of Congress that climate change is a direct threat to national security and required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on vulnerabilities to military installations and combatant commander requirements resulting from climate change.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) reinforced the committee’s emphasis on the Department of Defense’s strategic approaches to energy use on military installations, requiring the military departments to perform mission assurance and readiness assessments of energy power systems that support critical mission infrastructure. Additionally, Public Law 115–232 encourages development of geothermal resources on military installations by designating 50 percent of proceeds from energy sales of electrical energy generated from a geothermal resource for use at the military installation in which the geothermal energy resource is located.

The ongoing challenge of mitigating PFOS/PFOA contamination in drinking water supplies was addressed in Public Law 115–232 by modifying provisions of Public Law 115–91 to clarify the source and increase funding for the health study and assessment of these contaminants. Public Law 115–232 also requires the Secretary of Defense to provide a plan that identifies remediation actions the Department of Defense plans to undertake once the Environmental Protection Agency establishes a maximum contaminant level. The committee furthermore provided a sense of Congress stating that the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces should expedite and streamline cleanup at installation restoration program sites and munitions response sites where contamination is having a direct impact on civilian access to clean drinking water.



## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

## Basing

As the Department of Defense is undergoing a significant change in force structure both in the United States and overseas, the committee reviewed all significant domestic and overseas basing and stationing proposals to ensure that these proposals included adequate construction funding and long-term sustainment resources.

The committee continued discussions with the Department of Defense and the military departments on excess infrastructure capacity associated with military installations, including proposed courses of action for consolidation. The committee conducted numerous engagements with the military departments seeking to define the force structure required to fulfill the national military strategy versus current or legacy unit sizes, locations, and configurations. The National Defense Strategy published in January 2018 prompted the committee to review the adequacy of available installations in the United States and overseas to support the strategy.

With respect to excess infrastructure capacity, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) authorized the Secretary of Defense to carry out the realignment or closure of a military installation if the Secretary of Defense and the Governor of a State, along with corresponding units of local government in which the installation is located, agree to the proposed realignment or closure. Public Law 115–232 also included a provision requiring an updated force structure plan tied to infrastructure capabilities for each of the military services that considers probable threats alongside updated end-strength levels.

## Military Construction Programming and Facilities Sustainment

The committee reviewed the Department of Defense's military construction program with respect to the overall capacity of the Department's infrastructure and prudent long-term military construction investment strategies. Recognizing the rapid change in weapon systems and missions in comparison to the timeline to plan, program, and execute new military construction, the committee engaged with the Department to seek more opportunities to construct flexible facilities rather than traditional purpose-built (i.e., single mission) facilities where practical and cost-effective. The committee sought to improve the Department's investment strategy in facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization, with respect to the Department's utilization of new authorities provided in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) related to the conversion of existing facilities and investments in infrastructure supporting research, development, test, and evaluation activities.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included legislative changes to increase the threshold under the unspecified minor construction authorities, provide additional flexibility to use operation and maintenance funding to replace facilities damaged by natural disasters or acts of terrorism, and require the submission of an annual report on the

unfunded requirements for laboratory military construction projects.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included authority to use amounts made available for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) to obtain architectural and engineering services in connection with RDT&E military construction projects executed under the Defense Laboratory Modernization Program, (authorized under section 2803 of Public Law 114–92). In addition, Public Law 115–232 included a provision enabling the secretary of a military department to carry out additional military construction projects to enhance force protection and safety on military installations.

In addition to conducting annual budget hearings on the Department’s military installation and environment programs, the committee held two hearings on the readiness, performance, and overall viability of shipyards, depots and defense organic industrial base organizations which are considered critical to the sustainment of the armed services. The hearings assessed the health and readiness of the 17 major industrial installations with respect to depot infrastructure condition, resiliency, and configuration. While the Navy has made progress developing a long-term facility recapitalization master plan for its four shipyards, the affordability of these plans is in question. The Army and Air Force have yet to develop an infrastructure reset strategy, which was the key take away from the hearing, and will be a focus for oversight in the 116th Congress.

#### Real Property Acquisition, Maintenance, and Disposal

The real property management process requires extensive oversight to maintain almost \$879.0 billion in infrastructure at an annual cost of nearly \$37.0 billion. The committee worked with the military departments to ensure that inadequate asset visibility, poor requirements development, and project planning inefficiencies do not result in poorly coordinated investment decisions and sub-optimal facility construction. The committee sought to apply best practices across the Department of Defense in order to efficiently develop and maintain the military services’ ranges, facilities, and infrastructure.

### MILITARY PERSONNEL AND HEALTH CARE ISSUES

#### Military Manpower and Force Structure

##### *Medical accession and retention standards*

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of military medical and behavioral health accession standards, an issue which directly impacts the readiness of the force. The Department of Defense is currently conducting an extensive review and re-drafting of the medical and behavioral health accession standards. These standards apply to all individuals applying for military service, and address a broad range of medical and mental health conditions that disqualify individuals from serving. The updated standards will also reflect advances in medical treatment for certain conditions that were previously disqualifying. Committee

staff received several briefings throughout the 115th Congress regarding these issues, including a comprehensive briefing on the Army's decision to delegate medical waiver authorities for accessions.

In February 2018, in furtherance of the Secretary of Defense's plan to enhance the lethality and readiness of the force, the Department of Defense implemented a new policy aimed at ensuring that all service members are deployable. The policy requires that, with certain exceptions, service members who are non-deployable for 12 months or more be evaluated for retention. The committee staff has received briefings from both the Department of the Defense and the military services on their implementation plans.

The committee will continue to provide oversight of any potential changes to the medical and behavioral health accession standards to ensure they are rooted in sound medical analysis and that the changes do not compromise force readiness.

#### *Gender integration*

The military services recently opened all military occupations to women. During the 115th Congress, the committee continued to provide oversight as the military services implemented new gender-neutral occupational standards and began to populate previously closed military occupations with women. The committee also examined the policies implemented to ensure proper support, training, assignment, and career advancement for women entering these career fields, with particular emphasis on lingering areas of disparate gender treatment, such as separate male and female portions of basic training in some services, as well as gender-based physical fitness standards. As a part of this oversight, committee staff traveled to several major training installations to observe gender-integrated training and to learn more about the implementation of these policy changes.

#### Military Benefits and Compensation

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued to give close scrutiny to proposals from both the Department of Defense and the private sector that called for funding reductions or changes to military compensation and other benefit programs in order to ensure any proposed changes thoroughly assess the impact to the All-Volunteer Force. The committee provided oversight of the January 2018 implementation of the Blended Retirement System as authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92), and the accompanying financial training for service members. To that end, on March 10, 2017, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel received an update briefing from the Department of Defense on the training and implementation status of the Blended Retirement System. The committee's oversight continued during the second session of the 115th Congress, as the military services continued to request to grow their end strength.

The subcommittee's oversight of pay and allowance issues led the committee, as part the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91), to recommend no change to current law, thereby enabling the by-law 2.4 percent raise in basic

pay during calendar year 2018 based on section 1009 of title 37, United States Code. It is the intent of the underlying law to ensure military pay raises match the rate of compensation increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index. As part of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232), the committee again recommended no change to the current law which resulted in a basic pay increase of 2.6 percent for 2019.

The committee also extended the authorities to pay bonuses and special pays during fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019, and monitored the value of those bonuses and special pays to ensure they were sufficient to achieve the recruiting and retention objectives for which they were developed. The committee also included legislation in Public Law 115–91 that increased the pilot bonus to help to address the Air Force’s pilot shortage. The committee understands and will continue to monitor the required increases in bonuses and special pays to enable the military services to continue recruit the quality force required to meet the National Defense Strategy.

Finally, the committee maintained focus on the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) financial offset from the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC). A provision of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) established a Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance (SSIA) for surviving spouses who are the beneficiary of the SBP annuity and have their annuity partially or fully offset by the DIC. This allowance was due to expire in May 2018. The committee’s oversight in this area led to a permanent extension of the SSIA in Public Law 115–91 and a continued focus on a whole of Congress solution for the complete repeal of the SBP annuity offset by DIC.

### Military Health System

The committee is committed to maintaining a robust Military Health System focused on ensuring the readiness of the force. To that end, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) included comprehensive reform of the Military Health System focused in three areas: medical readiness, the Military Health System organizational structure, and the TRICARE benefit. During the 115th Congress, the committee provided vigorous oversight of the Department of Defense’s progress towards implementing the elements of the various health care reform efforts.

#### *Mental health and pain management*

On April 27, 2017, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on the current state of Department of Defense programs for treating post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury. This was followed by a hearing on June 20, 2018, focused on Department of Defense pain management, opioids, prescription management and reporting transparency. Both hearings provided an overview of the state of ongoing research and whether more needs to be done to meet the needs of service members. With regard to pain management, the committee heard testimony that provided an overview of the issue of opioid abuse among service members and the Department’s progress in implementing pain manage-

ment best practices across the Military Health System. Additionally, oversight efforts included reviewing quarterly suicide reports and understanding the current suicide prevention program capabilities being administered by the Department of Defense. The committee provided a 2-year extension of the suicide prevention and resiliency program for the National Guard and the Reserves in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91). As a result of this oversight, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) contained a provision that requires the Department of Defense to establish a Military Health System Prescription Drug Monitoring Program that will share information with State prescription drug monitoring programs and requires the Department of Defense to develop a pilot program on opioid safety.

#### *Wounded warrior care*

The committee continued to monitor the adequacy of the Department of Defense’s wounded warrior initiatives. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included a provision that requires the Department of Defense and the military departments to review and update wounded warrior policies. The committee staff received briefings on the status of the integrated disability evaluation system. Additionally, committee staff visited the Warrior Transition Unit, the William Beaumont Army Medical Center, and the Soldier Readiness and Resiliency Center at Fort Bliss, Texas, to understand the capabilities and processes involved with transitioning service members. Finally, committee staff visited the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center for a tour and town hall meeting with service members and their families to obtain a better understanding of the challenges wounded warriors face.

#### *Military health system reform*

The committee continued to build on military health care reforms introduced in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328). These oversight efforts focused on the selection of a new operating model for the Military Health System (MHS), maintaining inpatient capabilities at military treatment facilities overseas, limiting the ability of the Department of Defense to close or downsize military treatment facilities (MTFs), additional reorganization within the MHS, changes to the TRICARE benefit, and implementation of the Department of Defense’s Genesis electronic health record.

The first session of the 115th Congress included oversight efforts to select and implement a Military Health System operating model that would reorganize the military department-based model of military health care to a consolidated operating model led by the Defense Health Agency. These oversight efforts included two briefings to the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, the first on May 25, 2017, and the second on December 12, 2017. The first briefing focused on the Military Health System reorganization implementation plan that included senior principals from the Department of Defense, Joint Staff, and the military services. The second briefing on December 12, 2017, featured senior civilian leaders from the De-

partment of Defense and was focused on understanding specific details related to the Military Health System operating model chosen by the Department of Defense. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included language voicing the conferees’ concerns with the progress and direction of the Department with respect to the MHS governing organization model. MHS reforms continued in section 711 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232), which requires the Department of Defense to establish Defense Health Agency Research and Development and Defense Health Agency Public Health from many existing military department related organizations and activities.

The committee remained concerned about the Department of Defense’s plan to close inpatient medical capabilities in military treatment facilities at installations in Aviano, Naples, and Sigonella, Italy. Committee staff visited these locations to understand the impact closures may have on the readiness of service members and operational plans, as well as the effect on the local beneficiary population. As a result, the committee included section 711 in Public Law 115–91 to require the Department of Defense to maintain inpatient capabilities at military treatment facilities outside of the United States until the Department certifies that alternate civilian facilities meet military treatment facility standards. Committee staff discussed the potential closure of the Navy MTFs with the Commander of U.S. Naval Forces Europe and encouraged the Navy to develop a position based on the operational need and agreement with U.S. European Command. Additionally, the committee is concerned with Department of Defense reform efforts that may precipitate closure or downsizing of MTFs prior to the implementation of the reforms required by section 702 of Public Law 114–328. Section 711 of Public Law 115–232 also requires the Department of Defense to submit a certification report to Congress prior to any potential MTF closure or downsizing.

The committee also focused oversight efforts on reforms in Public Law 114–328 to the Department of Defense TRICARE benefit. These reforms included consolidating TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra into one preferred provider option, TRICARE Select. The committee staff met with various military and veterans’ service organizations to better understand beneficiary concerns with changes related to the TRICARE benefit and also met frequently with the Defense Health Agency. In addition, committee staff met with Humana and Health Net, the two managed care support contractors that are administering the purchased care contracts, to ensure there are mitigation strategies in place to meet challenges with implementing changes to the TRICARE program. The Government Accountability Office completed a study in early 2018 assessing the effectiveness of the TRICARE Select implementation plan. Additionally, Public Law 115–232 included section 713 that consolidates the TRICARE dental program into the Office of Personnel Management’s Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program (FEDVIP), as well as section 714, which streamlines the TRICARE Prime beneficiary referral process.

Finally, the committee provided oversight over the implementation of the Military Health System Genesis electronic health record.

These efforts included a visit to the implementation sites in the Pacific Northwest and ongoing discussions with the Department of Defense and House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on interoperability of the Genesis system with the Department of Veterans Affairs. The conference report (H. Rept. 115-874) accompanying Public Law 115-232 also included a requirement to provide a corrective action report following completion of the Department of Defense initial operational test and evaluation.

#### *Medical readiness for the Joint Force*

The committee continued to provide oversight on the development of the Department of Defense's core medical capabilities and their integration across the Joint Force and the Military Health System. The committee focused oversight efforts on the implementation of reforms in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328), which required improvements in the way that trauma care was being provided across the Military Health System. Section 707 of Public Law 114-328 established a Joint Trauma System that would serve as a reference body for trauma care being provided across the Military Health System, established standards of care for trauma services provided at military medical treatment facilities, and coordinated the translation of research from the centers of excellence into Department of Defense standards of clinical trauma care. Section 708 of Public Law 114-328 required the establishment of the Joint Trauma Education and Training Directorate to ensure that traumatologists of the Armed Forces maintain proficiency and can rapidly deploy for future armed conflicts. The committee has conducted considerable oversight in this area, including a Subcommittee on Military Personnel briefing on September 13, 2017, to examine the Department's implementation and reform efforts to ensure progress has been made in the development of the Department's joint trauma capabilities. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) also contained provisions to address this issue, including section 719, which provided the Department of Defense with broadened trauma partnership opportunities.

Finally, committee staff have had multiple discussions and engagements with the Joint Staff Surgeon regarding core capabilities that will ensure a ready medical force. To that end, Public Law 115-232 included a provision which requires the Department of Defense to develop a joint medical capabilities development and standardization process.

#### **Military Personnel Policy**

During the 115th Congress, the personnel policies of the Department of Defense remained under considerable scrutiny as the military continued to grow and the military services competed to recruit and retain the best and brightest men and women. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel staff received several briefings from the military departments and the Department of Defense on recruiting efforts and how to grow the military without lowering standards. On May 17, 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing on military personnel posture, with a significant portion of the hearing dedicated to recruiting, retention, and associated policies. In the

second session of the 115th Congress, on April 13, 2018, the subcommittee held another military personnel posture hearing, this time focusing on service end strength and the military services' efforts to define and achieve their respective numbers.

As a part of this personnel policy oversight, the committee has focused on officer personnel management. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) contained a provision requiring the Department to provide a comprehensive report on the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act and Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act. The report requires the Department to provide information on recruiting and retention of officers, and requires the Department to provide statistical analysis to support their conclusions. The committee received an interim report in early 2018, which addressed limited issues related to officer personnel management. As a result, the John S. McCain National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included several new authorities, including provisions that gave promotion boards the ability to recommend officers of particular merit be placed higher on the promotion list, expanded the ability to award constructive credit for certain civilian experience, and standardized temporary promotion authority for certain officers with critical skills. The committee looks forward to receiving the final report to better understand the current efficacy of personnel management laws and the need for reform.

#### Uniform Code of Military Justice to Include Sexual Assault

The committee remained focused on sexual assault prevention and response in the military. After passing substantial reform of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) in the previous Congress, the committee continued to provide comprehensive oversight of the implementation of these changes and made refinements where needed. The committee also received the final reports from the 3-year review conducted by the Judicial Proceedings Panel, which informed the committee on the investigation and prosecution of sexual assault crimes. Finally, the committee identified and passed legislation to better protect and provide care for victims of sexual assault.

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel held several briefings and hearings in furtherance of the committee's oversight of this important issue. On May 2, 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Annual Report on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies. The subcommittee heard from the military service academy superintendents and the Department of Defense. In addition, the hearing included a panel of cadets and midshipmen who are survivors of sexual assault or harassment.

The committee also provided oversight and legislation in response to reports of non-consensual distribution of intimate images of service members on a website known as "Marines United." The Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a briefing on March 16, 2017, to receive an overview of the on-going investigation and to better understand how these crimes are committed. On March 21, 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing on the broader issue of social media policies within the military services and the standards of social media conduct provided to service members. In response



to the Marines United case, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) contained a provision that established a punitive article in the UCMJ on the non-consensual distribution of intimate images.

In addition to the new punitive article, the subcommittee continued to provide oversight of military justice in general. On April 4, 2017, the subcommittee received a briefing from the Department and the military services on implementation of recent military justice reforms. In addition, Public Law 115–91 contained a considerable number of provisions related to the UCMJ and sexual assault prevention and response, including provisions that:

(1) expand the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program by: (a) requiring those in a delayed entry program to receive sexual assault prevention training before entering the military; (b) expanding sexual trauma counseling and treatment for members of the Reserve Components; and (c) expanding training for special victims counsel to include training on the unique challenges often faced by male victims of sexual assault.

(2) improve transparency by expanding the information required in the SAPR Report, including reports of sexual assaults committed by service members against their spouses and other dependents, and reports of sexual harassment and incidents involving non-consensual distribution of intimate images;

(3) require a new report on sexual assault victim recovery in the Coast Guard;

(4) establish several new procedures and requirements to address sexual assault and harassment at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and

(5) require the military services to provide procedures for a confidential review of discharge characterizations for service members who were victims of sex-related offenses.

In the second session of the 115th Congress, the subcommittee held a hearing with the Vice Chiefs of Staff, the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the military service inspectors general on military senior leader misconduct, including prevention efforts and how senior leaders are held accountable for their misconduct. Furthermore, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) contained several provisions related to military justice, including establishing a separate punitive article on domestic violence; requiring increased oversight of the registered sex offender management program; and improvements in the reporting of crimes for inclusion in Federal Bureau of Investigation databases.

#### Military Family Readiness

During the 115th Congress, the committee focused on the support provided to service members' families, particularly during deployments. The committee continued to explore means to expand and improve child care services and examined ways to boost spouse employment. To that end, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included four provisions enhancing these programs. With regard to child care, one provision required the military service secretaries to operate child development centers in a manner that considers the demands of military

service, including Reserve service, and another provided the Secretary of Defense with direct hire authority to expedite the hiring of qualified child care providers. To improve spouse employment, Public Law 115–91 also contained a provision that authorized military service secretaries to reimburse a military member up to \$500 for the expense of a spouse obtaining licensing upon relocation to another state due to military orders, and a second provision that authorized a pilot program to establish telework facilities for military spouses overseas.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) also contained several provisions related to military family readiness, including a provision that temporarily expanded the authority for noncompetitive appointments of military spouses by Federal agencies and a requirement that the Department of Defense publicize the My Career Advancement program and study the impact that frequent permanent change of station moves have on military spouse employment. In addition, Public Law 115–232 included a comprehensive overhaul of the Transition Assistance Program designed to provide service members and their spouses with transition assistance tailored to their post-military career plans. The committee will continue to monitor the impacts these improvements have on military family readiness.

#### Morale, Welfare and Recreation Programs and Military Resale Programs

The committee believes the cost efficient sustainment of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) and military resale programs (commissaries and exchanges) is required to protect and enhance the quality of life in military communities and maintain the combat readiness of the force. The committee continued to provide extensive oversight efforts during the 115th Congress directed toward that goal in conjunction with major reforms, begun in the 114th Congress, to maintain the viability of these programs.

The committee believes that MWR and military resale programs must remain competitive with private sector entities to ensure that service members and their families benefit fully from these programs. The committee continued to monitor the current practices and policies to ensure that MWR and military resale programs employ the full range of strategies available to private sector competitors, to inform authorized patrons about the benefits associated with these programs, and to encourage them to participate. This is especially true for commissaries that are restricted, because of legislative and policy barriers, from using pricing, product, and advertising strategies that are common in the private sector. These barriers continued to be addressed as the Department of Defense proceeded with the directed commissary reforms throughout the second session of the 115th Congress. Several legislative authorities were granted to the Department of Defense in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) that would allow currently non-eligible veterans and others to use the commissary, thereby increasing the transactions in the commissary with a potential corresponding increase in revenue.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) required the Department of Defense to reform management, food and pricing options for the Defense Commissary Agency to assist in maintaining a competitive and effective commissary system in the future that requires less appropriated funding. During the 115th Congress, the committee continued to monitor and oversee the long term changes required by the commissary reform plan with a focus of ensuring an uninterrupted benefit for the beneficiaries of the system. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel met on February 16, 2017, to receive an update from the Department of Defense and the Defense Commissary Agency on the status of the reform implementation. The subcommittee met again on November 29, 2017, to receive an update on the reforms and to meet the interim director of the Defense Commissary Agency. In the intervening months, and throughout the 115th Congress, the subcommittee staff continued to receive regular updates from the Department of Defense and the Defense Commissary Agency, and attended scheduled Reform Management Group update meetings on the reform efforts.

#### Prisoner of War and Missing in Action

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued oversight of the Department of Defense’s Prisoner of War/Missing in Action activities, focusing on the operations of the Defense Personnel Accounting Agency (DPAA). Committee staff met multiple times with the leadership of this relatively new agency to monitor progress in integrating all operations into a single agency and achieving the required minimum 200 identifications annually. Section 523 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) broadened the ability for DPAA to accept certain types of gifts that may assist in the recovery of designated Department of Defense missing persons. Committee staff visited the DPAA Joint Recovery Operation in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic to better understand both the impact of this new authority on tactical activities, as well as the challenges of forthcoming operations.

### MODERNIZATION AND INVESTMENT ISSUES

#### Overview

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its oversight efforts of military service modernization strategies, to include whether these strategies were aligned with the National Defense Strategy’s emphasis on mitigating threats from strategic competitors. The committee’s activity addressed the effectiveness of current modernization strategies in retaining technology superiority and overmatch, both in the near-term and long-term, after years of deferred modernization that resulted from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25). The committee worked to ensure acquisition reform initiatives were being implemented by the military services to better streamline the development and fielding of solutions to the warfighter in a timely manner, while also setting the

conditions to allow for needed and stable modernization investment to accelerate the development of next generation systems.

The committee, through oversight and legislative action, examined the development of modernization strategies and worked to identify problems, including: late determination of requirements and failure to properly control requirements changes; inadequate analyses of alternatives; concurrency in test and evaluation; military services proceeding prematurely with development and procurement of immature technology; poor cost estimating; inadequate funding profiles; over-estimation of potential production rates; and overall program instability. In particular, the committee also worked to ensure the military services have the appropriate authorities, capabilities, force structure, and modernization strategies in place to allow for the successful execution of future multi-domain operations in a high intensity conflict.

#### Army and Marine Corps Armored Vehicle Modernization

The Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) funding levels have reduced buying power, disrupted modernization plans, and reduced the Army and Marine Corps’ ground combat overmatch advantage against strategic competitors. In particular, Army modernization funding declined 74 percent from 2008–2015 as a result of the drawdown from two wars and the imposition of the budget caps by Public Law 112–25. Through oversight activity, the committee noted that the most significant funding decline was that research and development (R&D) funding was reduced by 50 percent, and appears to be concentrated in the later stages of R&D at the prototyping and system design and development stages, which are the precursors to fielding new capabilities. Given the committee’s ongoing efforts to restore full spectrum operational readiness through modernization, the committee noted concerns that the tactical overmatch that U.S. ground forces have enjoyed for decades was being diminished, or in some cases, no longer exists. Therefore, during the 115th Congress, the committee’s oversight efforts focused on providing for improved stability and increases for Army modernization funding in fiscal year 2018 and beyond, which set the conditions for the Army to fully modernize at least one Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) per year beginning in fiscal year 2018.

With respect to combat vehicle modernization programs, the committee’s oversight efforts focused on the acceleration of engineering change proposals for the M1 Abrams tank and M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, improving the survivability and lethality of the family of Stryker Combat Vehicles, the development and procurement of the family of Amphibious Combat Vehicles, specifically the Amphibious Combat Vehicle Increment 1.1 program, continued survivability and performance upgrades for Light Armored Vehicles, the Paladin Integrated Management program’s transition to full-rate production, the Armored Multipurpose Vehicle program’s transition from research and development to procurement, the acceleration of the Army’s mobile protected firepower program, and the Army’s requirement for a next generation combat vehicle. Furthermore, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces has also engaged in oversight work with the Government Accountability Office (GAO)

to begin a comprehensive review of the overall effectiveness of the Army's near-term and long-term modernization strategies.

During the 115th Congress, the committee also continued ongoing oversight to assess the viability and fragility of the armored combat vehicle industrial base, to include assessing the resiliency of the critical sub-tier supplier base for items such as transmissions and forward looking infrared radars. Committee staff also conducted oversight visits to each of the contractors' production facilities who actively participated in the Marine Corps Amphibious Combat Vehicle program to assess production capability and capacity.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held four oversight hearings during the 115th Congress to continue oversight on the program issues noted above.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a comprehensive report on the Army's plan for executing its ground combat vehicle modernization strategy, and also required the GAO to review and assess the report. Section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) required a similar report on the Army's modernization strategy, to include force structure requirements. Public Law 115–91 authorized an additional \$6.8 billion for Army modernization, to include additional Abrams tanks, Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Hercules improved recovery vehicles, Stryker Combat Vehicles to include lethality upgrades, and vehicle active protection systems.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee directed the Army to conduct a cost-benefit analysis comparing a traditional 5-year multiyear (MYP) contract with an alternative 3-year multiyear contract for ABCT vehicle platforms instead of single-year contracts, which should yield significant cost-savings and help to stabilize the fragile supplier base. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) authorized funding to modernize 1.5 ABCTs and out-year funding to modernize at least one ABCT per year, including: 135 M1 Abrams tanks, 60 Bradley fighting vehicles, 197 armored multipurpose vehicles, 38 Improved Recovery Vehicles, and 3,390 Joint Light Tactical Vehicles. Public Law 115–232 also requires a report on the Army's plans to accelerate vehicle active protection systems, directs the Army to provide adequate resources for its Next Generation Combat Vehicle program, as well as accelerate prototyping efforts, and requires a detailed briefing on the mobile protected firepower development program. Additionally, Public Law 115–232 also authorizes an increase of \$203.4 million, for Stryker A1 combat vehicles, the most survivable and advanced version of the Stryker combat vehicle; it also authorizes an increase of \$110.0 million for the most modernized version of the Paladin self-propelled howitzer artillery system.

#### Army and Marine Corps Tactical Wheeled Vehicles

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its oversight efforts regarding Army and Marine Corps' tactical wheeled

vehicle (TWV) modernization strategies for their families of light, medium, and heavy TWVs, the family of mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles, line haul tractor trailers, and construction equipment. Through oversight activity, the committee examined TWV fleet size and composition, as well as current TWV acquisition strategies to ensure the viability of the TWV industrial base, to include the supplier base. The committee also focused particular attention on the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program and monitored the JLTV cost, schedule, and performance as the program transitioned from low-rate production to full-rate production. Committee members led a congressional delegation to the JLTV production facility to conduct on-site assessments of production capacity and engage with the industrial base to better understand current challenges. Additionally, the committee conducted oversight on the Army's efforts to improve the lethality of the JLTV and monitored the Army's acquisition strategies in the development and procurement of the Ground Mobility Vehicle and Light Reconnaissance Vehicle that would "enhance the tactical mobility and lethality of Infantry Brigade Combat Teams."

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held hearings on May 24, 2017, and on April 18, 2018, about the "Ground Force Modernization Budget Request" that reviewed the effectiveness of Army and Marine Corps ground force modernization programs against current and future threats, as well as provided oversight on current acquisition strategies, to include TWVs such as the JLTV and High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle recapitalization programs.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) authorized the President's budget request for the JLTV program. In addition, Public Law 115-91 authorized an additional \$424.1 million for TWVs. In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Chief, National Guard Bureau, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2017, on the advisability and feasibility of installing external fire suppression systems on high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWVs) to improve force protection.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee directed a briefing to the committee on the Army's current acquisition strategy and sustainment strategy for medium and heavy TWVs that includes potential courses of action to minimize impacts to the industrial base, as well as strategies to maintain surge capacity across the Future Years Defense Program. H. Rept. 115-676 also required the Army to provide a briefing on the long-term strategy for planning, programming, and budgeting for sustainment, research and development, and procurement of MRAP vehicle platforms.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) authorized over \$1.3 billion for the JLTV program, and included an additional \$25.0 million for new production HMMWVs for the Army National Guard.

### Army and Marine Corps Rotorcraft Programs

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its ongoing oversight efforts on Army and Marine Corps rotorcraft modernization programs, related force structure requirements, and challenges facing overall rotorcraft readiness for the military services. The committee focused particular attention on UH-60 Black Hawk utility rotorcraft, AH-64 Apache Attack rotorcraft, UH-72A Lakota light utility rotorcraft, CH-47 Chinook heavy lift rotorcraft, V-22 tiltrotor platforms, UH-1 Huey utility helicopters, AH-1 attack rotorcraft, the CH-53K heavy lift rotorcraft program, and the future vertical lift (FVL) development program. The committee noted that legacy rotorcraft platforms continue to be operated at high operational tempos in very challenging environments. The committee worked to ensure that modernization upgrades and reset efforts for these platforms were adequately resourced and being fielded in a timely manner for both the Active and Reserve Components. In addition to its oversight of rotorcraft requirements for, and performance in, combat operations, the committee conducted oversight of the critical need for advanced aircraft survivability equipment upgrades to provide warning and protection against evolving surface-to-air missile threats, as well as to develop potential solutions to accelerate the fielding of degraded visual environment technology on legacy platforms.

H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the House, authorized a 7-year multiyear procurement contract for the V-22 tiltrotor program. Section 126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) included this authority. Such a multiyear contract will save several hundred million dollars over a 7-year period and provide for better stability for the industrial base.

Public Law 115-91 authorized an additional \$313.4 million for 10 additional AH-64E Apache Helicopters; an additional \$108.0 million for 5 additional UH-60 Black Hawk utility helicopters; an additional \$354.5 million for 8 additional CH-47 heavy lift helicopters; an additional \$522.0 million for 6 V-22 tiltrotor helicopters; and an additional \$220.5 million for 7 AH-1 attack rotorcraft.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee continued to encourage the Army to fully fund Future Vertical Lift efforts and to seek opportunities to accelerate the program based on performance and available resources. Public Law 115-91 authorized the President's budget request for the FVL program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted that all 4 Army National Guard (ARNG) attack reconnaissance battalions should be equipped with 24 AH-64 attack helicopters, the same as Active Component battalions, in order to improve overall readiness and compatibility between the ARNG and Active Component. Further, the committee encouraged the Secretary of the Army to plan, program, and budget for 24 additional AH-64 attack helicopters across the Future Years Defense Pro-

gram to address ARNG requirements. H. Rept. 115-676 also directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing on the Army's long-term sustainment strategy for the UH-72A Lakota helicopter fleet.

Regarding the Future Vertical Lift program, in H. Rept. 115-676, the committee continued to encourage the Department of Defense to explore opportunities to accelerate the FVL program in order to meet national security challenges, and noted the expectation that the Department will maximize full and open competition. As such, the committee directed the Army to provide a briefing on the outcome of the analysis of alternatives and on any other analysis utilized in deciding the Army's priority of rotorcraft investment for FVL prior to the release of a request for proposal.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) included an additional \$85.0 million for five additional UH-60M Black Hawk helicopters for the ARNG, and also included an additional \$168.0 million for six additional AH-64E helicopters for the ARNG. Section 251 of Public Law 115-232 also requires an extensive briefing from the Army and Marine Corps on their strategy for the FVL program.

#### Army Communications and Network Programs

Given the growing importance of tactical communication networks in global combat operations and the many complex challenges they face in contested environments, the committee continued to conduct oversight of the Army's plans for tactical network modernization, as well as the supporting research and development programs now in place. In particular, the committee focused oversight efforts on the incremental development and fielding of the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) program and other tactical radio programs. The committee, through legislative action, worked to address issues related to tactical network operational requirements, over-reliance on satellite communications, the ability to operate effectively in contested environments, the ability of current network acquisition strategies to capitalize on advancements in commercial wireless network technology, and overall management of current major network acquisition programs to prevent previous stove-piped management approaches to tactical network programs.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held hearings on May 24, 2017, and April 18, 2018, to review the ground force modernization request for fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019 respectively, which included tactical network programs. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also held a hearing on September 27, 2017, to review major changes being proposed by the Army with respect to the acquisition strategy for tactical network modernization. The hearing provided members with the opportunity to gain a better understanding of how this new approach would mitigate current operational shortfalls of legacy static and on-the-move tactical network systems.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the committee on the Army's network strategy. H.R. 2810, the Na-



tional Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the House, included a provision requiring a report on options to accelerate WIN-T Increment 2 program.

Section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) limited funds for WIN-T Increment 2 until the Army provided a detailed report on their proposed new acquisition strategy for the tactical network that included detailed budgetary information and impacts to current programs of record.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted the Army's new tactical network modernization strategy is designed to enable the Army to "fight tonight," while also actively seeking next-generation solutions to stay ahead of potential adversaries. The committee noted this strategy would fix the existing programs that are necessary to fulfill the most critical operational shortfalls, while pivoting to a new acquisition methodology that fosters rapid insertion of new technology. The committee encouraged the consideration of readily available, non-developmental tactical communications technologies that deliver improved performance in voice, video, and data dissemination at the squad and individual soldier level.

#### Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued to devote substantial attention to the oversight of the research, development, and procurement of organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE), as well as other complementary personal protective equipment (PPE) programs. Consistent with previous committee oversight activity, the committee focused on ensuring that acquisition strategies were in place to modernize PPE in order to address evolving threats, and continued to encourage and express the need for the military services to manage PPE acquisition as a weapon system, rather than an expendable commodity. Focus areas included: advances in weight reduction ("lightening the load") in clothing and individual equipment; continued investment in advances of next generation material development, and development and procurement of PPE systems better designed for military servicewomen; small arms and small caliber ammunition modernization with particular emphasis on fielding enhanced performance small caliber rounds; improved combat helmets to help mitigate traumatic brain injury; improved combat uniforms; and the overall management of these associated niche, but highly critical industrial bases.

Committee oversight activity also consisted of staff and congressional delegations to Program Executive Office-Soldier and the Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory to receive updates on how the Army and Marine Corps are coordinating and accelerating modernization efforts related to PPE and OCIE. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on May 24, 2017, "Ground Force Modernization Budget Request," as well as held a briefing on September 13, 2017, "Update on Army and Marine Corps Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) Programs," to conduct oversight on the issues noted above. In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee highlighted the critical need for modernization of personal protective equipment (PPE), to include body armor and combat helmets. The committee also directed a briefing from the Army and Marine Corps regarding coordination efforts related to the development and procurement of PPE for female service members. H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the House, included an additional \$25.0 million for PPE development. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included an additional \$15.0 million for PPE development. The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) authorized an additional \$10.0 million for PPE development.

#### Tactical Aircraft Force Structure

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the adequacy of fighter force structure and capability in both the Navy and the Air Force, that included hearings by the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces. During these hearings witnesses testified that the Navy’s current budget plans put the service on track to meet fighter aircraft inventory requirements by 2022; however, those aircraft would require modifications to extend their service-life. Air Force testimony reflected the Air Force requirement for a minimum of 1,900 fighter aircraft. To maintain force structure, Air Force officials testified that any shortfall mitigation would include executing funded sustainment and fleet management actions for older F–16 Block 25, 30, and 32 aircraft, newer block 40 and 50 service-life extension, and targeted modernization and examination of the overall force structure to ensure the maintenance of viable warfighting capabilities.

The committee used the findings from these hearings to inform the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232). As such, Public Law 115–91 authorized 24 F/A–18E/Fs, an increase of 10 F/A–18F aircraft for the Navy; 10 F–35Cs, an increase of 6 F–35C aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps; 24 F–35Bs, an increase of 4 F–35B aircraft for the Marine Corps; and 56 G–35As, an increase of 10 F–35A aircraft for the Air Force. Public Law 115–91 also authorized the requested procurement to extend the life of the legacy F/A–18 and AV–8B fleets and authorized the entire Air Force request for modifications to its A–10, F–15, F–16, F–22A, and F–35 fleets. Additionally, Public Law 115–91 included a provision that requires the Air Force to maintain an inventory of 1,900 fighter aircraft. Public Law 115–232 authorized 24 F/A–18E/Fs and 77 F–35 aircraft and multiyear procurement authority for F/A–18E/F and EA–18G aircraft. Public Law 115–232 also authorized the entire Air Force request for modifications to its A–10, F–15, F–16, F–22A, and F–35 fleets and the Navy’s request for modifications to its F/A–18, F–35 and AV–8B fleets.

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the ongoing occurrences of physiological episodes in Navy F/A–18 and T–45 aircraft and Air Force T–6, A–10, and F–35 aircraft. Public Law 115–232 included a provision which required that

the Department of the Navy make certain modifications to its F/A-18 fleet to minimize physiological episodes. It also required the Secretaries of the Navy and the Air Force to certify that procurement of new fighter, attack or training aircraft include the most recent technological advancements necessary to minimize the impact of physiological episodes on aircraft crewmembers, and required the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report on its efforts to mitigate physiological episodes in fighter, attack, and training aircraft.

#### F-35 Joint Strike Fighter

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued oversight of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program. The committee believes that the F-35 will form the backbone of U.S. air combat superiority for decades to come, replacing or complementing the legacy tactical fighter fleets of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps with a dominant, multi-role, fifth-generation aircraft capable of projecting U.S. power and deterring potential adversaries. In particular, the committee placed oversight emphasis on the following: lowering overall program costs; completion of the system development and demonstration phase; ongoing software block development; the F-35 continuous capability development and delivery (C2D2) program; challenges facing the Autonomic Logistics Information System; and setting conditions to help accelerate production and fielding of F-35 aircraft.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on February 16, 2017, to receive an update on the F-35 program. Additionally, the subcommittee held a hearing on March 7, 2018, on an update to the F-35 program and service requirements for fifth generation aircraft.

With some minor reductions, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) authorized the budget request of \$8.7 billion for 63 F-35 aircraft and \$1.8 billion for F-35 development, and provided an increase of \$800.0 million for six additional F-35C aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps, \$525.6 million for 4 additional F-35B aircraft for the Marine Corps, and \$1.03 billion for 10 additional F-35A aircraft for the Air Force. Public Law 115-91 also included a provision authorizing the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$661.0 million to procure economic order quantities of parts planned for use in F-35s to be acquired in fiscal years 2019 and 2020, so that overall costs of the F-35 program could be reduced.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) authorized the budget request for \$8.8 billion for 77 F-35 aircraft and \$1.3 billion for F-35 development. Additionally, Public Law 115-232 included a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to acquire higher numbers of F-35 aircraft if such additional procurement does not require additional funds to be authorized because of production efficiencies or other cost reductions, a provision that would require quarterly F-35 briefings by the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Sustainment to the congressional defense committees, and a provision that would limit funds for the C2D2 program until the Secretary of Defense submits a detailed cost estimate and baseline schedule for the program to the congressional defense committees.

### Bomber Force Structure

During the 115th Congress, the committee continued to support significant Air Force investments for engineering, manufacturing, and development of the B-21A Raider, long-range strike bomber aircraft. This oversight of current bomber aircraft inventory requirements and modernization efforts was to ensure that the Air Force maintains a sufficient, credible, and lethal fixed-wing aircraft with conventional and strategic weapons delivery capability to support all aspects of the National Military Strategy. During the engineering, manufacturing, and development phase of the new bomber aircraft, the committee noted it was imperative that the Air Force continue to maintain, modernize, and upgrade the existing fleet of bomber aircraft to preserve the effective capabilities needed to meet current and future threats.

Regarding B-52 modernization, in the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 6, 2018, on its modernization plan for the B-52 aircraft fleet. The briefing included: re-engine options, including utilizing authorities pursuant to section 2371b of title 10, United States Code, third-party financing, and traditional procurement; plans to upgrade the ground mapping radar; electronic self-defense options; and an integration timeline that best takes advantage of scheduled depot throughput.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted that the Air Force released its “Bomber Vector” in conjunction with the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2019, which outlined the future of the B-1, B-2, B-52, and B-21 bomber fleets. According to this document, during development and production of the B-21, the Air Force will sustain the B-2 bomber to assure no gaps in bomber force availability. In addition to availability, the committee is concerned that the B-2 bomber fleet must keep pace with the threat level and maintain competitive capability during the transition. The committee noted that this was a crucial function as a global competitor, while hostile nations increase their fielding of anti-access and area denial weapon systems that impede and degrade the Air Force’s ability to hold any target at risk around the globe.

The fiscal year 2019 budget request stated, “modern communications are key enablers for the B-2 in the anti-access/area denial battle-space and directly enhance lethality and force multiplication”. The committee provided additional oversight on the Department’s proposed termination of the Extremely High Frequency Satellite Communications program, which provided two-way, high-bandwidth, secure, survivable, strategic communication in anti-access and area denial environments. In its place, the Air Force has chosen to rely on the Common Very-Low-Frequency Receiver, which is to provide the B-2 with receive-only, secure, survivable communications. The committee supported this B-2 limitation.

Regarding additional B-2 modernization, in H. Rept. 115-676, the committee directed the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a

briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 28, 2019, on the B-2 secure communications modernization plan. This briefing should include: the impact of the Air Force's decision to downgrade B-2 communications capabilities on the ability of the B-2 to perform its critical strike missions in anti-access/area denial environments; recommend solutions that would enable automated transfer of data to the B-2 and enable the aircraft to operate in a networked fashion with other elements for the long-range strike family of systems and other Air Force and Joint systems; and provide estimated modernization costs and timelines, and consider opportunities to exploit capabilities developed for other programs.

#### Aerial Refueling Aircraft

During the 115th Congress, the committee provided oversight of the KC-46, KC-10, and KC-135 tanker programs. Currently, the Air Force requires 479 air refueling tankers to meet the National Military Strategy. Currently however, the fleet only consists of 395 KC-135 and 59 KC-10 tankers, for a total of 454 tankers. KC-46A deliveries will grow the tanker force to 479 aircraft in fiscal year 2019. Subsequently, the Air Force plans to replace its older tankers one-for-one with 179 KC-46A aircraft.

With regard to the KC-135 fleet, limited fiscal resources are available to the Air Force for recapitalization of all 395 aircraft, necessitating the continued maintenance and operation of legacy aircraft. Consequently, the committee supported the Secretary of the Air Force's efforts to modernize avionics and communication equipment to meet the January 1, 2020, Federal Aviation Administration Next Generation (NEXTGEN) Airspace Control Mandate for the KC-135 fleet by authorizing the Air Force's modernization request in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91).

The Air Force plans to fully recapitalize all 59 KC-10 tanker aircraft starting in fiscal year 2019, and to be completed by fiscal year 2024. The committee supported the Secretary of the Air Force's efforts to modernize avionics and communication equipment to meet the January 1, 2020, Federal Aviation Administration NEXTGEN Airspace Control Mandate for the KC-10 fleet by authorizing the Air Force's modernization request in Public Law 115-91.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676), accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted that the KC-46A program costs remain stable, but the delivery schedule may be further delayed. The Air Force reported three category one deficiencies including two for the remote vision system (RVS) and one for the center-line drogue system (CDS). The Government Accountability Office (GAO) observed in its report, GAO-18-353, that the program updated its delivery schedule in 2017 to allow the defense contractor to delay delivery of the first 18 fully capable aircraft by 14 months. According to a schedule risk assessment and GAO's analysis, if risk is not mitigated, deliveries could be delayed further to May 2019, 21 months from the originally scheduled delivery. The continued delays are set to cause a backup of unaccepted aircraft awaiting the completion of contractual test and documentation requirements. To address KC-46A delivery, section 146 of the John S. McCain National Defense Author-

ization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) limits the funds authorized to be appropriated to procure three KC–46A aircraft until the Secretary of the Air Force certifies that both supplemental and military type certifications have been approved and that the first aircraft has been accepted by the Air Force.

Regarding KC–10A, section 141 of Public Law 115–232 requires the Secretary of the Air Force to increase the current air refueling tanker fleet from 457 to 479 primary assigned aircraft before it can begin to retire KC–10A aircraft. The Air Force must maintain 479 total tanker aircraft thereafter, unless adjusted by the fiscal year 2018 Mobility Capability and Requirements Study.

#### Intertheater and Intratheater Airlift

During the 115th Congress, the committee provided extensive oversight of Air Force’s intratheater and intertheater airlift fleets. Additionally, the committee continues to oversee the COMPASS CALL re-host, and the Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization programs.

The committee was concerned with the level of risk in the intratheater program. As such, section 144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) directed the Secretary of the Air Force to continue to preserve certain C–5 aircraft in a storage condition that would allow a recall of retired aircraft to future service in the Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, or the Active Force structure. In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200), accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2018, on intratheater airlift. The briefing outlined the Air Force’s efforts to leverage commercial off-the-shelf solutions and non-development solutions for the C–130H AMP Increment 1 and 2 programs.

The COMPASS CALL re-host program in section 135 of Public Law 115–91 restricts the Secretary of the Air Force from contracting with any entity for the purposes of the COMPASS CALL re-host program until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submits a certification to the congressional defense committees that indicates the acquisition strategy has been reviewed and determined to meet applicable laws, guidelines, and best practices. The Secretary of the Air Force provided such certification.

The Presidential Aircraft Recapitalization program in section 211 of Public Law 115–91 requires the Secretary of the Air Force to provide quarterly briefings to the House Committee on Armed Services on the efforts to control costs, beginning by October 1, 2017, and continuing through October 1, 2022. Additionally, section 143 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) directed the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure that the VC–25B contract for logistics support complies with part 17.204(e) of the Federal Acquisition Regulation and also complies with section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, with regard to open competition.

Section 144 of Public Law 115–232 adjusted the retirement date for the two Air Force VC–25A aircraft to not be later than December 31, 2025.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2019, the committee noted that the C–130H Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) addresses cockpit modernization needs of the aircraft, however it does not include the flight engineers control panel, which is a key component of the cockpit. Failure to upgrade the flight engineer control panel could leave the C–130H fleet with continued obsolescence issues post AMP. If the Air Force were to decide to upgrade this equipment at a later date, they will have missed the efficiencies of conducting those upgrades concurrent with the AMP upgrades. Therefore, the committee encouraged the Air Force to explore the possibility of upgrading the C–130H flight engineer overhead control panel using readily available off the shelf technology. Furthermore, if the Air Force determines that these upgrades are necessary, they should make every effort to upgrade the aircraft in parallel with the AMP program in order to minimize disruption to the operation of the C–130H fleet and mission. Additionally, section 142 of Public Law 115–232 authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into 1 or more multiyear contracts for up to 52 C–130J aircraft beginning in fiscal year 2019, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

The committee noted that the Air National Guard (ANG) completed testing of the T56 3.5 engine enhancement and reported results that exceeded expectations for fuel savings and performance. The committee understood that the ANG expected to issue a full test report in the summer of 2018, to be followed by a business case analysis for upgrading the entire fleet of C–130H/LC–130H aircraft. Additionally, the committee was aware that fiscal year 2016 and 2017 propulsion upgrade funds had been put on contract. The committee expected the Air Force to include the necessary funds to accelerate C–130H/LC–130H upgrades in future base budgets. Public Law 115–232 authorized \$129.0 million above the Air Force base budget request to support the upgrade of C–130H/LC–130H aircraft with the T56 3.5 engine enhancement and NP2000 8-bladed propeller.

In H. Rept. 115–676), the committee included a requirement for the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2019, on the Compass Call transition plan. Additionally, section 145 of Public Law 115–232 struck the 30-day waiting period imposed on EC–130H funds by section 135(a) of Public Law 115–91.

Finally, in H. Rept. 115–676, the committee directed the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2019, on the Total Force C–17 Fleet Management Plan.

#### Surface Warfare Programs

The committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense’s shipbuilding programs to ensure balanced investments are made and the Navy achieves the force structure, with the appropriate capabilities needed to meet requirements. Through its over-

sight activities, the committee faced the challenge of balancing current demands on an aging fleet within current economic constraints. As of November 15, 2018, the Navy indicated they currently support 286 deployable battle force ships. This available force structure contrasts the Navy's 2016 requirements projection of 355 ships. Despite these shortfalls, the committee sought to obtain the required capability and provide stability to the shipbuilding industrial base.

Preeminent in the Navy force structure is the aircraft carrier, which represents the embodiment of the United States' ability to project power. The Navy has developed a new design, and completed construction of the lead ship for the Ford-class aircraft carriers. Technologies introduced with the USS Gerald R. Ford have challenged the Navy to maintain cost controls on the Ford-class aircraft carrier. Additionally, the Navy has been challenged to generate sufficient aircraft carrier force structure to support the combatant commanders. To address these cost and force structure concerns, section 121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) included a provision that amended section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), by modifying the cost limitation baseline for the future USS Enterprise (CVN-80) and follow-on aircraft carriers to \$12.6 billion. This section also authorized the Secretary of Defense the ability to waive the requirement to conduct full ship shock trials on the USS Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78). Additionally, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) authorized the procurement of an additional Ford-class aircraft carrier to be designated CVN-81.

The committee also provided the Department of the Navy the authority to more efficiently procure vessels and associated weapon systems. Section 123 of Public Law 115-91 included a provision that would authorize the multiyear procurement of 15 Arleigh Burke class destroyers over the next 5 years. Additionally, section 124 of Public Law 115-232 authorized multiyear procurement of 625 standard missile-6 missiles over the next 5 years. The Navy estimated that these rates of procurement would have a cost savings of at least 10 percent over conventional contract instruments.

Additionally, the committee recognized the national importance of recapitalizing the U.S. icebreaker fleet and the extraordinary circumstances that necessitated use of Department of Defense funding to procure the first polar-class heavy icebreaker. Accordingly, section 122 of Public Law 115-91 authorized a single heavy icebreaker. Section 151 of Public Law 115-232 further authorized the procurement of an additional 5 polar-class icebreaker vessels.

Finally, the committee noted that the auxiliary and sealift fleets consist of numerous platforms that have, or are approaching the end of their useful service life and need to be recapitalized. To address this concern, section 1021 of Public Law 115-91 authorized the Secretary of Defense to purchase up to two used vessels to begin replacing these older vessels and required auxiliary ships to be included in the annual 30-year shipbuilding plan required by section 231 of title 10, United States Code. Section 1021 was further amended by section 1012 of Public Law 115-232 and expanded



the authority purchase up to seven used vessels. This expansion beyond the procurement of 2 used vessels was conditioned on the Secretary of the Navy's certification that the Navy has initiated an acquisition strategy for the construction of not less than 10 new sealift vessels and the lead ship would be delivered not later than 2026.

### Undersea Warfare Programs

The committee conducted oversight of the Navy's undersea warfare domain and placed increased emphasis on a new program that will be used to replace the current fleet of ballistic missile submarines. This replacement submarine program, SSBN(X), is projected to cost over \$1.0 billion for the design and construction of the 12 submarines and will be the second largest Department of Defense acquisition program. Considering this program is expected to support 70 percent of the Nation's strategic deterrence capability, the committee has resolved to acquire the 12 submarines, and is supportive of authorizing an efficient contract for the construction of the SSBN(X) program. To ensure sufficient oversight of this critical capability, section 231 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) required periodic update of matrices on Columbia-class cost, design, and construction goals. The Comptroller General of the United States would also be required to review and assess this program and provide feedback to the congressional defense committees. Additionally, section 1022 of Public Law 115-91 provided authority for multiyear procurement of certain critical components to support continuous production.

Finally, section 124 of Public Law 115-91 also addressed multiyear procurement of 13 Virginia-class attack submarines. The Navy estimated that this rate of procurement would save almost 10 percent over conventional contract instruments. Section 129 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) further required the Secretary includes an option for the procurement of a third submarine in fiscal years 2022 and 2023.

### Military Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Programs

Manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) system programs have come to constitute a significant component of the overall Department of Defense force structure. The committee believed the capability provided by these assets remains critical to sustaining deterrence and full spectrum readiness capability of U.S. forces.

Throughout the 115th Congress, the committee focused on the budget, cost, schedule, and performance outcomes of major ISR manned and unmanned aerial systems (UAS) programs, and examined the ISR enterprise for balance in inventory, collection, and analysis capabilities. Also, close examination of the Office of the Secretary of Defense ISR policy formulation and oversight has been of interest to the committee. These long-standing committee concerns of the Department's ISR enterprise were assessed: lack of an adequate long-term ISR architecture and acquisition strategy; lack

of supporting analysis for programmatic decisions; and, the failure to balance collection programs data output with adequate resources to process, exploit, and disseminate data and analyses. The committee emphasized to the Joint Staff and Joint Requirements Oversight Council the need to take a more proactive role in coordinating ISR system acquisition of the services and better coordinating employment of service-provided ISR capabilities with the combatant commanders.

In particular, the committee placed oversight emphasis on, but was not limited to, the cost, schedule, performance, and procurement objectives of the following ISR programs: RQ-4 Global Hawk Blocks 30/40, MQ-9 Reaper, MQ-1C Gray Eagle, MQ-4C Triton, MQ-8 Fire Scout, MQ-25 Stingray, Marine Air Ground Task Force UAS Expeditionary, and sustainment of U-2 and legacy Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System aircraft.

#### Emerging Advanced Weapons Capabilities

Department of Defense investment in science and technology often leads to the development of advanced weapons capabilities or weapons concepts that contribute to the technological superiority of U.S. military forces. Maintaining technological overmatch of current and potential adversaries is a significant part of the qualitative advantage of U.S. forces, but is increasingly difficult in an environment of globalized technologies and asymmetric combinations of high-tech and low-tech capabilities. The committee continued to monitor technological developments, from both government funded labs, as well as commercially developed sources, and supported transition of the most promising technological weapons systems or concepts. Advancements in areas such as directed energy, hypersonics, autonomy, and synthetic biology may prove to be double-edged swords, benefiting U.S. national security, but also exploiting U.S. security weaknesses when adopted by potential future adversaries.

In the 115th Congress, the committee examined the strategy, concepts of employment, and other organizing concepts being pursued by the military services and the Office of Secretary of Defense, and when matured, develop acquisition plans in support of fielding advanced capabilities, such as artificial intelligence, hypersonics, and autonomous systems. The committee oversaw the maturation of the Department of Defense outreach efforts with the commercial sector and the transition of innovative commercial technologies into national security and defense applications. Additionally, the committee monitored policies or trends impeding or supporting the development of new, innovative capabilities, as well as monitoring scientific developments internationally to better understand how state-of-the-art advancements can contribute to foreign military developments.

The committee held related hearings and briefings, including a hearing on January 8, 2018, “China’s Pursuit of Emerging and Exponential Technologies”.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for 2018, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a plan to fund enhanced lightweight hard armor; an assessment on the

Army's counter-improvised explosive device technology; an assessment of the Air Force Test Center; and a roadmap for future weapons and munitions science and technology investment.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included a provision that authorizes funds to be used exclusively for high energy lasers and high power microwave prototyping and demonstrations; a provision that provides the Joint Hypersonic Transition Office with the responsibility to coordinate and integrate programs, ensure coordination of current and future Department programs on hypersonics, and approve demonstrations; and a provision that authorizes a pilot program to improve incentives for technology transfer from Department of Defense laboratories.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for 2019, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: an analysis of targeted soldier borne sensor efforts; a plan that addresses the challenges of urban warfare combat and training within the Army; a briefing on the Navy's support for research into autonomous systems; a plan on engine noise reduction efforts; and a plan on the future strategy for directed energy and non-lethal weapons.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included: a provision that provides an extension of directed energy prototype authority; a provision that provides a limitation of funds for certain high energy laser advanced technologies; a provision that requires a plan to eliminate, transfer, or retain the Strategic Capabilities office; a provision that establishes procedures for the rapid reaction to emerging technology requirements; a provision that requires a report on comparative capabilities of adversaries in key technology areas; and a provision that requires a briefing on the National Hypersonics Initiative and impact on treaty obligations.

#### Nuclear Deterrence

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy and nuclear policies and programs of the Department of Defense. The committee's oversight of these programs intends to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. The committee continued to provide oversight of the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense's nuclear modernization plans, including but not limited to infrastructure investments, warhead life extension programs, stockpile stewardship programs, stockpile management programs, stockpile responsiveness programs, delivery system modernization, nuclear command and control, cost savings and efficiency initiatives, and security.

On March 8, 2017, the committee held a hearing entitled "Military Assessment of Nuclear Weapons Requirements", in which the witnesses offered their military advice and professional judgments regarding the military requirements related to nuclear deterrence, including U.S. needs and foreign developments driving those needs. On March 9, 2017, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled "Nuclear Deterrence, the Defense Science Board's Perspective" that reviewed recent studies and recommendations of

the Defense Science Board regarding the U.S. nuclear deterrent. On March 16, 2017, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on “Oversight Review of Infrastructure Needs and Projects Ready for Immediate Implementation in the Nuclear Security Enterprise”. The hearing looked to discuss these infrastructure problems while looking to secure the significant levels of funding needed to address them. On March 29, 2017, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a joint hearing with the House Committee on Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade entitled “Consequences and Context for Russia’s violations of the INF Treaty”, and discussed the implications of Russian violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. On May 25, 2017, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities for Nuclear Forces and Atomic Energy Defense Activities” that examined the Administration’s fiscal year 2018 priorities, plans, programs, and policies associated with the Department of Defense’s nuclear forces and the defense-related nuclear activities of the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration. In addition, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces conducted a classified briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review on December 7, 2017.

In the second session of the 115th Congress, the committee held a hearing and briefing on February 6, 2018, focusing on “the NDS and NPR”. The hearing provided an opportunity for the committee to provide oversight of the Administration’s National Defense Strategy and its Nuclear Posture Review. The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on March 22, 2018, on the “Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Nuclear Forces and Atomic Energy Defense Activities” that examined the nuclear-related budget requests for the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense. The subcommittee also conducted a classified briefing on June 27, 2018, entitled “Intel Update on Foreign Nuclear Weapons”.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included several legislative provisions related to nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise. Public Law 115–91 included provisions to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and materials by strengthening nonproliferation programs, modernizing our nuclear deterrent, and ensuring the safety, security, and reliability of our nuclear stockpile, delivery systems, and infrastructure.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included several legislative provisions related to nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise. Competitors like the People’s Republic of China and the Russian Federation are investing in new strategic weapons to modernize their arsenals, and Public Law 115–232 takes a comprehensive approach to ensure our security and maintaining U.S. nuclear forces and makes critical investments to modernize America’s nuclear deterrent and align it with these modern threats.

#### Missile Defense and Conventional Prompt Global Strike

The committee oversaw the Department of Defense’s efforts to develop, test, and field layered missile defense capabilities to pro-

tect the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies against the full range of ballistic missile threats.

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued to place a particular emphasis on U.S. homeland missile defense capabilities (including the Missile Defense Agency's proposal and strategy for acquiring a Redesigned Kill Vehicle and development and deployment of Homeland Defense Radars in Alaska and Hawaii). The committee also continued to oversee the European Phased Adaptive Approach implementation, developmental and operational testing, force structure and inventory requirements, continued development of so-called "left-of-launch" capabilities and exercises, and science and technology investments in areas such as directed energy.

During the first session of the 115th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on June 7, 2017, on "Fiscal year 2018 Priorities and Posture of Missile Defeat Programs and Activities" that focused on missile defense activities under deployment by the Department of Defense, including "left-of-launch" ballistic missile defense.

During the second session of the 115th Congress, the subcommittee held a hearing on April 17, 2018, on the "Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Missile Defense and Missile Defeat Programs." In addition, on September 5, 2018, the subcommittee held a classified briefing on "Chinese and Russian Hypersonic Weapon Development and Testing and U.S. Hypersonic Defense Update" that provided an intelligence assessment on recent Chinese and Russian hypersonic weapon developments. The brief also included an update from the Missile Defense Agency on the U.S. hypersonic defense program and ongoing analysis of alternatives.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91) included several provisions supporting missile defense and defeat programs. Given the increased threats against the United States, particularly from Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Public Law 115-91 authorized up to 28 additional ground-based interceptors, and directed the Missile Defense Agency, if consistent with the Ballistic Missile Defense Review, to develop a space-based sensor layer for ballistic missile defense to assure that we remain ahead of the threat.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232) included several legislative provisions supporting missile defense and defeat programs. The NDAA accelerated the integration of Patriot and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense missiles and required the director of the Missile Defense Agency to establish a space sensor layer and a boost phase intercept program, regardless of the outcome of the Ballistic Missile Defense Review, which commenced in 2017.

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued to oversee Conventional Prompt (Global) Strike (CPS) activities across the Department of Defense and military services. The committee focused on current and projected warfighter requirements for CPS capabilities, the timelines needed to meet those requirements, and related policy issues related to reducing the risk of ambiguity. Public Law 115-91 directed the Secretary of Defense to deliver a CPS capability not later than September 30, 2022. In the second session of the 115th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and the

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a joint briefing led by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics on the progress of the CPS program. Public Law 115–232 included a provision on CPS, and required the Secretary of Defense to validate requirements provided by the warfighter, in addition to providing additional funding above the President’s budget request to accelerate development and testing of the system.

### National Security Space

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued to oversee the national security space programs of the Department of Defense, including combat support agencies and elements of the Department of Defense that are also part of the intelligence community. The committee focused on current and projected foreign space threats and will continue to assess the Department’s space security and defense programs. The committee also focused on improving the organization and management of the national security space enterprise to posture the military to maintain the advantages we derive from space capabilities.

The committee continued its oversight of national security space activities in support of warfighter operations and plans; space acquisition strategies that provide necessary warfighter capability, while reducing cost and technical risk and supporting the industrial base; maintaining assured access to space; efforts to address gaps in space capabilities for key warfighter needs; investments in science and technology to improve the capabilities of space systems; efforts to appropriately leverage commercial satellite services; exploitation of space sensor data to maximize effectiveness and efficiency; improvements of the synchronization between satellite, ground, and terminal acquisition programs; and efforts that develop and sustain an expert space workforce.

In the first session of the 115th Congress, on March 29, 2017, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a joint hearing with the House Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications entitled “Threats to Space Assets and Implications for U.S. Homeland Security.” On May 19, 2017, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities and Posture of the National Security Space Enterprise”.

In the second session of the 115th Congress, the committee held a hearing on “Space Warfighting Readiness” on March 14, 2018. The hearing discussed the current and future readiness for U.S. forces to deter an attack on space systems and, if deterrence fails, to successfully operate through and win in a conflict that extends to the space domain. On March 15, 2018, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled, “The Fiscal Year 2019 Priorities and Posture of the National Security Space Enterprise”. On June 20, 2018, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a joint hearing with the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Space entitled, “Space Situational Awareness: Whole of Government Perspectives on Roles and Responsibilities” and reviewed the roles and responsibilities of particular departments and agencies that execute SSA missions.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included several provisions related to national security space. Public Law 115–91 recognized that space, just like land, air and sea, has quickly become a warfighting domain. This included provisions to begin addressing the organizational and management challenges faced by national security space enterprise. Public Law 115–91 streamlines Air Force acquisition authorities and empowers a single accountable organization for space forces within the Air Force.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included several provisions related to national security space programs, including those that address improvement to the acquisition system, personnel, and organization of space forces; space warfighting readiness policy; rapid, responsible and reliable space launch; supply chain security for certain space programs; the use of small- and medium-size buses for strategic payloads; and improving coordination and accountability across the Department.

#### Maritime Aviation

The committee provided oversight of Navy’s maritime aviation programs. The committee also continued its oversight efforts of the unmanned aircraft MQ–25 air-refueling aircraft program.

With regard to naval aviation force structure, in the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2018, or 12 months after the issuance of the National Defense Strategy. The briefing provided estimates as to the number of Navy and Marine Corps aircraft by series and type needed to achieve the objectives of the National Defense Strategy, and to complement the capability resident in a 355-ship Navy with 12 aircraft carriers. The briefing also included a detailed explanation of the strategy and associated force sizing and shaping constructs, associated scenarios and assumptions used to conduct the analysis, and quantification of risk using the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff risk management classifications.

Section 126 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to enter into one or more multiyear contracts, for up to 24 E–2D Advanced Hawkeye aircraft, beginning in fiscal year 2019, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee notes that the Navy has the opportunity to leverage a \$300.0 million Air Force investment in the MS–177A maritime enhanced sensor, which is meant to improve maritime target detection and long-range imaging. This investment could significantly reduce procurement costs and expedite fielding. The committee believes that having an organic Navy MS–177A demonstration in the U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) area of responsibility could help the Navy to assess the full range of anti-surface unit warfare and

anti-submarine warfare capabilities. In addition, the MS-177A would help gather needed intelligence against threats in the PACOM strategic environment. The MS-177A would improve the Navy organic capability to conduct standoff anti-surface unit warfare intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and long-range positive identification of targets. As such committee authorized \$23.5 million for the MS-177A maritime enhanced sensor demonstration program.

The committee supports the MQ-25 unmanned air refueling capability. In H. Rept. 115-676, the committee noted that the Navy's efforts to develop and field a carrier-based unmanned aerial system to provide refueling as well as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to the fleet. The committee further noted that the Chief of Naval Operations intends to accelerate this program by 2 years in order to provide this capability by 2026. To date, the Navy has not provided sufficient air vehicle justification. Budget documents stated that \$598.78 million will go to Air Segment Primary Hardware Development with very little further justification or cost estimates. As such, the committee authorized a decrease of \$116.9 million to procure one test article for the MQ-25 Unmanned Carrier Aviation program.

Additionally, in H. Rept. 115-200, the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2018, on the Navy's carrier based unmanned aircraft acquisition program(s), with specific focus on the MQ-25 that takes into account the revised capability development document. The report included the extent to which the program(s) have established cost, schedule, and performance goals, including test, production, and fielding plans and an assessment of program progress toward meeting those goals.

Finally, section 220 of Public Law 115-232 required the Navy to fund the modification of CVN-73 during its refueling and overhaul period in support of future MQ-25 unmanned carrier aircraft operations.

#### Munitions and Munitions Industrial Base

During the 115th Congress, the committee devoted particular oversight to conventional and precision guided munition programs, to include the health of the associated industrial base and supplier base, as well as munition inventories. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before the committee that, "key precision guided munitions shortfalls are exacerbated by ongoing operations and may impact potential contingency response." He further stated that "our current global inventories are insufficient for theater missile defense, standoff, and air-to-air munitions needs." The Secretary of the Air Force also indicated that "when it comes to munitions, we are stretched." The committee efforts primarily focused on the adequacy of current stockpiles of conventional munitions, as well as concerns regarding the ability of the industrial base to surge in order to meet emerging demands for overseas contingency operations. The committee, through official activities and legislation, worked to improve munition capacity, develop intelligent options for mitigating the bottlenecks and long-lead times required for munitions, mitigate the risk associated with single points of



failure in the supplier base, as well as acquisition reform efforts to include stockpiling, multi-year procurement contracts, paying to keep additional production capacity, and new production techniques. Committee staff delegations and congressional delegations also conducted oversight visits to the primary critical energetic material production facilities that provide the energetics for munition programs.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a briefing on July 27, 2017, to review the challenges facing Army and Air Force munition programs.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the committee on the Army’s strategic plan for the ammunition industrial base.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) authorized an additional \$2.0 billion to address munition unfunded requirements identified by the military service Chiefs of Staff.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee cited significant concerns regarding the adequacy of the Army’s Stinger missile inventory, as well as the resiliency of the associated industrial base that produces key components. H. Rept. 115–676 directed the Army to provide a briefing on the Stinger Modernization Program, to include the Army’s strategy to mitigate the decline of the Stinger missile inventory, to include required funding, maintenance of the Stinger industrial base, and modernization of the Stinger program in the out-years.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) supported the budget request for critical munitions, and authorized additional funding to maintain the maximum production rate of critical munitions, such as small diameter bombs, joint direct attack munitions, hellfire missiles, advanced precision kill weapon systems, long range anti-ship missiles, tomahawk missiles, advanced medium-range air-to-air missiles, and torpedoes. Sections 1061 and 1067 of Public Law 115–232 improves oversight of the Department’s management of critical munition portfolios, and also requires the Department to submit a separate Future Year’s Defense Program specifically for critical munitions.

#### Electronic Warfare Enterprise

During the 115th Congress, the committee assessed the electronic warfare (EW) strategy document that was released by the Department’s Electronic Warfare Executive Committee in June 2017. The committee sought to gain a greater understanding of current Joint Electro-Magnetic Spectrum Operations (JEMSO) efforts since release of the EW strategy document. The committee determined during the assessment that subsequent efforts to strengthen, modernize, and create synergy of effort across the Department related to the JEMSO enterprise may have stagnated within the military services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee

noted that officials overseeing the JEMSO enterprise needed to reinvigorate efforts towards achieving the goals and objectives described in the EW strategy due to the fact that peer adversaries are beginning to outpace U.S. capabilities.

The committee continued oversight of the Department's implementation of all JEMSO initiatives and capabilities, and encouraged the Department to quickly regain asymmetric superiority in this warfighting domain. Section 1053 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included oversight initiatives to enhance the governance, development of capabilities, and inter-service synergies of the Department's JEMSO enterprise.

## EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

### Investment in Future Capabilities Science and Technology

In the 115th Congress, the subcommittee continued to oversee the Department of Defense's science and technology (S&T) activities to ensure the planning and execution of a balanced S&T program that reflects the national security priorities of the military, and is in alignment with the National Defense Strategy. The committee also continued to examine how S&T investments are integrated into strategic and operational plans to ensure the investments that were made, including in people and infrastructure, were properly aligned. The committee focused on achieving a better understanding of how S&T programs integrate intelligence analyses into the S&T planning cycle, as well as better cognizance of global developments and industry-based independent research and development. The committee expanded its focus to take a similar look at other emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence and quantum computing, to see how they can contribute to new security strategies, and to ensure that they are supported by rigorous technical analysis, guidelines, and relevant concepts of employment.

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a related briefing on May 17, 2017, "Technological Superiority and Defense Investment Planning to Mitigate Foreign Advances"; a hearing on March 14, 2018, "A Review and Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for the Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs"; a briefing on June 21, 2018, "Artificial Intelligence Industry Roundtable"; and a hearing on December 11, 2018, "Department of Defense's Artificial Intelligence Structure, Investments, and Applications".

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a briefing on the development of a long-term science and technology roadmap for the development of Naval energetic materials, both explosives and propellants; a briefing on the Department's plans to develop and improve additive manufacturing, or 3-D printing; a briefing on current investments in medical simulation technology and research, and Department-wide efforts to incorporate simulated learning techniques in defense medical training; and a report on how the Defense Innovation Unit Experiment will be suf-

ficiently tied into the broader activities of the Department of Defense.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included a provision that raises the limit on in-house capital purchases using defense working capital funds from \$250,000 to \$500,000; a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to continue serving as the Department of Defense Executive Agent for the Defense Production Act Programs, and require the Secretary of Defense to complete a review and assessment of the Defense Production Act Title III program and provide a briefing; a provision that makes permanent the authority of the Secretary of Defense to award prizes for advanced technology achievements; a provision that requires the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to conduct a pilot program among defense laboratories, national laboratories, and private entities to facilitate the licensure, transfer, and commercialization of innovative technologies; a provision that codifies the research authorities of the defense laboratories; a provision requesting a report on educational opportunities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics for children dependents of members of the Armed Forces; a provision that establishes senior scientific technical managers at Major Range and Test Facility Base Facilities, and Defense Test Resource Management Center; a provision that would allow United States Merchant Marine Academy members to participate in competitions for grants that have scientific or educational value to the Academy; and a provision that revises and updates the list of Department of Defense S&T reinvention laboratories.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for 2019, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: an overview of the Navy's Small Business Innovation Research Automated Test and Retest Program; a briefing on the Air Force's wind energy radar mitigation efforts; an assessment of the common data environment for modeling and simulation capabilities; an update on counter-small tactical unmanned air system programs and associated threat detection technologies; an assessment of the future uses of synthetic biology; a plan for further integrating the National laboratories with defense innovation hubs; and a plan for protecting defense industrial base critical technologies.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included a provision that would establish a National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence; a provision that requires the establishment of a Department of Defense critical technologies list; a provision that requires the development of a National Science and Technology Strategy; a provision that requires the Defense Technical Information Center to establish an innovators information repository for the Department; a provision that extends and codifies the authority to conduct technology protection features activities during the research and development of defense systems; a provision that reauthorizes the defense research and development rapid innovation program; a provision that expands the mission areas supported for expedited access to technical talent and expertise at academic institutions; a provision that establishes the National Security Innovation Activi-

ties program and authorizes funding in the amount of \$75.0 million; a provision that establishes the Defense Quantum Information Science and Technology Research Program; a provision that establishes the a Joint Artificial Intelligence Research, Development, and Transition Activities Program; and a provision that requires a report on Defense Innovation Unit Experimental integration in the broader Department of Defense research enterprise.

### Cyber Operations Capabilities

Cyber operations have taken on an increasingly important role in military operations, as well as overall in national security. Accordingly, the committee continued to scrutinize the Department of Defense's cyber operations, organization, manning, and funding to ensure that the military has the freedom of maneuver to conduct the range of missions in the Nation's defense, and when called upon, to support other interagency and international partners. An important oversight role for Congress regarding the conduct of defensive and offensive cyber operations has been to ensure that the proper legal and policy frameworks are in place and followed. The committee also continued to scrutinize military cyber operations to ensure that they are properly integrated into the combatant commander's operational plans, and to ensure that adequate capabilities exist or are in development to employ these cyberspace operational tools with rigor and discretion to support a full range of options for the Nation's decision makers. In the course of monitoring the cybersecurity posture of the military, the committee continued to examine the effects of globalization on the assured integrity of microelectronics and software.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several hearings and briefings within this area, including: February 28, 2017, "Cyber Warfare in the 21st Century: Threats, Challenges and Opportunities"; March 1, 2017, "Cyber Operations Quarterly Update"; May 23, 2017, "Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request for U.S. Cyber Command: Cyber Mission Force Support to Department of Defense Operations"; September 26, 2017, "Initiatives for Protecting Naval Vessels Afloat From Cyber Vulnerabilities"; November 29, 2017, "Cyber Operations Quarterly Update"; December 6, 2017, "Update on National Security Agency (NSA) Activities"; January 17, 2018: "An Update on U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) Ongoing Cyber Reviews and Studies"; April 11, 2018, "A Review and Assessment of the Department of Defense Budget, Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Cyber Operations and U.S. Cyber Command for Fiscal Year 2019"; April 11, 2018: "Cyber Operations Today: Preparing for 21st Century Challenges in an Information-Enabled Society"; June 6, 2018, "Cyber Operations Quarterly Update".

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: an assessment, and subsequent briefing, of the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement clause to assess compliance of industry and identify any issues and concerns with the quality of System Security Plans from contractors; an assessment, and subsequent briefing, to assess the Department of Defense's current and

planned state of cyber training; a briefing on cyber talent management tools in development and use across the Department of Defense; an assessment, and subsequent briefing, on creating criteria for evaluating commercial threat information service providers and sources; and a briefing on the progress in developing the Persistent Training Environment.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included a provision that would authorize service secretaries to credit any person receiving an original appointment as a reserve commissioned officer with a period of constructive service, and allows the Defense Department to better recruit individuals with cyberspace-related skills into vacant critical cyberspace positions; a provision that would require the Director of National Intelligence to develop a list of telecommunications contractors who have been found to have knowingly assisted or facilitated a cyber attack carried out or on behalf of the government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from entering into a contract with any entity on this list; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress a report on all prior attempted Russian cyber attacks against Department of Defense systems within the last 2 years; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of an enhanced personnel management system for cybersecurity and legal professionals; a provision that included all of the congressional defense committees in the requirement of quarterly cyber operations briefings, as well as increasing the fidelity of the items included; a provision that would prohibit any department, agency, organization, or other element of the U.S. Government from using any product developed by Kaspersky Lab or any entity of which Kaspersky Lab has majority ownership; a provision that would establish the policy of the United States with respect to matters pertaining to cyberspace, cybersecurity, and cyber warfare; a provision that would modify the requirements and authorities germane to the establishment of a unified combatant command for cyber operations; a provision that would authorize a pilot program to assess the effectiveness of carrying out a full-scale talent management program to ensure that the cyber work force of the Department has the capacity needed to effectively perform its cyber missions and the kinetic missions impacted by cyber activities; a provision that would require the establishment of a cross-functional task force to integrate across organizations of the Department of Defense responsible for information operations, military deception, public affairs, electronic warfare, and cyber operations; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to incorporate the cybersecurity of elections systems of the states as a component of the Cyber Guard Exercise; a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to update its cyber scorecards; a provision that would establish the Strategic Cybersecurity Program; a provision that would require the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command to conduct an evaluation of alternative methods for developing, acquiring, and maintaining software-based cyber tools and applications for Cyber Command and for the cyber component commands of the Armed Forces; a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to

submit a report on significant security risks to defense critical electric infrastructure; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a cyber posture review; a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit to Congress a report on the Army Combat Training Centers and the current resident cyber capabilities and training at such centers; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the potential offensive and defensive cyber applications of blockchain technology; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the Department of Defense training infrastructure for cyber forces; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on termination of the dual-hat arrangement for the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command; a provision that would establish the Department of Defense Cyber Scholarship Program; a provision that would develop and implement a pilot program at not more than 10, but at least 5, community colleges to provide scholarships to eligible students who are veterans of the Armed Forces pursuing associate degrees or specialized program certifications in the field of cybersecurity; a provision that adds a scholarship-for-service condition to U.S. Code in which recipients of the relevant scholarships must agree to work for a period equal to the length of the scholarship in local, state, or Federal government; a provision that expands the definitions of “math and science teacher” and “science, technology, engineering, or mathematics professional” to include persons with relevant cybersecurity experience and qualifications in section 1862n–1(i) of title 42, U.S. Code; and a provision that would require an annual assessment of the cyber resiliency of the nuclear command and control system.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee included several directive reporting requirements, including: a briefing on activities and investments the Department is making with respect to foreign suppliers of critical technologies to national defense to ensure their integrity, including microelectronics; a briefing on how the Department may expand Hacking for Defense to support the Department’s innovation and entrepreneurial education efforts; a Comptroller General review of the Department of Defense’s current military cyberspace operations; a Comptroller General review of the Department’s information operations strategy and implementation efforts; a briefing on the implementation and utilization of the Cyber Scholarship Program; a briefing outlining the resources and any recommendations that will be required to fully address the information security continuous monitoring capability and comply-to-connect policy requirements contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328); a briefing outlining the specific steps the Department is taking to protect autonomous systems from cyberattack; a briefing on the status and evolution of automated cyber defense capabilities, to include those that automatically detect and mitigate malware and other threats; a plan on how the Department can leverage and partner with universities and industry on cyber education and training; a briefing on information security technologies that the Department employs to protect the official unclassified email and official unclassified mobile communica-

tions of its employees; and a briefing on the outcomes of its cost and technical analyses to implement enterprise-wide programs and policies for insider threat detection, user activity monitoring, and cyber attack detection and remediation.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included a provision that directs policy of the United States on cyberspace, cybersecurity, cyber warfare, and cyber deterrence; a provision that affirms the authority of the Secretary of Defense to conduct military activities and operations in cyberspace; a provision that provides authority to the Department to engage in active defense to disrupt, defeat, and deter cyber attacks in cyberspace; a provision that would expand the Department of Defense Cyber Scholarship Program scholarships and grants; a provision that amends a pilot program regarding cyber vulnerabilities of Department of Defense critical infrastructure to include the Defense Digital Service; a provision that extends the acquisition authority of the Commander of the U.S. Cyber Command; a provision that directs budget displays for cyber vulnerability evaluations and mitigation activities for major weapon systems of the Department of Defense; a provision that directs a determination and report regarding the roles, missions, and responsibilities of the Commander, Joint Force Headquarters-Department of Defense Information Networks of the Defense Information Support Agency; a provision requiring procedures and establishing reporting requirements for cybersecurity breaches and loss of personally identifiable information and controlled unclassified information; a provision that would limit funds, require a report, and implement specified capabilities for the Sharkseer program; a provision that requires the Department to designate an official for matters relating to integrating cybersecurity and industrial control systems within the Department of Defense; a provision to provide assistance for small manufacturers in the defense industrial supply chain on matters relating to cybersecurity; a provision requiring implementation of email and Internet website security and authentication; a provision requiring a demonstration of a security product integration framework; a provision requiring a report on the information security continuous monitoring program and the cybersecurity scorecard; a provision requiring a tier 1 exercise of support to civil authorities for a cyber incident; a provision establishing a pilot program on modeling and simulation in support of military homeland defense operations in connection with cyber attacks on critical infrastructure; a provision establishing a pilot program authority to provide personnel to the Department of Homeland Security to enhance cybersecurity and resiliency of critical infrastructure; a provision that would allow the establishment of a pilot program on regional cyber security training center for the Army National Guard; a provision that establishes a Cyberspace Solarium Commission; and a provision that requires a study and report on Reserve Component cyber civil support teams.

#### Information Operations

Engagement with foreign audiences and nuanced understanding of the information environment is pivotal in navigating the 21st century security environment. Whether one is trying to influence

nation-state actors or potential allies, counter violent extremist groups, or identify and counter efforts at deception or misinformation, strategic communication and information operations are key elements to success on the battlefield. During the 115th Congress, the committee most notably increased oversight and focus on understanding and countering state-sponsored Information Operations (IO) against adversaries such as the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and others. The committee also increased oversight on the nexus and convergence between IO and cyber operations and cyber warfare.

With the continued threat of violent extremist groups like Al Shabaab, Boko Haram, and the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, the sustained need for the Department of Defense to plan and execute effective Information Operations continued to grow. Recent examples illustrate how these groups are still utilize social media to support the radicalization process, as well as planning, financing, and command and control for terrorist acts. The committee continued to scrutinize the programs, authorities, funding, and training for traditional military information support operations, as well as ensured such capabilities were integrated into contingency planning and theater security cooperation plans. Additionally, as emerging technologies like social media and big data analytics are forcing the Department of Defense to be more agile and adaptable in how it uses emerging technology, including flexible and agile policies for their employment, and concept exploration and development to determine new ways of operationalizing information influence. The committee monitored how developments in the defense space adapted and synchronized with broader interagency and international activities in order to exert influence from tactical effect to strategic effect.

The committee held a related hearing on March 15, 2017, entitled "Crafting an Information Warfare and Counter-Propaganda Strategy for the Emerging Security Environment".

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee included a reporting requirements related to information operations: a briefing assessing the opportunities for support of and integration with the Global Engagement Center to address similar missions.

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities considered and reported legislation related to Information Operations and in all related areas of its jurisdiction that was ultimately included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91). This included provisions to authorize and strengthen the Global Engagement Center within the U.S. Department of State, and provisions to strengthen the relationship between traditional IO functions and cyber warfare and cyber operations.

The subcommittee additionally considered and reported legislation related to Information Operations and in all related areas of its jurisdiction that was ultimately included in John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232). This included provisions to strengthen and re-authorize



the Global Engagement Center and other inter-agency efforts. Other Information Operations initiatives are detailed elsewhere in this report.

#### Compromises of National Security Information and Insider Threats

In the 115th Congress, the committee continued to monitor the Department of Defense's efforts to identify and mitigate the threats to military programs, plans, operations, and personnel stemming from the compromise of a large amount of classified information through unauthorized disclosures. The committee monitored efforts to mitigate future compromises by overseeing the implementation of insider threat programs and other security clearance reform efforts within the executive branch, and the Department of Defense's compliance with the requirements of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) regarding the Department's security practices, audit capabilities, and information-sharing policies. In June 2018, the committee held a hearing titled "Military Technology Transfer: Threats, Impacts, and Solutions for the Department of Defense", and heard directly from senior Department of Defense leaders about efforts to protect Department information and technology. The committee also held multiple briefings about the Department's continued efforts to improve vetting of personnel to improve capabilities to detect and mitigate potential insider threats.

#### Use of Force in Counterterrorism Operations Outside the United States and Areas of Active Hostilities

The committee conducted extensive oversight, often in classified form, over the use of force in counterterrorism operations outside of the United States and areas of active hostilities. While the use of force in this area was overseen in all aspects, the committee paid particular attention to special operations and activities, and the interagency coordination that occurs with the U.S. intelligence community. In conducting this oversight, the committee also reviewed and considered presidential policy guidance documents and similar executive branch directives, and ensured that counterterrorism operations conducted outside of the United States and areas of active hostilities were in line with broader national security objectives, strategies, and resources. Members and staff of the committee conducted overseas travel to review and assess counterterrorism operations and activities, principally within the U.S. Central Command and U.S. Africa Command areas of responsibilities. Finally, the committee continued to coordinate with the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on intelligence matters of the Department of Defense in the course of its annual oversight of the intelligence community and the authorization of appropriations for intelligence activities shared by the two committees.

#### Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction

Countering weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is a key mission for the Department of Defense. The proliferation and potential use of nuclear, chemical, and biological agents pose a unique and en-

during threat to U.S. national security. In addition, emerging technologies, like synthetic biology, broaden the scope of potential weapons of mass destruction. To respond to this threat, the Department engaged in activities to understand current threats and vulnerabilities; control, defeat, disable, and dispose of WMD threats; and safeguard the force and manage WMD consequences. The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued reviewing the Department's countering WMD plans and programs to ensure the WMD threat is appropriately addressed and is properly resourced despite budget constraints and competing priorities.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several hearings and briefings on countering WMD, including: a hearing on March 20, 2017, "Hearing on High Consequences and Uncertain Threats: Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2018"; and a hearing on March 22, 2018, "Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2019."

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee included several directives related to countering weapons of mass destruction, including: a briefing on countermeasures for botulinum toxin type A and B; a briefing on the Department's Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Response Enterprise, which includes National Guard units; a briefing from the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) on planned activities to promote the ability of partner nations to respond to WMD, including infectious disease; and a Comptroller General review of the Realignment of the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization under the DTRA.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115-676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee included several directives related to countering weapons of mass destruction, including: a briefing on how the Department may leverage advancements in synthetic biology, genomics, and biotechnology to enhance service members' performance; a briefing on implementation of lessons learned from the Department's 2016 Ebola response; a briefing on the Department's efforts to secure service member genetic and medical information and foreign intelligence services attempts to collect this information on Department personnel; a Comptroller General of the United States review of the Department's preparedness to counter chemical and biological weapons on the Korean Peninsula; and a report on how to strengthen the Cooperative Threat Reduction program to address emerging threats and proliferation concerns.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232), included multiple legislative provisions related to countering WMD. These include the development of a plan to streamline the Department's countering WMD oversight framework and an annual report on the work of the Countering WMD Unity of Effort Council.

## Global War on Terrorism

Since the 9/11 attacks, the United States has dealt al-Qaida repeated and significant blows during the global war on terrorism. Despite many notable successes, al-Qaida, as well as its adherents and affiliates, remains active in areas of importance to the United States, including: the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; the Islamic Republic of Pakistan; the Republic of Iraq; the Federal Republic of Somalia; and the Republic of Yemen. The committee continued to conduct oversight, often in classified form, over terrorism issues, with particular attention to special operations capabilities and the changing nature of al-Qaida's organization, affiliates, and its operations, as well as threats being posed by the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. The committee continued to focus on efforts to build partner nation counterterrorism and conventional warfare capabilities to counter these threats at the regional and local level. As the United States strengthened and built partnership capacity with key allies around the globe, the committee remained focused on the Department of Defense's efforts to aggressively fight the global war on terror and counter radicalism in places of concern, such as Syria, Iraq, Pakistan, Yemen, the Horn of Africa, and North Africa. Committee members and staff conducted numerous overseas congressional delegations to review and assess ongoing U.S. and coalition counterterrorism operations and activities. Ensuring security and stability in volatile regions that cannot adequately govern themselves or secure their own territory remained a top priority for the committee.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several related hearings in this area including: a hearing on March 15, 2017, "Crafting an Information Warfare and Counter-Propaganda Strategy for the Emerging Security Environment"; a hearing on March 23, 2017, "High Consequences and Uncertain Threats: Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2018"; a hearing on May 2, 2017, "Three Decades Later: A Review and Assessment of U.S. Special Operations Forces 30-Years After the Creation of U.S. Special Operations Command"; a hearing on February 15, 2018, "Evolution, Transformation, and Sustainment: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Forces and Command"; a hearing on March 22, 2018, "Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2019"; and a hearing on July 19, 2018, "Department of Defense's Role in Foreign Assistance".

Similarly, the committee and the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several classified and/or closed briefings and roundtables including: a briefing on February 15, 2017, "Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief"; a briefing on March 21, 2017, "Yemen Update Brief"; a roundtable discussion on March 29, 2017, "The Future of Counterterrorism Policy: Identifying Essential Elements to Achieve an Effective and Sustainable Strategy"; a briefing on June 14, 2017, "Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief"; a briefing on September 6, 2017, "Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence

Update Brief”; a briefing on October 26, 2017, “Recent U.S. Military Operations in Niger” in conjunction with the Full Committee; a briefing on December 13, 2017, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”; and a briefing on June 26, 2018, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included several provisions related to the global war on terrorism, counterterrorism, special operations forces, and sensitive activities that are reported elsewhere in this report. Similarly, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included several legislative provisions related to the global war on terrorism, counterterrorism, special operations forces, and sensitive activities that are reported elsewhere in this report.

### Information Technology

Information technology (IT) systems are critical enablers for the Department of Defense. The IT budget represents a major investment area requiring the same rigorous planning, analysis, and oversight as any other complex major weapon system. The Department recognized this area as a source of greater efficiencies, and has managed to reduce spending in IT by several billion dollars across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee continued to review the Department’s IT investment planning and review processes, as well as specific acquisitions, to improve the ability to identify and reduce unwarranted duplication and eliminate programs of little value to the warfighter. The committee also provided robust oversight on the adoption of enterprise-wide cloud architecture and the overarching Department cloud strategy.

The committee held related hearing on April 26, 2017, entitled “Creating a Flexible and Effective Information Technology Management and Acquisition System: Elements for Success in a Rapidly Changing Landscape”; a hearing on April 27, 2017, entitled “Update on activities of the Electronic Warfare Executive Committee”; and a briefing on July 26, 2017, entitled “Briefing on the Navy’s Digital Warfare Office”.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–200) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, the committee included several reporting requirements related to information technology, including a briefing on cloud computing coordinated with the acquisition community; a briefing on any current plans to demonstrate or incorporate Department-wide digital risk management and attribute-based access control capabilities into upgrades to key enabling cyber capabilities inside the Joint Regional Security Stacks initiative; and a report with a plan to carry out the timely completion of network consolidation and installation of Joint Regional Security Stacks and Multi-Protocol Label Switching at key nodes in the U.S.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) included: a provision that eliminates the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology and extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative; a provision that excludes defense business systems and major automated information systems from the definition of major

defense acquisition program; a provision requiring the Defense Innovation Board to complete an analysis of software development and acquisition regulations for the Department; a provision that establishes two pilots that encourage the Department's use of tailoring to realign several major warfighting programs and defense business systems; a provision that directs the Secretary of Defense to identify software development activities and pilot the use of modern agile methods, to include open source approaches, as well as oversight metrics appropriate for agile development; a provision that directs the Secretary of Defense to manage the Department's unclassified, non-defense article, custom developed computer software code using open source licenses and an open source software repository; a provision that authorizes two types of funds to modernize the Federal Government's legacy IT and to incentivize IT savings in federal agencies; a provision that elevates the role of the Chief Information Officer and realigning its responsibilities and authorities to two other officials: Chief Information Warfare Officer and Chief Management Officer; and a provision that requires that procurement for each Distributed Common Ground System be carried out in accordance with section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, regarding commercial items.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 115–676) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, the committee included a reporting requirement related to information technology, including a request for information on the Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure and its impacts to current cloud computing services.

The John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) included: a provision that requires implementation of the recommendations of the final report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on the Design and Acquisition of Software for Defense System; a provision that requires the Chief Information Officer to develop an approach to rapidly acquire advanced network and cloud capabilities to conduct an analysis of the migration to the Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure, and to provide a report on the Department's Cloud Initiative; and a provision that would require the Department to establish regulations and a registry of providers of information technology who have obligations to foreign governments.

## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

### Full Committee Hearings and Briefings

During the 115th Congress, the committee held a series of budget posture hearings and briefings in preparation for the fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019 budgets. The hearings and briefings, combined with the committee's responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are a central element in the discharge of the committee's oversight responsibilities. In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement of Federal Government programs, and pursuant to House rule XI, clause 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times

to conduct oversight of Department of Defense activities, as noted elsewhere in this report.

To inform its consideration of the fiscal year 2018 budget request, the committee convened a hearing on February 7, 2017, with military senior leaders to receive testimony on the state of the military. On April 5, 2017, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from the military service chiefs about a continuing resolution's impact on the military. The committee convened a hearing on June 12, 2017, to receive testimony from the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the fiscal year 2018 budget request. The committee also sought the perspective of the commanders of the unified combatant commands through several briefings and hearings in 2017. Additionally, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from Members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, which took place on April 27, 2017.

To inform its consideration of the fiscal year 2019 budget request, the committee convened a hearing on March 20, 2018, with the Secretaries of the military departments to receive testimony about the fiscal year 2019 budget request and acquisition reform progress. The committee received testimony from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on October 3, 2017, about the U.S. defense strategy in South Asia, on February 6, 2018, about the National Defense Strategy and Nuclear Posture Review, and on April 12, 2018, about the fiscal year 2019 budget request for the Department of Defense. The committee also sought the perspective of the commanders of the unified combatant commands through briefings and hearings in 2018. Additionally, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from Members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, which took place on April 11, 2018.

In keeping with the committee's emphasis on defense reform, the committee convened a series of hearings and briefings throughout the 115th Congress to examine initial findings of the Section 809 Panel, future opportunities in defense reform, oversight and reform of the 4th Estate of the Department of Defense, promotion of the Department's culture of innovation, military service acquisition reform, and the Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation plan.

Additionally, in recognition of the changing nature of conflict and competition, the committee met several times over the course of the 115th Congress to conduct hearings and briefings on threats and the United States' role and policies. Topics covered included America's role in the world, the evolution of hybrid warfare and its key challenges, cyberwarfare, the evolving threat of terrorism and effective counterterrorism strategies, national security threats and challenges, state and non-state actor influence operations, strategic competition with the People's Republic of China, readying the U.S. military for future warfare, and China's pursuit of emerging technologies.

The committee also held frequent classified briefings to receive intelligence and operational updates on threat developments across the globe. These briefings informed the committee's oversight hear-

ings and briefings on the Department's strategic reassurance and deterrence activities in Europe and the Asia-Pacific, and operations in Africa. They also informed the committee's legislative initiatives in readiness, capabilities, and infrastructure to ensure that the U.S. Armed Forces remain capable of addressing current and emerging conventional and unconventional threats.

The committee also sought to emphasize and complement the oversight work of the subcommittees and, throughout the 115th Congress, conducted oversight series focused on securing the peace after the fall of ISIS, evaluating Department of Defense equipment and uniform procurement in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, evaluating the Defense Contract Auditing Process, infrastructure needs and projects ready for immediate implementation in the nuclear security enterprise, and the inspector general's report about its investigation on allegations relating to U.S. Central Command's intelligence products. Lastly, the committee conducted hearings on the preparation the Department of Defense is undertaking to execute its first ever full financial audit on the financial statements of fiscal year 2018.

#### Budget Oversight

On March 3, 2017, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2018 to the Committee on the Budget. At that time, the President had announced a topline of \$603.0 billion for fiscal year 2018 discretionary budget authority for national defense. At that funding level, a full budget submission would not comply with the limitations mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) for funding levels in fiscal year 2018 and across all budgeted fiscal years. While the \$603.0 billion would be a 3.2 percent increase for national defense compared to the fiscal year 2018 funding levels proposed in President Obama's fiscal year 2017 budget request, the committee indicated that level of funding would not accomplish the Administration's goals.

At the direction of the Speaker of the House, the committee identified funding gaps that have resulted in significant damage to our military in recent years, as well as the funding required to fulfill the specific goals set by the President. Proposed increases to the funding above that projected in the budget proposal for fiscal year 2018 include an additional \$15.0 billion to start rebuilding toward an active Army of 490,000 Soldiers; almost \$14.0 billion to begin repairing U.S. Navy ships, restoring U.S. naval presence around the world, and recovering current readiness shortfalls; and nearly \$11.0 billion to replace worn out equipment and begin making up for military training missed over the last four years. The committee also noted that it would take nearly \$4.0 billion to restore over-used facilities. The committee assessed that the total cost to begin the repair and rebuilding effort was approximately \$640.0 billion for fiscal year 2018, or a 9.5 percent increase.

As requested by the chairman of the Budget Committee, the committee outlined its legislative priorities for the upcoming year. The committee noted that the annual National Defense Authorization Act contained all the essential authorities required to sustain our

military and is the chief mechanism through which Congress exercises its Article I, Section 8 responsibilities. The committee intended to enact a national defense authorization bill in 2017 as it has for 56 consecutive years. The committee identified that it will continue the practice of conducting a significant number of hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions in order to better understand the current security environment, evaluate proposals for reform, and receive independent feedback on the military requirements necessary to support a robust strategy. The committee's ranking member did not join the chairman in his views and estimates.

On March 9, 2018, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2019 to the Committee on the Budget. The President's fiscal year 2019 budget submission complied with the limitations mandated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) as modified by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123). The committee noted that funding levels provided by the Public Law 115–123 for national defense would begin to redress our readiness shortfalls. The 2018 agreement provided the Department with the increases the Secretary of Defense requested. However, Congress would need to follow the fiscal cycle through to conclusion by properly providing appropriations in a timely manner for the Department to execute these funds effectively.

The committee noted that it will take years to address the readiness shortfall, and was therefore pleased to see the President's Budget request not only matched the funding levels set by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 for fiscal year 2019, but maintained higher levels of funding through the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP). The committee stated further that while changes in the security environment must always be considered when formulating budgets, providing the Department and the defense industrial base with a reliable budget that extends into the outyears would enable more cost effective decision-making. Retaining adequate budget levels in the outyears would be critical to continuing the positive trajectory Public Law 115–123 had provided for readiness restoration.

The committee was also encouraged by the budget request's proposal to realign Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funds to the base budget starting in fiscal year 2020. As OCO activities become enduring requirements over time, those requirements should be funded in the base budget. Increases to base funding levels in the outyears would accommodate the realignment of funding for these enduring requirements, and the President's budget request allowed for this accommodation over the life of the FYDP. The committee identified that while an adjustment to the funding caps in the Budget Control Act would still be required for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, the committee supported early congressional action on an applicable budget agreement.



## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES

### Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities

In coordination with the committee, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted additional oversight of specific issues related to the global war on terrorism, to include; special operations capabilities, counterterrorism, and counter-proliferation programs and activities; homeland defense and consequence management programs; intelligence policy, national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements of the intelligence community.

In order to conduct oversight, subcommittee members and staff made numerous trips to countries impacted by terrorism and emerging threats, to include areas where U.S. forces are engaged in combat operations, to further understand the resources leveraged against terrorism and other emerging threats, the authorities applied in these efforts, and the Department of Defense's interaction with its interagency and international partners. These congressional and staff delegations were preceded by operational and intelligence oversight briefings to Members and staff by senior officials from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the intelligence community, and represented an important part of oversight conducted by the subcommittee. Countries visited include: United Arab Emirates, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, the State of Kuwait, the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Ukraine, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Republic of Djibouti, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Kingdom of Belgium.

The subcommittee considered and reported several legislative provisions in H.R. 2810, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the House, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91), H.R. 5515, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, as passed by the House, and the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115-232). The provisions covered a range of issues within the subcommittee's jurisdiction including: counterterrorism and counter-proliferation programs and activities; U.S. Special Operations Forces; science and technology policy and programs, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency; information technology and programs; homeland defense and consequence management programs; and defense intelligence policy. These specifically included: increased congressional oversight of cyber operations; requiring a cyber posture review to clarify U.S. cyber deterrence policy and strategy; support for Defense innovation to ensure technological superiority and overmatch for warfighters against current and future threats; reinforces counterterrorism and unconventional warfare capabilities by fully resourcing U.S. Special Operations Command's programs and activities; granted specific permanent authority for family support programs within U.S. Special Operations Command; advanced hypersonic weapons research, development, and transitional efforts within the Department; and provisions previously addressed elsewhere in this report.

The subcommittee conducted three oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2018 budget request, including the following: March 23, 2017, “High Consequences and Uncertain Threats: Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2018”; May 2, 2017, “Three Decades Later: A Review and Assessment of U.S. Special Operations Forces 30-Years After the Creation of U.S. Special Operations Command”; and May 23, 2017, “Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request for U.S. Cyber Command: Cyber Mission Force Support to Department of Defense Operations”.

The subcommittee conducted four oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2019 budget request, including the following: February 15, 2018, “Evolution, Transformation, and Sustainment: A Review of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Forces and Command”; March 14, 2018, “A Review and Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs”; March 22, 2018, “Department of Defense (DoD) Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) for Fiscal Year 2019”; and April 11, 2018, “A Review and Assessment of the Department of Defense Budget, Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Cyber Operations and U.S. Cyber Command for Fiscal Year 2019”.

In addition to oversight hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight, including classified briefings: February 15, 2017, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”; March 1, 2017, “Cyber Operations Quarterly Update”; March 1, 2017, “Cyber Warfare in the 21st Century: Threats, Challenges, and Opportunities”; March 15, 2017, “Crafting an Information Warfare and Counter-Propaganda Strategy for the Emerging Security Environment”; March 3, 2017, “Industry Roundtable on Challenges to the Department of Defense’s Information Technology and Cyber Infrastructure”; March 21, 2017, “Yemen Update Brief”; March 29, 2017, “The Future of Counterterrorism Policy: Identifying Essential Elements to Achieve an Effective and Sustainable Strategy”; April 4, 2017, “China’s Information Warfare Strategy: A Conversation with Dean Cheng, Author of *Cyber Dragon*”; April 26, 2017, “Creating a Flexible and Effective Information Technology Management and Acquisition System: Elements for Success in a Rapidly Changing Landscape”; April 27, 2017, “Update on activities of the Electronic Warfare Executive Committee (EW EXCOM)”; May 17, 2017, “Technological Superiority and Defense Investment Planning to Mitigate Foreign Advances”; June 14, 2017, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”; July 26, 2017, “Briefing on the Navy’s Digital Warfare Office”; September 6, 2017, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”; September 26, 2017, “Initiatives for Protecting Naval Vessels Afloat from Cyber Vulnerabilities” jointly with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces; October 26, 2017, “Recent U.S. Military Operations in Niger”; November 29, 2017, “Cyber Operations Quarterly Update”; December 6, 2017, “Update on National Security Agency (NSA) Activities”; December 13, 2017, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”; January 8, 2018, “China’s Pursuit of Emerging and Exponential Tech-

nologies”; January 17, 2018, “An Update on U.S. Government Accountability Office’s (GAO) Ongoing Cyber Reviews and Studies”; April 11, 2018, “Cyber Operations Today: Preparing for 21st Century Challenges in an Information-Enabled Society”; June 6, 2018, “Cyber Operations Quarterly Update”; June 21, 2018, “Industry Roundtable on Artificial Intelligence”; June 26, 2018, “Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update Brief”; July 19, 2018, “Department of Defense’s Role in Foreign Assistance”; September 26, 2018, “Cyber Policies, Authorities, and Approvals for Department of Defense Cyber Operations”; November 14, 2018, “Inter-agency Cyber Cooperation: Roles, Responsibilities and Authorities of DOD & DHS” in coordination with the House Committee on Homeland Security; and December 11, 2018, “Department of Defense’s Artificial Intelligence Structure, Investments, and Applications”.

#### Subcommittee on Military Personnel

The committee conducted oversight of several additional military personnel-related issues during the 115th Congress. On July 25, 2017, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a classified briefing on the results of a Department of Defense Inspector General investigation into the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest (MAVNI) program. The briefers provided an overview of the original purpose of the program, and how the investigation uncovered several security issues, including the fact that several thousand non-citizens were allowed to enter the military without completed background investigations. As a result of the investigation, the Department of Defense suspended the MAVNI program and tightened the policies related to background investigations. On June 27, 2018, the subcommittee held a classified follow-up briefing to better understand what steps have been taken to remedy the security concerns. In an effort to prevent future issues related to this program, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) contained a provision that puts in place restrictions on the program, including limits on the number that can enlist under the program, as well as a requirement that all participants have completed background investigations before attending initial training.

The committee also conducted substantial oversight of Arlington National Cemetery. A recent report and survey made clear that the cemetery was rapidly running out of burial space. As a result, the subcommittee held a briefing on January 11, 2018, and a hearing on March 8, 2018, where the Members heard from the Arlington National Cemetery administrators and from veteran stakeholders. Both the briefing and the hearing made clear that changes are necessary to ensure that Arlington National Cemetery remains an active burial ground for the Nation’s heroes. To that end, Public Law 115–232 included a provision that directed the Secretary of the Army to establish revised eligibility criteria for interment at Arlington National Cemetery to ensure that the cemetery remains an active burial ground well into the future.

Finally, the subcommittee continued its oversight of the military service review board agencies. The agencies are charged with receiving and reviewing applications for the correction of military

records and for reviewing requests for discharge upgrades. The subcommittee held a hearing on March 2, 2017, with the directors of the agencies to gain a better understanding of their purpose and the nature of the applications they receive. On September 27, 2018, the subcommittee held another hearing with the review board agencies' directors to understand why the agencies are unable to meet congressionally-mandated processing timelines.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91) contained several provisions designed to ensure applicants receive a fair and thorough review, including a provision that requires the Boards of Correction for Military and Naval Records consider additional medical evidence submitted by the applicant and grant liberal consideration of evidence in cases involving post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury. Other provisions required a confidential review of discharge characterizations for victims of sexual assault and a pilot program to leverage teleconferencing technology to allow applicants to appear before review boards. Similarly, Public Law 115–232 contained a provision that extended a previous prohibition on reducing the civilian manning at the review board agencies. The committee will continue to provide oversight of this issue to ensure review board agency applicants receive timely and thorough reviews of their applications.

#### Subcommittee on Readiness

The Subcommittee on Readiness continued oversight of military readiness, training, logistics, and maintenance issues; military construction, installations, shipyard repair facilities, and family housing issues; energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense; and civilian personnel and service contracting issues.

On February 15, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the “Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress.”

On February 28, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on “The Department of Defense’s Readiness Rebuilding Efforts.”

On March 8, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The Current State of U.S. Army Readiness.”

On March 16, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The Current State of U.S. Navy Readiness.”

On March 22, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The Current State of U.S. Air Force Readiness.”

On March 30, 2017, the subcommittee met in joint session with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive testimony on “The Current State of U.S. Transportation Command.”

On April 5, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “The Current State of U.S. Marine Corps Readiness”

On April 27, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on “Shipyard Readiness.”

On June 8, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on “The Department of the Navy 2018 Budget Request.”

On June 9, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on “The Department of the Army 2018 Budget Request.”

On June 13, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on “The Department of the Air Force 2018 Budget Request.”

On July 27, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Continued Oversight of the Transfer of Excess Military Equipment to Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies.”

On September 7, 2017, the subcommittee met in joint session with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive testimony on “Navy Readiness—Underlying Problems Associated with the USS Fitzgerald and USS John S. McCain.”

On September 28, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on the “European Defense Initiative Training Plan, Past & Future.”

On November 3, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing from the Government Accountability Office on “Navy and Marine Corps Training: Further Planning Needed for Amphibious Operations Training.”

On November 8, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on the “Investigation Results of the USS Fitzgerald and USS John S. McCain Collision Incidents.”

On November 9, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Aviation Readiness: What’s the Flight Plan.”

On November 29, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the “Quarterly Readiness Update.”

On December 1, 2017, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Amphibious Warfare Readiness and Training: Interoperability, Shortfalls, and the Way Ahead.”

On January 10, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive a roundtable briefing on “F-35 Aircraft Sustainment Challenges.”

On January 18, 2018, the subcommittee met in joint session with the Seapower and Projection Forces subcommittee to receive testimony concerning the Navy’s reviews of surface forces operations and sustainment following recent incidents.

On February 7, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing from the Office of the Secretary of Defense on a Readiness Update.

On February 14, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Air Force Readiness Posture.”

On March 6, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Marine Corps Readiness Posture.”

On March 8, 2018, the subcommittee met in joint session with the Seapower and Projection Forces subcommittee to receive testimony on “Mobility and Transportation Command Posture.”

On March 20, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Navy Readiness Posture.”

On April 18, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on the “Fiscal Year 2019 Energy, Installations and Environment Budget Request.”

On April 19, 2018 the subcommittee met to receive testimony on the “Army Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Readiness Posture.”

On June 6, 2018, the subcommittee met in joint session with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces to receive a roundtable briefing on a progress report for fixing Navy surface fleet readiness.

On June 14, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Navy and Air Force Depot Policy Issues and Infrastructure Concerns.”

On June 21, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on a progress report for aviation mishaps and prevention.

On June 28, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on “Army and Marine Corps Depot Policy Issues and Infrastructure Concerns.”

On September 13, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on the “Army Futures Command: Will It Help?”

On November 16, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on “Moving Military Families: Can We Fix A Broken System.”

On December 19, 2018, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the “Quarterly Readiness Update.”

#### Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces provides oversight of Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee is responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the committee as delineated in paragraphs 5 and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces also provided oversight on policy, such as modernization and investment issues, as appropriate within the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. This includes current or future acquisition programs that relate to gaps in the capabilities required to execute current national military strategies, as well as the allocation of acquisition resources. This would also include military service specific acquisition policies as long as there is a nexus to the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces focused on maintaining air and sea dominance and superiority, as well as policies ensuring effective use of these forces as a strategic deterrent.

The subcommittee conducted two oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2018 budget request, including the following: May 24, 2017: “Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces”; May 25, 2017: “Department of the Air Force FY 2018 Budget Request for Sea Power and Projection Forces”.

In addition to oversight hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight including classified briefings: February 14, 2017: “Navy Requirements Underpinning the 355–Ship Navy”; March 8, 2017: “An Independent Fleet Assessment of the U.S. Navy”; March 15, 2017: “B–21 Program Update”; March 21, 2017: “Shipbuilding Industrial Base”; March 28, 2017: “Maintaining Undersea Dominance and Projected Aircraft Carrier Shortfalls”; March 30, 2017: “The Current State of U.S. Transportation Command”; May 3, 2017: “Littoral Combat Ships and the Transition to Frigate Class”; May 18, 2018: “Amphibious Warfare

in a Contested Environment”; June 8, 2017: “Columbia-class Ballistic Missile Submarine Program Brief”; July 19, 2017: “Ready Reserve Force Readiness Assessment and Recapitalization Plan”; July 27, 2017: “Aircraft Carrier Force Structure and Shock Trial Requirements”; September 7, 2017: “Navy Readiness—Underlying Problems Associated with the USS Fitzgerald and USS John S. McCain”; September 14, 2017: “Bomber Vector”; September 26, 2017: “Navy Cyber Vulnerabilities”; November 8, 2017: “Comprehensive Assessment Related to Surface Ship Accidents in 7th Fleet”; December 6, 2017: “B-21 Raider”; and December 13, 2017: “Secretary of Navy Independent Review”.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation that was ultimately included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91). The legislation covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Department of the Navy, Air Force, and Reserve Components.

The subcommittee conducted two oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2019 budget request, including the following: March 6, 2018: “Department of the Navy FY 2019 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces”; March 14, 2018: “Department of the Air Force FY 2019 Budget Request for Sea Power and Projection Forces”.

In addition to oversight hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight including classified briefings: January 18, 2018: “Surface Warfare: At a Cross Roads”; January 30, 2018: “Conventional Prompt Global Strike”; February 6, 2018: “U.S. Air Force Support of Continuity of Government Operations”; February 27, 2018: “B-21 and Family of Systems”; March 8, 2018: “Mobility and Transportation Command Posture”; March 20, 2018: “Submarine Industrial Base: Options for Construction”; April 12, 2018: “355 Ship Navy: Delivering the Right Capabilities”; June 6, 2018: “Progress Report—Fixing Navy Surface Fleet Readiness”; July 12, 2018: “KC-46A Program Brief”; September 5, 2018: “B-21”; September 28, 2018: “Contributing Factors to C-130 Mishaps and Other Intra-Theater Airlift Challenges”; and November 29, 2018: “Advanced Russian Submarine Threats in the Atlantic”.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation that was ultimately included in the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232). The legislation covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Department of the Navy, Air Force, and Reserve Components.

#### Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

In the first session of the 115th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces convened for a series of hearings related to its oversight of the President’s fiscal year 2018 budget request. On May 19, 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing on “Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities and Posture of the National Security Space Enterprise”. On May 25, 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing on “Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities for Nuclear Forces and Atomic Energy De-

fense Activities”. On June 7, 2017, the subcommittee met for a hearing on “Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities and Posture of Missile Defeat Programs and Activities”.

During the first session of the 115th Congress, the subcommittee held additional oversight hearings related to the following topics: nuclear deterrence and the Defense Science Board’s perspective; threats to space assets and implications for homeland security; and consequences and context for the Russian Federation’s violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

In the second session of the 115th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces met for a series of hearings related to its oversight of the President’s fiscal year 2019 budget request. On March 15, 2018, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “National Security Space Budget”. On March 22, 2018, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “Department of Defense Nuclear Forces and Department of Energy Budget”. On April 17, 2018, the subcommittee held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2019 Budget for Missile Defense and Defeat Activities.”

During the second session of the 115th Congress, the subcommittee held additional oversight hearings related to the following topics: The National Defense Strategy and the Nuclear Posture Review; Space Situational Awareness; and a posture hearing on the entirety of the strategic forces portfolio.

In addition to these hearings, the subcommittee conducted briefings in support of its oversight on the following topics: U.S. strategic forces posture; national security space operations; foreign counter space threats and defense of national security space; national security space programs; national security space acquisition; national security space strategy; reports and studies on national security space reform from the Rumsfeld Commission to present; nuclear command, control, and communications system; U.S. and foreign nuclear weapons programs—current status and future trends; North Korea nuclear and missile programs; foreign nuclear programs and threats; and the history of the nuclear posture review.

#### Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces provided oversight of the Departments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense acquisition programs providing tactical aircraft and missiles; armor and ground vehicles; munitions; rotorcraft; individual equipment to include tactical networks and radios; counter improvised explosive device equipment; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms to include unmanned aerial systems, and associated support equipment, including National Guard and Reserve equipment programs. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also provided oversight on policy, such as threats and force structure requirements, as appropriate within the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. This includes current or future acquisition programs that relate to gaps in the capabilities required to execute current national military strategies, as well as the allocation of acquisition resources. This also includes military service specific acquisition policies as long as there is a nexus to the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces focused on maintaining



Air Dominance and Air Superiority, as well as policies ensuring effective use of land forces as a strategic deterrent. The subcommittee also conducted oversight on addressing physiological episodes in fighter, attack, and training aircrafts, as well as looking into the Department of Defense's aviation safety mishap review and oversight process.

The subcommittee conducted two oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2018 budget request, including the following: May 24, 2017: "Ground Force Modernization Budget Request"; and June 7, 2017: "Combat Aviation Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request."

The subcommittee conducted three oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2019 budget request, including the following: March 15, 2018: "Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request on Air Force Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Programs"; April 12, 2018: "Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Combat Aviation Programs"; and April 18, 2018: "Ground Force Modernization Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2019".

In addition to oversight hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight, including classified briefings: February 16, 2017: "Military Services 5th Generation Tactical Aircraft Challenges and F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program Update"; March 1, 2017: "U.S. Ground Force Capability and Modernization Challenges in Eastern Europe"; March 10, 2017: "The Effect of Sequestration and Continuing Resolutions on Marine Corps Modernization and Readiness"; March 16, 2017: "The Effect of Sequestration and Continuing Resolutions on Army Modernization and Readiness"; March 28, 2017: "Naval Strike Fighters—Issues and Concerns"; May 3, 2017: "Roundtable discussion with the Commander of Naval Air Forces and the Commander of the Naval Air Systems Command Regarding Physiological Episodes in Navy T-45 Aircraft"; May 18, 2017: "Review of DOD Airborne ISR Requirements and Allocation Processes and Military Department Aircraft that Support Those Requirements"; July 27, 2017: "Update on Challenges Facing Army and Air Force Munition Programs and the Associated Industrial Bases"; September 13, 2017: "Update on Army and Marine Corps Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) Programs"; September 27, 2017: "The Army's Tactical Network Modernization Strategy"; January 18, 2018: "DOD Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance (ISR) Force Structure Allocation Processes to Address Combatant Commander Airborne ISR Requirements"; February 6, 2018: "Addressing Physiological Episodes in Fighter, Attack, and Training Aircraft." March 7, 2018: "The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Lightning II Program"; June 13, 2018: "Department of Defense Aviation Safety Mishap Review and Oversight Process"; and September 6, 2018: "Update on Activities Related to Programs of the Air Force Rapid Capabilities Office".

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation that was ultimately included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115-91). The legislation covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Reserve Components.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation that was ultimately included in John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232). The legislation covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test, and evaluation programs for the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Reserve Components.

#### Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations supplements and expands upon the oversight activities undertaken by the full committee and other subcommittees. It conducts comprehensive, in-depth inquiries; convenes hearings and briefings; and makes recommendations to the committee, including for potential legislative action on pressing issues within the committee’s jurisdiction. The subcommittee’s efforts on behalf of defense reform, the Foreign Military Sales process, nuclear infrastructure, and detainee matters are described elsewhere in this report. In addition to those activities, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations undertook the following work:

##### *U.S. Central Command Intelligence Products*

On February 28, 2017, the subcommittee convened a hearing entitled “Investigation on Allegations Relating to USCENTCOM Intelligence Products”. The subject was a January 2017 Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) report that concluded allegations of intelligence manipulation at U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) had not been substantiated, and suggested reforms to improve the command climate and prevent potential intelligence distortion. Witnesses were the Honorable Glenn A. Fine, Acting Inspector General, Department of Defense and officials from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), the Joint Staff, CENTCOM, and the Defense Intelligence Agency.

##### *Industrial Base Issues*

The subcommittee also addressed issues related to the military industrial base. On May 4, 2017, the subcommittee convened in closed session for an intelligence briefing on “Foreign Threats to National Labs, Academia, and Defense-Related Supply Chains.” Briefers from the Department of Defense and the intelligence community were present.

On May 23, 2017, the subcommittee convened in another closed session for a briefing on “The Office of Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy: Role and Policies Pertaining to the Review and Assessment of Foreign Investment in the U.S.”. A Department of Defense briefer addressed challenges to the defense manufacturing and industrial base, including potential threats to national labs, academia, and defense-related supply chains.

##### *Procurement*

On July 25, 2017, the subcommittee held a hearing to receive testimony on “Evaluating Department of Defense Equipment and Uniform Procurement in Iraq and Afghanistan.” The hearing focused on four oversight reports that covered problems in the pro-

curement and equipping of forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. The Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction and representatives from the Government Accountability Office and the Department of Defense Inspector General summarized their reports and witnesses from the Office of the Secretary of Defense described the steps the Department is taking to ensure accountability.

#### *Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS)*

On October 3, 2017, the subcommittee received testimony on “Securing the Peace After the Fall of ISIL.” The hearing assessed the state of U.S. planning to enable Iraq to achieve and maintain stability following the liberation of Mosul from ISIS. The hearing also addressed associated challenges, policy efforts, and resources required to achieve a stable political and security environment in Iraq. Witnesses were representatives from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and academia.

#### *Military Food*

On November 2, 2017, the subcommittee convened in closed session for a briefing on “The Status of ‘Prohibited Ingredients’ in Military Food Service”. This briefing provided information about Department of Defense policies regarding the potential exclusion of specific ingredients from military food. Department representatives reviewed the roles of the Joint Subsistence Policy Board, the military services, the Department of Defense Nutrition Committee, and the Defense Logistics Agency in setting the Department’s nutritional policy, as well as the existence of any plans to prohibit ingredients; the rationale for any prospective prohibitions; the mechanisms for soliciting input on prospective prohibitions; and the implementation process and schedule for any future prohibitions.

#### *Background and Security Investigation Reform*

The subcommittee, in partnership with the Subcommittee on Readiness, held a series of events in 2018 to address issues related to the security clearance process. On February 14, 2018, the subcommittee convened in a closed session for a briefing on “Reforming the Security Clearance Process.” The briefing provided information about the origins and nature of problems with the security clearance process managed by the National Background Investigations Bureau (NBIB). A briefer from the Government Accountability Office discussed that organization’s perspective on the extent to which the security clearance process had already reformed, the timeliness of the clearance process, and efforts by NBIB to address the backlog.

On February 27, 2018, the subcommittee held a second closed briefing on the topic. This was entitled “Background and Security Investigation Reforms”. The Department of Defense provided its first quarterly update to Congress on the Department’s plan to assume security clearance responsibility from NBIB and otherwise reform the clearance process. Such quarterly briefings were mandated by section 925 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91). Briefers from the Department of Defense and NBIB participated.

On April 11, 2018, the subcommittee held a third closed briefing on “Security Clearance Reform: Understanding ‘Continuous Evaluation’”. The briefing provided information about the “continuing evaluation” pilot program in the Department of Defense and subordinate agencies, issues in the development and implementation of the program, and the potential role continuous evaluation could play in security clearance reform. The briefers were from the Department of Defense.

A closed briefing was held on June 26, 2018. At this time, the subcommittee received the second required quarterly congressional briefing on progress made carrying out reforms to the background and security investigation process. Briefers from the Department of Defense participated.

For the final event, the subcommittee convened a hearing on December 12, 2018, to receive another quarterly update. Testimony was provided by witnesses from the Department of Defense and the National Background Investigations Bureau of the Office of Personnel Management.

#### *U.S. Strategy in Syria*

On September 26, 2018, the subcommittee held a hearing to receive testimony on “U.S. Strategy in Syria”. The hearing focused on the Administration’s strategic objectives in Syria, the authorities and resources required to achieve those objectives, and the methods the Administration will use to measure success. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs and a representative from the Joint Staff described the Department of Defense’s goals and actions in Syria.

## PUBLICATIONS

### HOUSE REPORTS

Report Number	Date Filed	Bill Number	Title
H. Rept. 115–13 ....	February 16, 2017 .....	H.R. 393 .....	To provide for an exception to a limitation against appointment of persons as Secretary of Defense within seven years of relief from active duty as a regular commissioned officer of the Armed Forces
H. Rept. 115–200 ..	July 6, 2017 .....	H.R. 2810 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018
H. Rept. 115–200, Part 2.	July 11, 2017 .....	H.R. 2810 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018
H. Rept. 115–676 ..	May 15, 2018 .....	H.R. 5515 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019
H. Rept. 115–676, Part 2.	May 21, 2018 .....	H.R. 5515 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019

### COMMITTEE PRINTS

Committee Print No. 1—Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives of the United States, 115th Congress, 2017–2018, adopted January 12, 2017.

### PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. No. 115–1—Full Committee hearing on Organizational Meeting for the 115th Congress. January 12, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–2—Full Committee hearing on Consideration of the Committee Oversight Plan for the 115th Congress. February 2, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–3—Full Committee hearing on The State of the World: National Security Threats and Challenges. February 1, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–4—Full Committee hearing on The State of the Military. February 7, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–5—Full Committee hearing on The Evolving Threat of Terrorism and Effective Counterterrorism Strategies. February 14, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–6—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Military Services 5th Generation Tactical Aircraft Challenges and F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Program Update. February 16, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–7—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Department of Defense Inspector General Report ‘Investigation on Allegations Relating to USCENTCOM Intelligence Products’. February 28, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–8—Full Committee hearing on Cyber Warfare in the 21st Century: Threats, Challenges and Opportunities. March 1, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-9—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on U.S. Ground Force Capability and Modernization Challenges in Eastern Europe. March 1, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-10—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Overview of Military Review Board Agencies. March 2, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-11—Full Committee hearing on Military Assessment of Nuclear Deterrence Requirements. March 8, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-12—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Current State of U.S. Army Readiness. March 8, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-13—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on An Independent Fleet Assessment of the U.S. Navy. March 8, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-14—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Nuclear Deterrence—The Defense Science Board’s Perspective. March 9, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-15—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on The Effect of Sequestration and Continuing Resolutions on Marine Corps Modernization and Readiness. March 10, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-16—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Crafting an Information Warfare and Counter-Propaganda Strategy for the Emerging Security Environment. March 15, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-17—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Current State of the U.S. Navy. March 16, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-18—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Oversight Review of Infrastructure Needs and Projects Ready for Immediate Implementation in the Nuclear Security Enterprise. March 16, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-19—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on The Effect of Sequestration and Continuing Resolutions on Army Modernization and Readiness. March 16, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-20—Full Committee hearing on America’s Role in the World. March 21, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-21—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Social Media Policies of the Military Services. March 21, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-22—Full Committee hearing on The Evolution of Hybrid Warfare and Key Challenges. March 22, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-23—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Current State of the U.S. Air Force. March 22, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-24—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on High Consequences and Uncertain Threats: Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction for Fiscal Year 2018. March 23, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-25—Full Committee hearing on Military Assessment of Russian Activities and Security Challenges in Europe. March 28, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-26—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Naval Strike Fighters—Issues and Concerns. March 28, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-27—Full Committee hearing on Military Assessment of the Security Challenges in the Greater Middle East. March 29, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-28—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces joint hearing with the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications on Threats to Space Assets and Implications for Homeland Security. March 29, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-29—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Pilot Shortage. March 29, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-30—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Readiness on The Current State of U.S. Transportation Command. March 30, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-31—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces joint hearing with the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade on Consequences and Context for Russia's Violations of the INF Treaty. March 30, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-32—Full Committee hearing on Assessing Progress and Identifying Future Opportunities in Defense Reform. April 4, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-33—Full Committee hearing on Consequences to the Military of a Continuing Resolution. April 5, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-34—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Current State of the U.S. Marine Corps. April 5, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-35—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Evaluating the Defense Contract Auditing Process. April 6, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-36—Full Committee hearing on Military Assessment of the Security Challenges in the Indo-Asia-Pacific Region. April 26, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-37—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Creating a Flexible and Effective Information Technology Management and Acquisition System: Elements for Success in a Rapidly Changing Landscape. April 26, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-38—Full Committee hearing on Member Day—National Defense Priorities from Members for the Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Act. April 27, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-39—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and Traumatic Brain Injury—Clinical and Research Program Assessment. April 27, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-40—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Three Decades Later: A Review and Assessment of Our Special Operations Forces 30-Years After the Creation of U.S. Special Operations Command. May 2, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-41—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Overview of the Annual Report on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies. May 2, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-42—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Littoral Combat Ships and the Transition to Frigate Class. May 3, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-43—Full Committee hearing on Initial Findings of the Section 809 Panel: Setting the Path for Streamlining and Improving Defense Acquisition. May 17, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-44—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Personnel Posture: FY 2018. May 17, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-45—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Amphibious Warfare in a Contested Environment. May 18, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-46—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities and Posture of the National Security Space Enterprise. May 19, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-47—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request for U.S. Cyber Command: Cyber Mission Force Support to Department of Defense Operations. May 23, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-48—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Department of the Navy FY 2018 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. May 24, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-49—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Ground Force Modernization Budget Request. May 24, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-50—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Department of the Air Force FY 2018 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. May 25, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-51—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities for Nuclear Forces and Atomic Energy Defense Activities. May 25, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-52—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2018 Priorities and Posture of Missile Defeat Programs and Activities. June 7, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-53—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Combat Aviation Modernization Programs and the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request. June 7, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-54—Full Committee hearing on The Fiscal Year 2018 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense. June 12, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-55—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Evaluating DOD Equipment and Uniform Procurement in Iraq and Afghanistan. July 25, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-56—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Continued Oversight of the Transfer of Excess Military Equipment to Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies. July 27, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-57—Subcommittee on Readiness joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on Underlying Problems Associated with the USS Fitzgerald and USS John S. McCain. September 7, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-58—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on The Army's Tactical Network Modernization Strategy. September 27, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-59—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Defense Strategy in South Asia. October 3, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-60—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Securing the Peace After the Fall of ISIL. October 3, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-61—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Aviation Readiness: What's the Flight Plan? November 9, 2017.



H.A.S.C. No. 115-62—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Amphibious Warfare Readiness & Training (Interoperability, Shortfalls, and the Way Ahead). December 1, 2017.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-63—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on China's Pursuit of Emerging and Exponential Technologies. January 9, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-64—Full Committee hearing on Department of Defense Update on the Financial Improvement and Audit Remediation (FIAR) Plan. January 10, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-65—Subcommittee on Readiness joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on Surface Warfare: At a Crossroads. January 18, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-66—Full Committee hearing on Readyng the U.S. Military for Future Warfare. January 30, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-67—Full Committee hearing on The National Defense Strategy and the Nuclear Posture Review. February 6, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-68—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Addressing Physiological Episodes in Fighter, Attack, and Training Aircraft. February 6, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-69—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Senior Leader Misconduct: Prevention and Accountability. February 7, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-70—Full Committee hearing on The Military and Security Challenges and Posture in the Indo-Pacific Region. February 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-71—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Air Force Readiness Posture. February 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-72—Full Committee hearing on Strategic Competition with China. February 15, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-73—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Evolution, Transformation, and Sustainment: A Review and Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Forces and Command. February 15, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-74—Full Committee hearing on Terrorism and Iran: Defense Challenges in the Middle East. February 27, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-75—Full Committee hearing on National Security Challenges and U.S. Military Activities in Africa. March 6, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-76—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Department of the Navy FY 2019 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. March 6, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-77—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Marine Corps Readiness Posture. March 6, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-78—Full Committee hearing on Assessing Military Service Acquisition Reform. March 7, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-79—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Lightning II Program. March 7, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-80—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on U.S. Strategic Forces Posture and the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request. March 7, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-81—Subcommittee on Readiness joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on Mobility and Transportation Command Posture. March 8, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-82—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Arlington National Cemetery Preserving the Promise. March 8, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-83—Full Committee hearing on Space Warfighting Readiness: Policies, Authorities, and Capabilities. March 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-84—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Department of the Air Force FY 2019 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. March 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-85—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on A Review and Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request for the DOD Science and Technology Programs. March 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-86—Full Committee hearing on Security Challenges in Europe and Posture for Inter-state Competition with Russia. March 15, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-87—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request on Air Force Airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Programs. March 15, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-88—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for National Security Space Programs. March 15, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-89—Full Committee hearing on Assessing the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request and Acquisition Reform Progress. March 20, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-90—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Submarine Industrial Base Options for Construction. March 20, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-91—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Navy Readiness Posture. March 20, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-92—Full Committee hearing on State and Non-State Actor Influence Operations Recommendations for U.S. National Security. March 21, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-93—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Nuclear Forces and Atomic Energy Defense Activities. March 22, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-94—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Reviewing Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) for Fiscal Year 2019. March 22, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-95—Full Committee hearing on Cyber Operations Today: Preparing for 21st Century Challenges in an Information-Enabled Society. April 11, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-96—Full Committee hearing on Member Day. April 11, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-97—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on A Review and Assessment of the Department of Defense Budget, Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Cyber Operations and U.S. Cyber Command for Fiscal Year 2019. April 11, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-98—Full Committee hearing on The Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense. April 12, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-99—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Combat Aviation Programs. April 12, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-100—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on 355 Ship Navy Delivering the Right Capabilities. April 12, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-101—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Personnel Posture: FY 2019. April 13, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-102—Full Committee hearing on Promoting DOD's Culture of Innovation. April 17, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-103—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for Missile Defense and Missile Defeat Programs. April 17, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-104—Full Committee hearing on Oversight and Reform of the Department of Defense 4th Estate. April 18, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-105—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Fiscal Year 2019 Energy, Installations, and Environment Budget Request. April 18, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-106—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Ground Force Modernization Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2019. April 18, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-107—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Army Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request Readiness Posture. April 19, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-108—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Department of Defense Aviation Safety Mishap Review and Oversight Process. June 13, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-109—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Navy and Air Force Depot Policy Issues and Infrastructure Concerns. June 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-110—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Health System Reform: Pain Management, Opioids Prescription Management and Reporting Transparency. June 20, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-111—Full Committee hearing on Military Technology Transfer: Threats, Impacts, and Solutions for the Department of Defense. June 21, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-112—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Aviation Mishap Prevention—A Progress Report. June 21, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-113—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces joint hearing with the Committee on Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Space on Space Situational Awareness: Whole of Government Perspectives on Roles and Responsibilities. June 22, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-114—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Army and Marine Corps Depot Policy Issues and Infrastructure Concerns. June 28, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115-115—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Department of Defense's Role in Foreign Assistance. July 11, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–116—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Army Futures Command: Will it help? September 13, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–117—Full Committee hearing on The Impact of National Defense on the Economy, Diplomacy, and International Order. September 26, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–118—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on U.S. Strategy in Syria. September 26, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–119—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Update on Military Review Board Agencies. September 27, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115–120—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Contributing Factors to C–130 Mishaps and Other Intra-Theater Airlift Challenges. September 28, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115 121—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities joint hearing with the Committee on Homeland Security Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection on Interagency Cyber Cooperation: Roles, Responsibilities and Authorities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security. November 14, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115 122—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Department of Defense’s Artificial Intelligence Structure, Investments, and Applications. December 11, 2018.

H.A.S.C. No. 115 123—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Security Clearance Processing Status Report. December 12, 2018.

## PRESS RELEASES

### First Session

#### JANUARY 2017:

1/10/2017—THORNBERRY WELCOMES NEW REPUBLICAN MEMBERS TO HASC

1/11/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JANUARY 9–13

1/11/2017—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JANUARY 9–13

1/11/2017—THORNBERRY RELEASES HASC SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRS FOR 115TH CONGRESS

1/11/2017—UPDATE 3: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JANUARY 9–13

1/12/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY

1/12/2017—THORNBERRY PRAISES COMMITTEE’S VOTE TO SUPPORT WAIVER FOR MATTIS

1/17/2017—THORNBERRY ON MANNING COMMUTATION

1/18/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JANUARY 23–27

1/20/2017—THORNBERRY ON MATTIS CONFIRMATION

1/23/2017—THORNBERRY ON SECAF APPOINTMENT

1/25/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JAN 30–FEB 3

1/27/2017—THORNBERRY ON READINESS REVIEW

1/31/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 6–10

#### FEBRUARY 2017:

2/1/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS  
 2/1/2017—JOINT TASK FORCE STATEMENT ON INSPECTOR  
 GENERAL CENTCOM REPORT  
 2/1/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY  
 6–10  
 2/3/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE MON-  
 DAY  
 2/7/2017—CHAIRMEN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS:  
 State of the Military  
 2/18/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 13–17  
 2/13/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE  
 WEDNESDAY  
 2/14/2017—THORNBERRY ON REPORTS OF RUSSIA'S LAT-  
 EST VIOLATION OF INF TREATY  
 2/14/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS  
 2/15/2017—THORNBERRY ANNOUNCES SUBCOMMITTEE  
 MEMBERS  
 2/15/2017—UPDATE: THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAG-  
 GLE THURSDAY  
 2/15/2017—UPDATE: THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAG-  
 GLE THURSDAY IN 2118 RAYBURN  
 2/15/2017—STEFANIK COMMENTS ON COUNTERTER-  
 RORISM BRIEFING  
 2/16/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 2/16/2017—THORNBERRY ANNOUNCES COMMITTEE VICE  
 CHAIRS  
 2/17/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEBRUARY 20–24  
 2/20/2017—THORNBERRY ON MCMASTER FOR NSA  
 2/22/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEB 28–MAR 3  
 2/27/2017—THORNBERRY ON LOW DEFENSE BUDGET OUT-  
 LINE NUMBER  
 2/28/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN  
 HARTZLER  
 2/28/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE  
 WEDNESDAY  
 MARCH 2017:  
 3/1/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 6–10  
 3/1/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS  
 3/1/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 3/1/2017—STEFANIK ON QUARTERLY CYBER UPDATE  
 3/2/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN  
 3/3/2017—MEDIA ALERT: REPS. THORNBERRY, BLACK-  
 BURN, AND BLACK TO VISIT FT. CAMPBELL TO FOCUS ON  
 MILITARY READINESS  
 3/5/2017—THORNBERRY ON DOD INVESTIGATION INTO  
 SOCIAL MEDIA SITE  
 3/7/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE  
 WEDNESDAY  
 3/7/2017—THORNBERRY ON DEPLOYMENT OF MISSILE DE-  
 FENSE SYSTEM TO SOUTH KOREA  
 3/8/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS  
 3/8/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 3/8/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

3/8/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE  
WEDNESDAY

3/8/2017—THORNBERRY ON PASSAGE OF DOD APPROPRIATIONS

3/9/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 13–17

3/9/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS

3/10/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER

3/10/2017—UPDATE; HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 13–17

3/13/2017—UPDATE #2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 13–17

3/15/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

3/16/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON

3/16/2017—THORNBERRY ON ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

3/16/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE TODAY

3/16/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN HARTZLER

3/16/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER

3/16/2017—THORNBERRY ON MARINES UNITED BRIEFING

3/20/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 20–24

3/21/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

3/22/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

3/22/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON

3/23/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

3/23/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 27–31

3/28/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

3/28/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER

3/28/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APRIL 3–7

3/29/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

3/29/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS

3/29/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN

3/30/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON

3/30/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

3/30/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS

3/31/2017—THORNBERRY ANNOUNCES SELECTION FOR COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE

APRIL 2017:

4/3/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APRIL 3–7

4/4/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

4/5/2017—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APRIL 3–7

4/5/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

4/5/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON

4/6/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN HARTZLER

4/6/2017—THORNBERRY CONGRATULATES JEANETTE JAMES ON ARMY CIVILIAN AWARD

4/6/2017—THORNBERRY ON U.S. MILITARY STRIKES IN SYRIA

4/10/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APRIL 10–21

4/16/2017—TUNE IN TODAY: CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY ON FOX NEWS SUNDAY

4/19/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APRIL 24–28

4/24/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APRIL 24–28

4/25/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 1–5

4/26/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

4/26/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

4/27/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN

4/28/2017—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 1–5

MAY 2017:

5/1/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE TUESDAY

5/1/2017—THORNBERRY ON SPENDING AGREEMENT

5/1/2017—SIMMONS TO DEPART ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF FOR PRIVATE SECTOR

5/1/2017—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 1–5

5/2/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

5/2/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN

5/3/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

5/4/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 8–12

5/10/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY ON SOUTH KOREAN ELECTION RESULTS

5/15/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 15–19

5/16/2017—PRESS CONFERENCE: THORNBERRY TO RELEASE DEFENSE ACQUISITION BILL

5/16/2017—HASC STAFF TO BACKGROUND PRESS ON ACQUISITION REFORM BILL

5/16/2017—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 15–19

5/16/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 22–26

5/16/2017—PRESS CONFERENCE: THORNBERRY TO RELEASE DEFENSE ACQUISITION BILL

5/17/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN

5/17/2017—PRESS CONFERENCE: THORNBERRY TO RELEASE DEFENSE ACQUISITION BILL

5/18/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

5/18/2017—THORNBERRY INTRODUCES ACQUISITION REFORM BILL

5/19/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS

5/19/2017—MONDAY: THORNBERRY AT BROOKINGS

5/23/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 22–26

5/23/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

5/24/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

5/24/2017—THORNBERRY ON PASSAGE OF PRIVATE ACT

5/24/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER

5/25/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN  
 5/25/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS  
 5/26/2017—THORNBERRY INTRODUCES INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC SECURITY BILL  
 5/30/2017—THORNBERRY LEADS TRIP TO STRENGTHEN INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC ALLIANCES  
 5/31/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 5–9  
 5/31/2017—THORNBERRY ON SUCCESSFUL MISSILE DEFENSE TEST  
 5/31/2017—THORNBERRY CODEL MEETS WITH JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER  
 JUNE 2017:  
 6/2/2017—THORNBERRY & CODEL DISCUSS DEFENSE COOPERATION WITH VIETNAMESE OFFICIALS  
 6/5/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 12–16  
 6/7/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS  
 6/7/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 6/8/2017—BIPARTISAN CYBER LEGISLATION INTRODUCED  
 6/8/2017—THORNBERRY, SMITH BEGIN FY18 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION PROCESS  
 6/9/2017—HASC STAFF TO HOST OF THE RECORD SESSION ON NDAA MARKUP LOGISTICS  
 6/12/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS  
 6/14/2017—HASC MARKUP SCHEDULE: JUNE 21–22  
 6/14/2017—HASC TO DISTRIBUTE NDAA AMENDMENTS BY EMAIL  
 6/16/2017—SUBCOMMITTEE MARKUP PRESS BRIEFINGS  
 6/20/2017—MARK RELEASE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS & CAPABILITIES  
 6/20/2017—MARK RELEASE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL  
 6/20/2017—MARK RELEASE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR & LAND FORCES  
 6/20/2017—MARK RELEASE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS  
 6/20/2017—MARK RELEASE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWERS & PROJECTION FORCES  
 6/20/2017—MARK RELEASE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES  
 6/21/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE THURSDAY  
 6/21/2017—UPDATE: HASC MARKUP SCHEDULE: JUNE 21–22  
 6/21/2017—FY18 NDAA FULL COMMITTEE MARKUP  
 6/21/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK  
 6/21/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE THURSDAY  
 6/21/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 6/22/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 6/22/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS  
 6/22/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN  
 6/22/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN



6/22/2017—TIME UPDATE: THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE THURSDAY

6/23/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE THURSDAY

6/26/2017—CHAIRMAN'S MARK PRESS BRIEFING

6/26/2017—THORNBERRY RELEASE FY18 NDAA

6/28/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS

6/29/2017—THORNBERRY ON COMMITTEE PASSAGE OF DEFENSE BILL

JULY 2017:

7/10/2017—DEFENSE BILL COMES TO THE HOUSE FLOOR

7/13/2017—HOUSE REPUBLICANS TO HOLD PRESS CONFERENCE ON THE NDAA

7/14/2017—UPDATE: HOUSE REPUBLICANS TO HOLD PRESS CONFERENCE ON THE NDAA

7/14/2017—HOUSE PASSES DEFENSE BILL

7/19/2017—THORNBERRY ON SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

7/19/2017—ROGERS/COOPER ON NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE BRIEFING

7/19/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 24–28

7/20/2017—ARMED SERVICES LEADERS APPOINT MEMBERS TO DEFENSE STRATEGY COMMISSION

7/20/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 24–28

7/24/2017—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 24–28

7/25/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN HARTZLER

7/25/2017—THORNBERRY ON NORTH KOREA BRIEFING

7/25/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 24–28

7/27/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON

7/28/2017—THORNBERRY ON NORTH KOREA MISSILE LAUNCH

7/31/2017—ROGERS/COOPER WEIGH IN ON GPS OCX & FAB-T PROGRAMS

AUGUST 2017:

8/9/2017—THORNBERRY ON THE SITUATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

8/11/2017—THORNBERRY ON MARINE CORPS FLIGHT PAUSE

8/21/2017—THORNBERRY ON AFGHANISTAN STRATEGY

8/21/2017—THORNBERRY ANNOUNCES NEW ARMED SERVICES LEADERSHIP TEAM

8/21/2017—THORNBERRY COMMENTS ON NAVY READINESS

8/23/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 4–8

8/30/2017—THORNBERRY ON AFGHANISTAN FORCE LEVEL ACCOUNTING & REPORTING

SEPTEMBER 2017:

9/1/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 4–8

9/6/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 11–15

9/7/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON

9/7/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN  
 9/8/2017—THORNBERRY VOTES NO ON CR  
 9/11/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 11–15  
 9/15/2017—THORNBERRY COMMENTS ON ANOTHER WEEK OF DEADLY MILITARY ACCIDENTS  
 9/19/2017—THORNBERRY REACTS TO PRESIDENT TRUMP'S DEFENSE BUDGET COMMENTS  
 9/20/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 25–29  
 9/25/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPTEMBER 25–29  
 9/26/2017—THORNBERRY PRAISES RESTRICTIONS TO OPEN SKIES TREATY  
 9/27/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: OCTOBER 2–6  
 9/27/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 9/28/2017—READOUT OF SEXUAL ASSAULT BRIEFING BEFORE MILITARY PERSONNEL SUBCOMMITTEE  
 9/29/2017—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE MONDAY  
 9/29/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: OCTOBER 2–6  
 OCTOBER 2017:  
 10/2/2017—POSTPONED—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE MONDAY  
 10/2/2017—THORNBERRY TO KEYNOTE AT HERITAGE  
 10/3/2017—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS  
 10/3/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN HARTZLER  
 10/5/2017—153 HOUSE REPUBLICANS SUPPORT POTUS CALL FOR DEFENSE BUDGET  
 10/5/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: OCTOBER 9–13  
 10/12/2017—DEFENSE BILL GOES TO CONFERENCE  
 10/13/2017—STATEMENT ON THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL  
 10/20/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: OCTOBER 23–27  
 10/24/2017—NDAА CONFEREES TO MEET WEDNESDAY  
 NOVEMBER 2017:  
 11/1/2017—THORNBERRY, FRELINGHUYSEN JOURNEY TO MIDDLE EAST, VISIT THE TROOPS  
 11/2/2017—7TH FLEET INVESTIGATION REINFORCES READINESS CONCERNS  
 11/2/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: NOVEMBER 6–10  
 11/2/2017—THORNBERRY ON ESPER NOMINATION TO SERVE AS SECRETARY OF THE ARMY  
 11/6/2017—THORNBERRY/MCCAIN ON MISSILE DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL  
 11/7/2017—COFFMAN ON DOD INVESTIGATION OF NCIC REPORTING ISSUES  
 11/7/2017—THORNBERRY ON AIR FORCE FAILURE TO PROPERLY REPORT CRIMINAL RECORD OF FORMER AIRMAN  
 11/8/2017—HOUSE & SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEES COMPLETE CONFERENCE ON NDAА FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

11/8/2017—ROGERS & COOPER ON FUNDAMENTAL SPACE REFORM  
 11/9/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 11/9/2017—NDAA CONFERENCE REPORT  
 11/14/2017—THORNBERRY/SMITH ON FDA PROVISION  
 11/14/2017—THORNBERRY ON NDAA PASSAGE  
 11/17/2017—STATEMENT BY THORNBERRY & MCCAIN ON BUDGET DEAL NEGOTIATIONS  
 11/27/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: NOVEMBER 27–DECEMBER 1  
 11/29/2017—CHAIRMAN WILSON ON READINESS BRIEFING  
 DECEMBER 2017:  
 12/1/2017—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 12/7/2017—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: DECEMBER 11–15  
 12/12/2017—PRESIDENT SIGNS NDAA CONFERENCE REPORT  
 12/13/2017—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: DECEMBER 11–14  
 12/14/2017—THORNBERRY ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

#### Second Session

JANUARY 2018:  
 1/3/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JANUARY 8–12  
 1/9/2018—READOUT OF YESTERDAY'S MEETING WITH EUCOM COMMANDER  
 1/9/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK  
 1/10/2018—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY'S OPENING REMARKS ON PENTAGON AUDIT  
 1/11/2018—THORNBERRY WELCOMES REP. HICE TO HASC  
 1/11/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JANUARY 15–19  
 1/12/2018—READOUT OF BRIEFING WITH THE ARMY AND ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
 1/17/2018—READOUT OF BRIEFING WITH GAO ON DOD CYBER POLICY, OPERATIONS, AND ACTIVITIES  
 1/18/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN  
 1/18/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 1/19/2018—THORNBERRY ON NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY  
 1/20/2018—THORNBERRY ON GOVERNMENT SHUT DOWN  
 1/20/2018—THORNBERRY: "WE NEED TO SET OUR TROOPS FREE FROM THIS POLITICAL DRAMA"  
 1/22/2018—THORNBERRY: OUR SUPPORT FOR OUR MILITARY SHOULD BE UNCONDITIONAL  
 1/22/2018—THORNBERRY ON ENDING THE SHUTDOWN  
 1/23/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JAN 29–FEB 2  
 1/24/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JAN 29–FEB 2  
 1/30/2018—THORNBERRY ON STATE OF THE UNION  
 1/30/2018—OPENING REMARKS: THORNBERRY ON FUTURE OF WARFARE  
 1/30/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEB 5–9

## FEBRUARY 2018:

2/2/2018—THORNBERRY ON NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW  
 2/5/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEB 5–9  
 2/6/2018—THORNBERRY ON NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY & NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW  
 2/6/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 2/7/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEB 5–9  
 2/7/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN  
 2/7/2018—THORNBERRY/MCCAIN ON BUDGET AGREEMENT  
 2/7/2018—TODAY @ 4:15 PM—ARMED SERVICES REPUBLICANS HOLD PRESS CONFERENCE ON BUDGET AGREEMENT TO FUND OUR TROOPS  
 2/9/2018—THORNBERRY: BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT BEGINS TO REBUILD AND RESTORE OUR MILITARY  
 2/14/2018—THORNBERRY ON THE MILITARY & SECURITY CHALLENGES & POSTURE IN THE INDO-PACIFIC REGION  
 2/14/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 2/15/2018—THORNBERRY ON STRATEGIC COMPETITION WITH CHINA  
 2/15/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK  
 2/23/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: FEB 26–MAR 2  
 2/27/2018—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE  
 2/27/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 5–9  
 2/27/2018—THORNBERRY ON TERRORISM AND IRAN: DEFENSE CHALLENGES IN THE MIDDLE EAST  
 2/28/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 5–9

## MARCH 2018:

3/1/2018—THORNBERRY TO KEYNOTE ON NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW AT CSIS  
 3/1/2018—THORNBERRY ON PUTIN'S NUCLEAR WEAPONS ANNOUNCEMENT  
 3/2/2018—ICYMI: THORNBERRY AT CSIS YESTERDAY  
 3/5/2018—PRESS ADVISORY: THORNBERRY, SMITH ANNOUNCE OFF-THE-RECORD NDAA 101 FOR REPORTERS  
 3/6/2018—THORNBERRY ON NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES AND U.S. MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN AFRICA  
 3/6/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN  
 3/6/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 3/6/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 5–9  
 3/7/2018—THORNBERRY ON ASSESSING MILITARY SERVICE ACQUISITION REFORM  
 3/7/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER  
 3/7/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS  
 3/8/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WILSON  
 3/8/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN  
 3/8/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN COFFMAN  
 3/8/2018—PRESS ADVISORY TOMORROW: OFF-THE-RECORD NDAA 101 FOR REPORTERS  
 3/8/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 12–16  
 3/12/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 12–16  
 3/13/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 19–23

3/13/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 12–16

3/14/2018—THORNBERRY ON SPACE WARFIGHTING READINESS: POLICIES, AUTHORITIES, AND CAPABILITIES

3/14/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

3/14/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

3/15/2018—OPENING REMARKS: THORNBERRY ON SECURITY CHALLENGES IN EUROPE AND POSTURE FOR INTER-STATE COMPETITION WITH RUSSIA

3/15/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN TURNER

3/15/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS

3/20/2018—THORNBERRY ON ASSESSING THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 BUDGET REQUEST AND ACQUISITION REFORM PROGRESS

3/20/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN WITTMAN

3/21/2018—STEFANIK INTRODUCES ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE LEGISLATION

3/21/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 19–23

3/21/2018—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAR 19–23

3/21/2018—THORNBERRY ON STATE AND NON-STATE ACTOR INFLUENCE OPERATIONS: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

3/21/2018—THORNBERRY ON OMNIBUS SPENDING PACKAGE

3/22/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN ROGERS

3/22/2018—OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRWOMAN STEFANIK

3/29/2018—THORNBERRY/SMITH ANNOUNCE MARKUP SCHEDULE FOR FY19 NDAA

3/29/2018—THORNBERRY RETURNS FROM EAST AFRICA TOUR

APRIL 2018:

4/7/2018—THORNBERRY ON AVIATION ACCIDENTS: MILITARY READINESS AT A CRISIS POINT

4/10/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APR 16–20

4/11/2018—THORNBERRY ON SPEAKER RYAN

4/12/2018—THORNBERRY ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

4/13/2018—THORNBERRY ON MILITARY ACTION IN SYRIA

4/13/2018—THORNBERRY, SMITH BEGIN FY19 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION PROCESS

4/16/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APR 16–20

4/16/2018—THORNBERRY TO KICK OFF FISCAL YEAR 2019 REFORM EFFORTS

4/17/2018—THORNBERRY RELEASES BILLS TO REFORM DOD ACQUISITION AND “4TH ESTATE”

4/17/2018—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APR 16–20

4/18/2018—NDAA MARKUP LOGISTICS BRIEFING FOR PRESS

4/18/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: APR 23–27

4/19/2018—NDAA MARKUP LOGISTICS BRIEFING FOR PRESS

4/23/2018—SUBCOMMITTEE MARKUP PRESS BRIEFINGS

4/24/2018—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY TALKS PENTAGON REFORM WITH CAGW

4/25/2018—READINESS SUBCOMMITTEE MARK

4/25/2018—SEAPOWER & PROJECTION FORCES SUBCOMMITTEE MARK

4/25/2018—STRATEGIC FORCES SUBCOMMITTEE MARK

4/25/2018—EMERGING THREATS & CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE MARK

4/25/2018—MILITARY PERSONNEL SUBCOMMITTEE MARK

4/25/2018—TACTICAL AIR & LAND FORCES SUBCOMMITTEE MARK

4/26/2018—THORNBERRY ON NIGER INVESTIGATION

MAY 2018:

5/1/2018—HASC TO DISTRIBUTE NDAA AMENDMENTS BY EMAIL

5/2/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 7–11

5/3/2018—CHAIRMAN'S MARK PRESS BRIEFING

5/4/2018—FY 19 NDAA TO FOCUS ON REBUILDING & REFORM

5/7/2018—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY RELEASES H.R. 5515 THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FY 2019

5/7/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: MAY 14–18

5/8/2018—THORNBERRY ON IRAN ANNOUNCEMENT

5/10/2018—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY ON FINAL PASSAGE

5/14/2018—CHAIRMAN JOE WILSON LEADS TRIP TO JERUSALEM

5/21/2018—DEFENSE BILL COMES TO THE FLOOR

5/21/2018—TOP FACTS TO KNOW ABOUT FY 2019 NDAA

5/24/2018—HOUSE PASSES DEFENSE BILL

5/26/2018—HONORING THE FALLEN: CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION COMMEMORATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WWI ARMISTICE

5/29/2018—CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION FOCUSES ON NATURAL PARTNERSHIP WITH INDIA

5/30/2018—DELEGATION CONCLUDES VISIT TO SRI LANKA

JUNE 2018:

6/1/2018—HONORING SERVICE PAST AND PRESENT: DELEGATION VISITS PHILIPPINES

6/3/2018—DELEGATION CONCLUDES INDO-PACIFIC MISSION AT SHANGRI-LA DIALOGUE

6/6/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 11–15

6/12/2018—THORNBERRY ON SUMMIT WITH NORTH KOREA

6/12/2018—THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAGGLE

6/13/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 18–22

6/18/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 18–22

6/19/2018—UPDATE 2: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 18–22

6/21/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JUNE 25–29  
 6/22/2018—READOUT: STEFANIK ARTIFICIAL INTEL-  
 LIGENCE INDUSTRY ROUNDTABLE  
 6/27/2018—THORNBERRY ON CFUS REFORMS  
 6/27/2018—DEFENSE BILL GOES TO CONFERENCE  
 6/29/2018—READOUT: HARTZLER LEADS OVERSIGHT OF  
 DOD CLEARANCE PROCESS

## JULY 2018:

7/4/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 9–13  
 7/9/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 9–13  
 7/10/2018—NDAA CONFEREES TO MEET WEDNESDAY  
 7/17/2018—THORNBERRY ON CR RESOLUTIONS  
 7/19/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: JULY 23–27  
 7/23/2018—HOUSE AND SENATE ARMED SERVICES COM-  
 MITTEES COMPLETE CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DE-  
 FENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FY 2019  
 7/26/2018—HOUSE PASSES NDAA CONFERENCE REPORT  
 359–54  
 7/31/2018—THORNBERRY ON THE PASSING OF FORMER  
 HASC CHAIRMAN RON DELLUMS

## AUGUST 2018:

8/9/2018—REPS ROGERS AND COOPER ON SPACE FORCE  
 REPORT  
 8/13/2018—THORNBERRY ON FY19 NDAA SIGNING  
 8/25/2018—THORNBERRY ON SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

## SEPTEMBER 2018:

9/5/2018—THORNBERRY AT CSIS: NATIONAL SECURITY  
 AND POLITICS IN TURBULENT TIMES  
 9/6/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPT 10–14  
 9/6/2018—THORNBERRY ON INHOFE SELECTION TO CHAIR  
 SASC  
 9/11/2018—THORNBERRY ON FIRST MINIBUS CON-  
 FERENCE REPORT  
 9/13/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPT 10–  
 14  
 9/14/2018—THORNBERRY ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS  
 CONFERENCE REPORT  
 9/18/2018—THORNBERRY ON SENATE PASSAGE OF DE-  
 FENSE APPROPRIATIONS  
 9/19/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: SEPT 24–28  
 9/24/2018—CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY TO HOST PRESS GAG-  
 GLE TOMORROW  
 9/26/2018—THORNBERRY ON DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS  
 9/28/2018—THORNBERRY ON PRESIDENT SIGNING DE-  
 FENSE APPROPRIATION

## OCTOBER 2018:

10/12/2018—SPEAKER RYAN, CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY RE-  
 TURN FROM AFGHANISTAN  
 10/26/2018—THORNBERRY ON ADDITIONAL BORDER DE-  
 PLOYMENT

## NOVEMBER 2018:

11/7/2018—THORNBERRY AND SMITH MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO AVIATION SAFETY COMMISSION

11/14/2018—THORNBERRY AND SMITH MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE COMMISSION

11/14/2018—THORNBERRY ON NDS COMMISSION REPORT

11/15/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: NOVEMBER 19–23

11/15/2018—THORNBERRY ON DOD AUDIT

11/30/2018—WSJ: THORNBERRY AND INHOFE ON DEFENSE BUDGET

DECEMBER 2018:

12/3/2018—UPDATE: HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: DECEMBER 3–7

12/6/2018—HASC HEARING SCHEDULE: DECEMBER 10–14

12/8/2018—THORNBERRY ON CJCS ANNOUNCEMENT

