

S. Hrg. 115-907

**NOMINATIONS OF MARK T. ESPER TO BE SEC-
RETARY OF THE ARMY; ROBERT L. WILKIE
TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR
PERSONNEL AND READINESS; JOSEPH D.
KERNAN TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DE-
FENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE; AND GUY B.
ROBERTS TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
DEFENSE FOR NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIO-
LOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS**

HEARING

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

NOVEMBER 2, 2017

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services



Available via: <http://www.govinfo.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

62-950 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN McCAIN, Arizona, *Chairman*

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma	JACK REED, Rhode Island
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	BILL NELSON, Florida
DEB FISCHER, Nebraska	CLAIRE McCASKILL, Missouri
TOM COTTON, Arkansas	JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
MIKE ROUNDS, South Dakota	KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York
JONI ERNST, Iowa	RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, Connecticut
THOM TILLIS, North Carolina	JOE DONNELLY, Indiana
DAN SULLIVAN, Alaska	MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
DAVID PERDUE, Georgia	TIM Kaine, Virginia
TED CRUZ, Texas	ANGUS S. KING, JR., Maine
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina	MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
BEN SASSE, Nebraska	ELIZABETH WARREN, Massachusetts
LUTHER STRANGE, Alabama	GARY C. PETERS, Michigan

CHRISTIAN D. BROSE, *Staff Director*

ELIZABETH L. KING, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

NOVEMBER 2, 2017

	Page
NOMINATIONS OF MARK T. ESPER TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY; ROBERT L. WILKIE TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS; JOSEPH D. KERNAN TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE; AND GUY B. ROBERTS TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS	1
MEMBERS STATEMENTS	
McCain, Senator John	1
Reed, Senator Jack	4
Tillis, Senator Thom	6
WITNESS STATEMENTS	
Wilkie, The Honorable Robert L., to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness	7
Advance Policy Questions	40
Questions for the Record	59
Nomination Reference and Report	64
Biographical Sketch	64
Committee on Armed Services Questionnaire	66
Signature Page	70
Esper, Mark T., Ph.D., to be Secretary of The Army	10
Advance Policy Questions	70
Questions for the Record	105
Nomination Reference and Report	120
Biographical Sketch	120
Committee on Armed Services Questionnaire	122
Signature Page	125
Kernan, Joseph D., to be Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence	14
Advance Policy Questions	126
Questions for the Record	136
Nomination Reference and Report	140
Biographical Sketch	140
Committee on Armed Services Questionnaire	141
Signature Page	144
Roberts, Guy B., to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs	16
Advance Policy Questions	144
Questions for the Record	154
Nomination Reference and Report	158
Biographical Sketch	159
Committee on Armed Services Questionnaire	160
Signature Page	165

**NOMINATIONS OF MARK T. ESPER TO BE
SECRETARY OF THE ARMY; ROBERT L.
WILKIE TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DE-
FENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND READINESS;
JOSEPH D. KERNAN TO BE UNDER SEC-
RETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE;
AND GUY B. ROBERTS TO BE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR NUCLEAR,
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PRO-
GRAMS**

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2017

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m. in room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator John McCain (Chairman of the Committee) presiding.

Committee Members present: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Perdue, Sasse, Reed, Nelson, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Kaine, King, Heinrich, Warren, and Peters.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN, CHAIRMAN

Chairman MCCAIN. Good morning. The Senate Armed Services Committee meets today to consider the nominations of Mark T. Esper to be Secretary of the Army; Robert L. Wilkie to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (P&R); Joseph D. Kernan to be Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)); and Guy B. Roberts to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs.

I would like to say that I have been pleased with the reaction of the Secretary of Defense and the Administration in being cooperative in responding to our questions and to our ability to carry out our responsibilities on the defense authorization bill. I think that most members were happy with the briefing that we received concerning the accidents on the USS *McCain* and others, and so we are glad to begin this hearing.

We thank you all for joining us this morning. We welcome your family and friends here with us today. As is our tradition, at the beginning of your testimony, we invite you to introduce those who are joining you.

It is the standard for this Committee to ask certain questions in order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities. It is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress be able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information. I would ask that you each provide responses to the following questions.

For the years that I have been a member of this Committee, it has not been an important issue. It is now an important issue because we are not receiving the information and communication that is the constitutional responsibility of this committee.

I urge you to consider your answers very carefully when I ask these questions.

Have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Will you ensure that your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to congressional requests?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Will those witnesses be protected from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this Committee?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee or to consult with the committee regarding the basis for any good-faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

[Chorus of ayes.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

[Chorus of nays.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you.

Mr. Wilkie, over half of the annual defense budget is spent on personnel costs, to include training, health care, and compensation. Our force is facing a readiness crisis. Our personnel are facing the strain of 16 years of continuous conflict.

I wish you could have heard our Navy testimony yesterday concerning the accidents that have taken place. We all know that this Congress bears significant responsibility for the lack of funding, the lack of readiness, and the lack of capability of our military, which then makes for 100-hour workweeks, which then leads to accidents. I am sure you are aware of the testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations.

Our force is facing, as I said, a readiness crisis. Personnel are experiencing the strain of 16 years of continuous conflict.

The next Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness will be the senior official responsible for issues that have been

a priority for this committee in the last 3 years. The sweeping personnel reforms Congress has passed in recent defense authorization bills reflect the importance we place on these issues.

If confirmed, we expect that you will work to faithfully implement these reforms and be a forward-thinking partner to this committee as we look to ensure that serving in defense of our Nation remains a compelling calling for our best and brightest Americans.

Admiral Kernan, if confirmed as the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, you will serve as the principal intelligence adviser to the Secretary of Defense and will be dual-hatted as the director of defense intelligence in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

It has been nearly 15 years since this position was created, and the security environment has changed dramatically during that time. The scope and complexity of global threats is unlike anything the Nation has faced during the last 7 decades. That is why it is more important than ever that this committee and the department make certain that the defense intelligence enterprise is appropriately structured to integrate and prioritize intelligence resources and capabilities throughout the department.

I look to our nominee to explain how he intends to reassess this structure and ensure that the military has timely and accurate intelligence to defend the Nation against a rapidly evolving series of security challenges.

Mr. Roberts, if confirmed, you will be the principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense on nuclear weapons and chemical and biological defense, as well as the executive director of the Nuclear Weapons Council. As such, you will have a key role in shepherding the modernization programs of the nuclear triad, including the bomber, the submarine, the ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missile], the Long-Range Stand-Off Weapon, and nuclear command and control.

If confirmed, we will expect you to advocate for the timely and responsible execution of these programs, which remain a cornerstone of our national defense, especially in the current strategic environment.

We also expect you will work with the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Energy (DOE) to support the recapitalization of the critical infrastructure that supports the nuclear weapons stockpile. Many of those facilities are in a disgraceful state of disrepair, and strong leadership from both the Department of Defense (DOD) and DOE will be required to keep all of these programs on time and at cost.

Dr. Esper, there is no clearer illustration that our Army remains at war than the combat loss of four of our noncommissioned officers in Niger last month. After 16 years of war, the Army, perhaps more than any other service, has been tested. Repeatedly, our soldiers have met that test and proved their commitment, courage, skill, and determination.

Today, however, our Army is facing a crisis. The burden imposed on our soldiers only grows as threats to our Nation increase and sequestration remains the law of the land. Given current operational demands, restoring readiness must be the Army's first priority. We have made some progress this year toward improving the number of ready brigades that are available for deployment. But

too many of our soldiers remain in brigades that are currently nondeployable, and the Army still does not plan to return to full spectrum readiness until 2021 at the earliest.

Meanwhile, the Army is woefully behind on modernization, and our soldiers are increasingly unprepared to confront the harsh realities of 21st Century warfare. With glaring capability gaps in mobility, lethality, and survivability, these problems will only get worse as our adversaries continue to modernize their forces. Put simply, our Army lacks both the adequate capacity and the key capabilities to win decisively.

If confirmed, we will expect you to implement the six key priorities for force modernization that the Army announced last month. You must work to turn these program goals into real weapons and equipment, and put them into the hands of soldiers as soon as possible. Our soldiers cannot afford the false choice between readiness and modernization. Building a ready, modern Army will require visionary leadership and a clear strategy.

If confirmed, we will expect you to lead the Army to those ends. You will have to learn the lessons of the past, make tough decisions, take and manage real risks, and hold yourself and those working for you accountable for results. When you do so, you will always have an ally in this chairman and this committee.

Finally, Dr. Esper, I would be remiss if I did not reiterate my concerns about the number of nominees from defense industry filling out the leadership ranks at the Department of Defense. I want to be clear that my reservations grew out of early consultations I had with the Administration about potential nominations, including yours and a handful of others that were yet to be nominated. It was then that I decided that I couldn't support further nominees with that background, beyond those we had already discussed.

I appreciate your commitment not only to recuse yourself from matters related to the Raytheon Company but further not to seek or accept waivers to your recusal obligation. And I would like to submit your letter stating that commitment into the record, without objection.

[The information referred to follows:]

[The nominee responded and the information is contained in the Committee's executive files.]

Chairman MCCAIN. Again, let me thank our witnesses for their willingness to serve our Nation at this challenging time.

The length of my opening statement was directly related to the importance of the tasks that you will be asked to undertake.

Senator Reed?

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JACK REED

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Let me join you in welcoming our nominees, and to thank them and their families for their willingness to serve in positions with great responsibility in the Department of Defense.

I also would like to, as you will as you introduce your families, acknowledge the critical role they play in supporting your efforts and supporting the men and women in uniform.

Dr. Esper, you have been nominated to lead one of our greatest institutions, the United States Army. If confirmed, you will serve during a time in which the organization is facing many challenges, including how to improve full spectrum readiness while we continue to deploy soldiers around the world. The Army also continues to grapple with modernization, to include how best to make targeted investment in programs and canceling those efforts that are underperforming or cost-prohibitive.

Dr. Esper, you have a wealth of experience, including your service in the Army, as well as your extensive experience in both the public and private sector. If confirmed as the next Secretary of the Army, your unique perspective will allow you to tackle these challenges head-on, and I look forward to hearing your views on these issues.

Mr. Wilkie, if confirmed as the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, you will face many challenges in ensuring, first and foremost, that our military has adequate numbers of ready and trained servicemembers of sufficiently high character and talent to meet national defense objectives.

This overarching imperative implies many organizational challenges. Military personnel costs have continued to rise at rates exceeding the increase to the overall defense budget, even as the overall number of Active Duty soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines has dropped from over 2 million in 1980 to 1.3 million today, despite an increase to the defense budget over that time frame.

Mr. Wilkie, your vast experience within the department and Congress should serve you well, if you are confirmed. I look forward to working with you. You will be tackling difficult issues, and I know you will do them well.

Admiral Kernan, you have been nominated to serve as the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence at a very critical time. Intelligence and operations are more integrated than ever before. But at the same time, the demand for accurate and timely intelligence continues to outstrip supply.

This challenge is exacerbated by the inefficient allocation process of available airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities among the geographic combatant commands. As tactical intelligence-gathering capabilities continue to advance at an exceptional pace, we are also experiencing a shortfall in the personnel and analytical tools necessary to make effective use of the overwhelming amount of raw intelligence that is being generated.

Given your more than 3 decades of service in the Navy, you bring important experience to the position of the USDI, which you should serve with great distinction, as you have in the past.

Mr. Roberts, if confirmed, you will serve in a position that dates back to the 1946 Atomic Energy Act. Since its creation, this office has assumed other important missions, including threat reduction, nonproliferation, and treaty verification. However, its core mission has not changed, which is to serve as the interface between the Department of Defense for its stockpile requirements to support its nuclear deterrence mission and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA.

In no uncertain terms, I expect you, as your predecessors have done, to hold the NNSA accountable in meeting the department's

stockpile needs and, in particular, restoring our ability to produce plutonium pits as we recapitalize our triad over the next 20 years.

Since 2011, following the ratification of the New START Treaty, this committee has extended considerable time and effort holding the NNSA accountable to this mission, and we expect you to continue it.

Again, thank you for your willingness, gentlemen, to serve the Nation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you.

I note the presence of our respected friend, Senator Tillis, who would like to, I believe, introduce one of the witnesses.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOM TILLIS

Senator TILLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, ranking member, and distinguished colleagues on Senate Armed Services.

I have the privilege of making a few comments about Robert Wilkie, or Colonel Robert Wilkie. He has an extensive resume that I am sure is in the record, but I think it bears repeating some of the more important things that I believe make him uniquely qualified for this role.

Many of you probably met Robert when he was working for the nomination of Secretary Mattis. We seconded Robert over to the Office of Personnel Transition to help with the transition.

He has several years of private sector experience, including working on projects that were to reform and reorganize the United Kingdom Ministry of Defense supply chain and logistics system. He also served in the Bush administration for both Gates and Rumsfeld as Assistant Secretary of Defense. Before that, he served under Condoleezza Rice. I could go through the full resume, but I will not.

I have to tell you that being a junior Senator coming in and having someone of Robert's caliber willing to serve with me was a real honor. He started under Jesse Helms, and he has worked on Capitol Hill for many years, up to and including serving in the Leader's office.

He has a grasp of history that is unparalleled. We play a game in my office called "Stump Robert". We have not figured out how to do it yet. He also has a very broad base of educational experience of all the lines of service.

But, Mr. Chair, in your comments about taking readiness seriously, there is probably not a day that goes by that we are not talking about that. It is one of the reasons, when we were looking at subcommittees that I may serve on, that he was the one to say it would be great for you to get the Personnel Subcommittee, because that is an area where we can do a lot of work. We focused on it, and we have made progress with the great staff. I am pretty sure most of the Senate Armed Services staff have a high opinion of Robert.

I will tell you we also call him Forrest Gump because there is not a single story he cannot put in context of some experience he had during his working career or dating back to the Roman times.

[Laughter.]

Senator TILLIS. He is going to be a great addition to the Department of Defense, and I am personally—it is bittersweet to lose him,

but in my capacity on the Personnel Subcommittee on Senate Armed Services, I get the opportunity to continue to work with him and do great work, so I wholeheartedly support his nomination and appreciate the opportunity to introduce them.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you, Senator Tillis, and thank you for your very good words. Your opinion is shared on this dais as well. I thank you very much.

Maybe we will just begin with you, Mr. Wilkie, if you would like to proceed?

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT L. WILKIE, TO BE
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PERSONNEL AND
READINESS**

Mr. WILKIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Reed, and distinguished Members of the Committee on Armed Services. This is the second time I have appeared in this chair.

Chairman MCCAIN. I hope it is better than the last time.

[Laughter.]

Mr. WILKIE. As in 2006, I was blessed to have my wife Julie with me. We grew up together outside of Fort Bragg, and she is the foundation of our family in both our civilian and military lives. Unlike 2006, my daughter Megan is now old enough to sit here. She is escaping from her junior high school classes at Washington and Lee, and is also representing her brother Adam, who is a first semester mechanical engineering student at Clemson University. I am also proud to have my sister-in-law Carla Council here. We, too, went to high school in Fayetteville.

Chairman MCCAIN. We welcome them to the Committee. Thank you.

Mr. WILKIE. Mr. Chairman, in 2006, I was honored to be introduced by a former member of this committee and a truly great Senate leader, Trent Lott. I am equally humbled today not only by the confidence placed in me by the President and Secretary Mattis but to be introduced by Senator Tillis.

Senator Helms said that for any senator to truly represent North Carolina, that senator must understand North Carolina Highway 24. That is the road that the next 45 percent of the entire United States Marine Corps in the eastern part of our State to the place Senator Reed calls the hub of the universe, Fort Bragg. Senator Tillis has met Senator Helms' charge and exemplifies what all of us who have been part of the military life strive to be, and that is a servant leader.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, I will be charged with making life easier for the men, women, and families, military and civilian, who carry our future on their shoulders. I have been privileged to see this military life from many angles, as a dependent, as the son of a gravely wounded combat soldier, as an officer with a family in the military health care system, and as a senior leader in the White House and the Pentagon.

My earliest memories are of the massed jumps of the 82nd Airborne Division on the Normandy and Sicily drop zones at Fort Bragg, and of the artillery half section rolling across the old post quadrangle at Fort Sill.

I have witnessed firsthand the transition from the conscript military to the all-volunteer total force of Guard, Active, and Reserve envisioned by the late Army Chief of Staff Creighton Abrams.

Mr. Chairman, since Desert Storm, readiness has meant the ability to mobilize, fight, and win two wars. Without prejudging Secretary Mattis' strategic review, that notion of readiness is a good place for P&R to start when assessing the quality of the total force.

In my opinion, as the chairman mentioned, the department has too often been caught up in chasing the shiny object, the new carrier or the new fighter. There have been few champions for readiness to work with this committee.

Simply put, we need to get people back on the range and in the motor pools, and prepare for the full spectrum of conflict, a spectrum that now includes cyber and space.

The threshold question is whether each decision made by the department enhances America's ability to deter and, if need be, defeat any enemy while keeping our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines alive, and getting them back home quickly.

When they return, we owe them and their families the same level of care and attention.

This is not the military that Senator McCain or my father joined at the dawn of the Kennedy administration. Yet we are hamstrung by policies and procedures in place then to run that force of multiple millions, refreshed each year by thousands of draftees and ROTC [Reserve Officers' Training Corps] graduates.

Today, our military is vastly different, comprised entirely of high-quality volunteers. Seventeen percent of the force is female, many of whom are serving on the frontlines in numbers and missions unmanageable in the days of the WACs [Women's Army Corps].

But our headquarters are bloated. We rely on a 20-year up-or-out model for service men and women who are forced to leave the military in their prime. Promotion models often see the bottom performer advance at the same pace as the frontrunner.

Success in the Information Age will increasingly rely on the technical ability of our troops, yet our assignment system values breadth over depth of experience. Recruiting can be stovepiped and not reach a wide audience online. Servicemembers cannot move freely amongst Active, Guard, and Reserve components to meet changing circumstances in their lives.

In my father's day, few soldiers had families. Today, over 60 percent do. For our families, the center of their lives can be their military health care system. But that system has been slow to keep up with modern medical advances for conditions like autism and other behavioral disorders, as Senators Gillibrand and Tillis have made clear. We still have military families making their medical appointments on paper.

Constant rotation, again, based on a 19th century Army model, prevents spouses from putting down roots and garnering meaningful employment. Child care is, at best, uneven.

The bottom line, as the chairman said in his remarks to Secretary Mattis, is that if the families are not happy, the soldier walks.

The All-Volunteer Force has performed miracles, but dwell times for frontline Marine Corps and Army infantry units are now down

to 1:1.14 years. On any given day, 15 percent of the Army is medically unable to deploy.

Mr. Chairman, we must address those hard facts or the force will break.

This Committee has kept pace and faith with the finest military in the world, and the solutions for many of the issues I mentioned have already begun to be put in place. If confirmed, I pledge to build on your work and also work with the great patriots, part of their family, the patriots who man OSD P&R, and help you keep that faith.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you, and I look forward to your questions. [The prepared statement of Mr. Wilkie follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY ROBERT L. WILKIE

Mr. Chairman, Senator Reed and distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services. This is the second time I have appeared in this chair. In 2006, I was honored to be introduced by a truly great Senate leader, Trent Lott. I am equally humbled today not only by the confidence placed in me by the President and Secretary Mattis, but to be introduced by Senator Tillis.

Jesse Helms said that to truly represent North Carolina one must understand HWY 24—that is the road that connects 45% of the entire Marine Corps in the eastern part of our state to the place Senator Reed calls the “hub of the universe,” Fort Bragg. If America is called to action Marines and soldiers from North Carolina will be probably be the tip of the spear—currently they are deployed in 120 countries.

In two years in the Senate, Senator Tillis has spent weeks walking and talking with Marines and paratroopers and their families, turning those conversations into positive results for them. He exemplifies what all of us in the military world strive to be—the servant leader.

Mr. Chairman, if confirmed, I will be charged with making life easier for those men and women who carry our future on their shoulders.

I have been privileged to see this military life from many angles; as a dependent; as the son of a gravely wounded combat soldier; as an officer with a family in the military health care system and as a senior leader in the White House and the Pentagon.

My earliest memories are of massed jumps of the 82nd Airborne Division on the Normandy and Sicily drop zones at Fort Bragg and the artillery half section rolling across the old post quadrangle at Fort Sill.

I have witnessed first-hand the transition from the conscript military to the all-volunteer total force of National Guard, Reserve and active components—envisioned by the late Army Chief of Staff Creighton Abrams.

Secretary Mattis notes that lethality comes from readiness. General Milley was clear when he said his three priorities are “readiness, readiness, and readiness”. Since Desert Storm “readiness” has meant the ability to mobilize, fight and win two regional wars. Without prejudging Secretary Mattis’ strategic review—that notion of readiness is a place for P&R to start when assessing the quality of the force.

In my opinion, the Department has too often been caught up in chasing the shiny object—the new carrier or fighter. There have been few champions for readiness to work with this Committee. We need to get people back on the range and in the motor pools and prepare for the full spectrum of conflict—a spectrum that now includes cyber and space.

Regarding the full spectrum of conflict, the People’s Liberation Army has two entire divisions dedicated to nothing other than cyber operations against America’s military. We have faced revolutionary technical challenges before. In the 1940s, George Marshall and Hap Arnold brought into the military from the civilian sector, Americans on the cutting edge of new technologies who were immediately set to mastering: photo reconnaissance and psychological and deception operations.

We now must bring in our cyber, engineering and scientific talent—by reopening that old system of lateral accessions. Marshall and Arnold looked to Hollywood and Madison Avenue during World War II, we need to look to Route 128 and the Research Triangle.

The threshold question then is whether each decision made by the Department enhances America’s ability to deter—and if need be defeat—any enemy while keeping our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines alive and getting them back home

quickly. When they return home, we owe them and their families, the same level of care and attention.

This is not the military that Senator McCain or my father joined at the dawn of the Kennedy Administration, yet we are hamstrung by the policies and procedures in place then to run that force of multiple millions refreshed each year by tens of thousands of draftees and thousands of ROTC graduates. Today, our military is vastly different. Comprised entirely of high-quality volunteers. Seventeen percent of the force is female—many of whom are serving on the frontlines—in numbers and missions unimaginable in the days of WACs.

We rely on a twenty year up or out model for servicemen and women who are forced to leave the military in their prime. Promotion models often see the bottom performer advanced at the same pace as the front runner. Success in the information age will increasingly rely on the technical ability of our troops, yet our assignment system values breadth over depth of experience. Recruiting is stove piped and not reaching a wide audience online. Service members cannot move freely amongst active, Guard and Reserve components to meet changing circumstances in their lives.

In my father's day, few soldiers had families—today over sixty percent do. For our families, the military health system has been slow to keep up with modern medical advances for conditions like autism and other behavioral disorders as Senators Gillibrand and Tillis have pointed out. We still have military families making their medical appointments on paper.

Constant rotation—again based on a 19th century Army model—prevents spouses from putting down roots and garnering meaningful employment. Childcare is at best uneven. The bottom line is that readiness is holistic—if the families are not happy, the soldier walks.

The all-volunteer force has performed miracles but dwell times for frontline Marine and Army infantry units are now down to 1:1.14 years and on any given day 10 to 15 percent of the Army is medically unable to deploy. We must address those hard facts, or the force will break.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has kept faith with the finest military in the world and the solutions for many of the issues I mentioned have already begun to be put in place. If confirmed I pledge to build on your work and help keep that faith.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you for an excellent statement.

Dr. Esper?

STATEMENT OF MARK T. ESPER, PH.D., TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Dr. ESPER. Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, members of the Armed Services Committee, it is an honor and a privilege to appear before you this morning as the President's nominee for Secretary of the Army.

I want to thank the President and Secretary Mattis for this opportunity and their confidence in me.

I would like to begin by recognizing my wife, Leah, and our children, Luke, John, and Kate, who are with me today. Like many military families, they made sacrifices in support of my service in the Army.

Chairman MCCAIN. They are welcome here.

Dr. ESPER. Less than a year after we married, my wife experienced anxious days and nights during my 7-month deployment with the 101st Airborne Division to the Gulf War. Later, she gave birth to our first son at an Army hospital in a foreign country while I was commanding an airborne rifle company that trained throughout Europe as part of a NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] rapid reaction force. We moved four times in 5 years, but she always made a home for our growing family wherever the Army sent us.

After I transitioned from Active Duty on the Army staff to the Virginia Guard, she shouldered additional parenting duties during

those long drill weekends, annual training, and everything in between. This would continue for several more years, during my various jobs in the Senate, the House, and as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, until my retirement from the Army Reserve in 2007.

I tell this story because of the big thanks I owe my wife for all of the support she gave me during those years, and the terrific job she did raising our children when I was gone. Her support is something I know I will lean on again, should I be confirmed as the next Secretary of the Army.

I also share this story to give you a sense of my experiences in the Army.

From my first day as a cadet at West Point until my retirement, I wore an Army uniform for over 25 years. I was privileged to serve in some of the best Active and Guard infantry units, attend the Army's top training and leadership schools, and serve on three separate continents in defense of our country. I understand well the challenges of military service, the importance of readiness, the rigors of wartime deployment, and how it all impacts our soldiers and their families.

Throughout my military career, I was fortunate to serve with America's best, the soldiers, NCOs [noncommissioned officers] officers, and civilian employees of the United States Army whose selflessness and vigilance keep our great Nation safe. I have learned a good deal from all of them and would not be here today were it not for many of them. Their welfare and readiness will always be my top priority.

Today's Army is the greatest ground combat force in history. Despite this fact, the service faces many challenges. This committee knows them well.

The Army is at a critical inflection point, pivoting to address the rise of aggressive near-peer adversaries while our soldiers fight terrorist groups abroad, and global demand for ready forces increases and fiscal pressures at home continue.

The next Secretary must lead the world's premier ground force to success in these difficult times, and ensure it is prepared for the future fights as well.

My vow, if confirmed, is to leverage my values, my experiences, and all my energies to make the hard choices and address these issues. If confirmed, my first priority will be readiness, ensuring the total Army is prepared to fight across the full spectrum of conflict.

With the Army engaged in over 140 countries around the world, to include combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, training rotations to Europe to deter Russia, and forward-deployed units in the Pacific defending against a bellicose North Korea, readiness must be our top priority. This means recruiting and retaining the best our Nation has to offer, ensuring these young men and women are well-trained and well-led, and equipping them with the best weapons and technology available. Every unit must be prepared to deploy and accomplish its mission.

These are the fundamental title 10 duties of the Secretary of the Army, and, if confirmed, I intend to do them well.

A second priority will be modernization, building capacity and capabilities in the longer term. This means growing the force while maintaining quality, reshaping it to be more robust and successful in all domains, and modernizing it with the best weapons and equipment available to guarantee clear overmatch in future conflicts.

For modernization to be successful, the Secretary must articulate a clear vision, reforms championed by this committee must be fully implemented, and the acquisition process must be greatly improved. This includes changing how requirements are set, modifying the personnel system to promote success and ensure accountability, prototyping and demonstrating systems early, and involving the private sector much more.

In short, we must provide our soldiers the tools they need to fight and win, when they need them.

Defense dollars are not where they need to be, and I know the Armed Services Committees are working hard to change that. But in the meantime, the Army must exercise better stewardship of its resources.

A third priority is efficiency. To achieve this, I intend to play a very active role in the Army's top acquisition programs, reduce bureaucracy, wring inefficiency out of Army organizations and processes, and promote an audit-ready culture that will facilitate much of this. We must free up time, money, and manpower to be utilized or invested in our top priorities.

Lastly, if confirmed, I will approach my duties with the values and behaviors proven to maximize the effectiveness of any team: act with integrity; collaborate broadly; treat others with respect; encourage innovation, critical thinking and straight talk; empower people; and hold leaders accountable. These principles must be lived, promoted, and upheld day-in and day-out by leaders at every level.

Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, members of this committee, thank you for your time and consideration today. Having served on Capitol Hill, I know well the critical Article I responsibilities of the Armed Services Committees, and when it comes to our Nation's security, what you expect. I look forward to working closely and continuously with the committee to ensure the United States Army is ready to deploy, fight, and win on any battlefield, on any day, under any conditions, and that the total Army family, our soldiers, civilians, and their loved ones at home, are well cared for.

I am grateful for your consideration of my nomination, and I look forward to your questions.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Esper follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY DR. MARK T. ESPER

Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, Members of the Armed Services Committee—it is an honor and a privilege to appear before you this morning as the President's nominee for Secretary of the Army. I want to thank the President and Secretary Mattis for this opportunity and their confidence in me.

I would like to begin by recognizing my wife, Leah, and our children—Luke, John, and Kate—who are with me today. Like many military families, they made sacrifices in support of my service in the Army.

Less than a year after we married, my wife experienced anxious days and nights during my seven month deployment with the 101st Airborne Division to the Gulf War. Later, she gave birth to our first son at an Army hospital in a foreign country while I was commanding an airborne rifle company that trained throughout Europe as part of a NATO rapid reaction force. We moved four times in five years, but she always made a home for our growing family wherever the Army sent us.

After I transitioned from active duty on the Army Staff to the Virginia Guard, she shouldered additional parenting duties during those long drill weekends, annual training, and everything in between. This would continue for several more years, during my various jobs in the Senate, the House, and as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, until my retirement from the Army Reserve in 2007.

I tell this story because of the big thanks I owe my wife for all of the support she gave me during those years, and the terrific job she did raising our children when I was gone. Her support is something I know I will lean on again should I be confirmed as the next Secretary of the Army.

I also share this story to give you a sense of my experiences in the Army. From my first day as a cadet at West Point until my retirement, I wore an Army uniform for over twenty-five years. I was privileged to serve in some of the best Active and Guard infantry units, attend the Army's top training and leadership schools, and serve on three separate continents in defense of our country. I understand the challenges of military service, the importance of readiness, the rigors of wartime deployment, and how it all impacts our Soldiers and their families.

Throughout my military career I was fortunate to serve with America's best—the Soldiers, NCOs, Officers, and Civilian employees of the U.S. Army whose selflessness and vigilance keep our great Nation safe. I have learned a good deal from all of them, and would not be here today were it not for many of them. Their welfare and readiness will always be my top priority.

Today's Army is the greatest ground combat force in history. Despite this fact, the Service faces many challenges; this committee knows them well. The Army is at a critical inflection point, pivoting to address the rise of aggressive near-peer adversaries while our Soldiers fight terrorist groups abroad, as global demand for ready forces increases and fiscal pressures at home continue. The next Secretary must lead the world's premier ground force to success in these difficult times, and ensure it is prepared for the future fights as well. My vow, if confirmed, is to leverage my values, my experiences, and all my energies to make the hard choices and address these issues.

If confirmed, my first priority will be Readiness—ensuring the Total Army is prepared to fight across the full spectrum of conflict. With the Army engaged in over 140 countries around the world, to include combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, training rotations to Europe to deter Russia, and forward deployed units in the Pacific defending against a bellicose North Korea, readiness must be our top priority.

This means recruiting and retaining the best our Nation has to offer, ensuring these young men and women are well-trained and well-led, and equipping them with the best weapons and technology available. Every unit must be prepared to deploy and accomplish its mission. These are the fundamental Title 10 duties of the Secretary of the Army, and, if confirmed, I intend to do them well.

A second priority will be Modernization—building capacity and capabilities in the longer term. This means growing the force while maintaining quality, reshaping it to be more robust and successful in all domains, and modernizing it with the best weapons and equipment available to guarantee clear overmatch in future conflicts.

For modernization to be successful, the Secretary must articulate a clear Vision, reforms championed by this Committee must be fully implemented, and the acquisition process must be greatly improved. This includes changing how requirements are set, modifying the personnel system to promote success and ensure accountability, prototyping and demonstrating systems early, and involving the private sector much more. In short, we must provide our Soldiers the tools they need to fight and win, when they need them.

Defense dollars are not where they need to be, and I know the Armed Services committees are working hard to change that. But in the meantime, the Army must exercise better stewardship of its resources. So a third priority is Efficiency. To achieve this, I intend to play a very active role in the Army's top acquisition programs, reduce bureaucracy, wring inefficiency out of Army organizations and processes, and promote an audit-ready culture that will facilitate much of this. We must free up time, money, and manpower to be utilized or invested in our top priorities.

If confirmed, I will approach my duties with the values and behaviors proven to maximize the effectiveness of any team: act with integrity; collaborate broadly; treat others with respect; encourage innovation, critical thinking and straight talk; em-

power people; and hold leaders accountable. These principles must be lived, promoted, and upheld day-in and day-out by leaders at every level.

Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, Members of this committee, thank you for your time and consideration today. Having served on Capitol Hill, I know well the critical Article I responsibilities of the Armed Services Committees when it comes to our Nation's security and what you expect, so I look forward to working closely and continuously with the committee to ensure the United States Army is ready to deploy, fight and win on any battlefield, on any day, under any conditions, and that the Total Army family—our Soldiers, Civilians, and their loved ones at home—are well cared for.

I am grateful for your consideration of my nomination, and I look forward to your questions.

Thank you.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you.
Mr. Kernan?

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH D. KERNAN, TO BE UNDER
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE**

Mr. KERNAN. Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, and distinguished members of this committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today and for your consideration of my nomination to be the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.

I am appreciative of the trust and confidence that President Trump and Secretary Mattis have placed in me. If confirmed, I look forward to assuming the responsibilities of the USD(I), a role that I view as extremely important to our Nation's security.

I would like to recognize my family, who are not here in person but in spirit, and fully supportive of this commitment, should I be confirmed. They have all influenced me greatly.

My father, who left Columbia Medical School in 1939 to fly B-17s in World War II; my father-in-law, who flew Navy Corsairs during World War II; my brother, Bob, a career Navy pilot; and two sisters, Martha and Mary, who, with their families, are active humanitarians on many fronts; and most importantly, my wife, Jan, always patriotic, always supportive, and always caring. She was alone for much of my military career, raising our two children, Sean and Shannon, and too often was called upon to support and console the families of casualties from my command.

Lastly, the preeminent reason for me and my willingness to serve is for the men and women who stand in defense of our country. They deserve the best we can provide them and should I be confirmed, they will have my unwavering commitment to that task.

The fidelity of intelligence, when combined with the skill and courage of those men and women, along with its impact on leader decision-making, is crucial to our Nation's security. During combat and contingency operations, I placed a high value on intelligence support because that intelligence allowed us to plan effectively, mitigate risk, prosecute high-value targets, and exploit intelligence on those target sites.

In my experience, my country's and our allies' intelligence and law enforcement enterprises were routinely vital contributors to our military operations. My commitment to the value of leveraging collective and collaborative intelligence capabilities, partnering, and collaborating remains firm, and if confirmed, that will continue.

If confirmed, my initial priorities would include: Providing intelligence support to warfighters and national security decision-makers; proactively collaborating across the Department of Defense, the intelligence enterprise, and with our allies and emerging foreign partners; and finally, leveraging commercial technologies and innovations where they can support mission success and address other internal and external security threats and challenges.

In this complex security environment, we must collect, process, and analyze information from all domains—human, sea, air, land, space, and cyber—to counter the traditional and nontraditional adversaries that constantly maneuver and adapt. Our intelligence enterprise must be trained and equipped to do so as well.

If confirmed, I will relentlessly pursue the resources, technologies, and solutions that meet our military and our Nation's intelligence needs.

In closing, I am committed to working very closely with this committee and other committees of jurisdiction to provide the information needed to carry out oversight responsibilities.

Thank you for your consideration of my nomination. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kernan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY JOSEPH KERNAN

Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, and distinguished members of this Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today and for your consideration of my nomination to be the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)).

I am appreciative of the trust and confidence that President Trump and Secretary Mattis have placed in me, and if confirmed, I look forward to assuming the responsibilities of the USD(I), a role that I view as extremely important to our nation's security.

I would like to recognize my family, who are not here in person, but in spirit and fully supportive of this commitment should I be confirmed. My father who left Columbia Medical School in 1939 to fly B-17's throughout WW-II, my father-in-law who flew Navy Corsairs in WW-II, my brother Bob, a career Navy pilot, and two sisters, Martha and Mary, who, with their families, are active humanitarians on many fronts. Most importantly, my wife Jan, always patriotic, supportive, and caring. She was alone for much of my military career, raising our two children, Sean and Shannon, and too often was called upon to support and console the families of casualties from my command. Lastly, the preeminent reason for my willingness to serve, the men and women who stand in defense of our country—they deserve the best we can provide them—and should I be confirmed, they will have my unwavering commitment to that task.

The fidelity of intelligence, when combined with the skill and courage of those men and women along with its impact on leader decision-making, is crucial to our nation's security. During combat and contingency operations, I placed a high value on intelligence support because that intelligence allowed us to plan effectively, prosecute high-value targets, and exploit target sites. In my experience, our country's and our allies' intelligence and law enforcement enterprises were routinely vital contributors to our military operations. My commitment to the value of leveraging collective intelligence capabilities, partnering, and collaborating remains firm and, if confirmed, that will continue.

If confirmed, my initial priorities would include: providing intelligence support to warfighters and national security decision-makers; proactively collaborating across the Department of Defense, the Intelligence Enterprise, and with our allies and emerging foreign partners; and finally, leveraging commercial technologies and innovations, where they can support mission success and address other internal and external security threats and challenges.

In this complex security environment, we must collect, process, and analyze information from all domains, human, sea, air, land, space, and cyber, to counter traditional and non-traditional adversaries that constantly maneuver and adapt—our in-

telligence enterprise must be trained and equipped to do so as well. If confirmed, I will relentlessly pursue the resources, technologies, and solutions that meet our intelligence needs.

In closing, I am committed to working closely with this committee and other committees of jurisdiction to provide the information needed to carry out oversight responsibilities.

Thank you for your consideration of my nomination. I look forward to your questions.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you.
Mr. Roberts?

STATEMENT OF GUY B. ROBERTS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Reed, and members of the committee for your consideration of my nomination to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs. It is, indeed, an honor and a privilege to be considered for this important position.

I wish to thank the President and Secretary Mattis for their confidence in me and their support for my nomination.

And, of course, I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to my family: my wife, Helene, and my two sons, Matthew and Alexander, who regrettably could not be here today. But their love, support, and sacrifice have been uplifting, and without it, I certainly wouldn't be here today.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation to the men and women who have served and who continue to serve our Nation in uniform today. Their sacrifices, and those of their families, are enormous. As I can attest firsthand, and we cannot thank them enough. I feel no stronger sense of purpose and inspiration than, if confirmed, to dedicate myself to ensure that they as well as all Americans are fully protected from the threat of weapons of mass destruction, proliferation, and use.

Likewise, if confirmed, I look forward to working with the rest of the Department of Defense team to support Secretary Mattis in implementing the President's plan to rebuild our military and to ensure the safety and security of the American people, particularly regarding modernizing our nuclear enterprise and our antiproliferation initiatives and programs.

I believe my 35 years of experience participating in and negotiating multilateral and bilateral agreements on arms control and proliferation issues, and overseeing our NATO nuclear posture, make me uniquely qualified for this position. This includes serving as a military officer tasked with representing the Department of Defense in various conventional and strategic arms control negotiations; working in the private sector as a subject matter expert on nonproliferation training programs and as an academic teaching classes on nonproliferation, arms control, and deterrence strategy; and as a senior official in OSD policy, where I worked on issues that continue to bedevil us, including Russia, North Korea, our nuclear deterrence and missile defense policy, and a range of arms control and counterproliferation initiatives.

Additionally, as NATO's Deputy Assistant Secretary General for WMD [weapons of mass destruction] Policy and the director for Nu-

clear Policy, I worked closely with our allies to help shape our policy towards a revanchist Russia, developed and implemented NATO's comprehensive policy to prevent WMD proliferation, and oversaw NATO's nuclear deterrence posture.

While there, I developed a keen appreciation for the importance of regular consultations and working closely with our allies and partners, as well as other international actors and industry.

If confirmed, I anticipate continuing to work closely with our allies and partners, as well as my interagency counterparts, to help synchronize our efforts regarding U.S. foreign nonproliferation and counterproliferation policy objectives.

Most importantly, the President has prioritized nuclear modernization as the highest priority among national defense requirements. If confirmed, I will work to first ensure we have a robust nuclear enterprise with a full set of flexible, credible, ready, and survivable nuclear capabilities; second, work to develop a nuclear posture that is responsive to today's threats and challenges; and third, institute declaratory policies that, in any adversary's eyes, credibly convey the message that aggression of any kind is not a rational option.

I believe we must maintain a second-to-none robust deterrence posture to complement our efforts to stop and counter the threat of WMD possession and use.

Additionally, if confirmed, I will work closely with other DOD components as well as our inter-agency partners and allies to ensure that state and non-state actors never have the opportunity to acquire and use these weapons of mass destruction and disruption against our forces, our allies, and our Homeland.

Finally, if confirmed, I look forward to working with this committee to support developing and modernizing the needed capabilities to deter our adversaries; reassure our allies; prevent the spread of, protect against, and effectively respond to the threat of WMD proliferation and use.

Thank you again, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Roberts follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT BY GUY B. ROBERTS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Reed, and members of the committee for your consideration of my nomination to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs. It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be considered for this important position.

I wish to thank the President and Secretary Mattis for their confidence in me and their support for my nomination, and of course, I owe an immense debt of gratitude to my family, my wife Helene, and my two sons, Matthew and Alexander who regrettably could not be here today. Their love, support and sacrifice have been uplifting and without it I certainly wouldn't be here today.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation to the men and women who have served, and who continue to serve our nation in uniform today. Their sacrifices, and those of their families, are enormous, as I can attest first hand, and we cannot thank them enough. I feel no stronger sense of purpose and inspiration than, if confirmed, to dedicate myself to ensure that they as well as all Americans are fully protected from the threat of weapons of mass destruction proliferation and use.

Likewise, if confirmed, I look forward to working with the rest of the Department of Defense team to support Secretary Mattis in implementing the President's plan to rebuild our military and to ensure the safety and security of the American people, particularly regarding modernizing our nuclear enterprise and our anti proliferation initiatives and programs.

I believe my 35 years of experience participating in and negotiating multi-lateral and bilateral agreements on arms control and proliferation issues and overseeing our NATO nuclear posture make me uniquely qualified for this position. This includes serving as a military officer tasked with representing the DOD in various conventional and strategic arms control negotiations; working in the private sector as a subject matter expert on non-proliferation training programs, as an academic teaching classes on non-proliferation, arms control and deterrence strategy; and as a senior official in OSD policy where I worked on issues that continue to bedevil us including Russia, North Korea, our nuclear deterrence and missile defense policy, and a range of arms control and counter proliferation initiatives.

Additionally, as NATO's Deputy Assistant Secretary General for WMD Policy and the Director for Nuclear Policy I worked closely with our allies to help shape our policy towards a revanchist Russia, developed and implemented NATO's comprehensive policy to prevent WMD proliferation, and oversaw NATO's nuclear deterrence posture. While there I developed a keen appreciation for the importance of regular consultations and working closely with our allies and partners as well as other international actors and industry.

If confirmed, I anticipate continuing to work closely with our Allies and partners as well as my interagency counterparts to help synchronize our efforts regarding U.S. foreign non-proliferation and counter proliferation policy objectives.

Most importantly, the President has prioritized nuclear modernization as the highest priority among national defense requirements. If confirmed, I will work to first ensure we have a robust nuclear enterprise with a full set of flexible, credible, ready and survivable nuclear capabilities; second, work to develop a nuclear posture that's responsive to today's threats and challenges; and third, institute declaratory policies that, in any adversary's eyes, credibly convey the message that aggression of any kind is not a rational option.

I believe we must maintain a second-to-none robust deterrence posture to complement our efforts to stop and counter the threat of WMD possession and use. Additionally, if confirmed, I will work closely with other DOD components as well as our inter-agency partners and allies to ensure that state and non-state actors never have the opportunity to acquire and use these weapons of mass destruction and disruption against our forces, our allies and our Homeland.

Finally, if confirmed, I look forward to working with this Committee to support developing and modernizing the needed capabilities to deter our adversaries, reassure our allies, prevent the spread of, protect against, and effectively respond to the threat of WMD proliferation and use.

Thank you again and I look forward to your questions.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Roberts.

I would just like to make a comment here, and that is the reason why these nominations have not been acted on as rapidly as possible is because of failures of communication between this committee and the Pentagon, which is a shame since I have known them for many, many years.

We expect from you, as in the opening questions that I asked, not only communication but cooperation. That is something that is our constitutional responsibility, and I hope that you appreciate it.

Dr. Esper, from time to time, there is frustration on this committee because of failures of major weapons systems. For example, over the last 10 years or so, we have wasted about \$40 billion on programs like the Future Combat Systems, the Comanche attack helicopter, the Crusader howitzer, the Joint Tactical Radio System, and the Distributed Common Ground System-Army. Most recently, the committee has learned of the failure of the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical, known as WIN-T. This program has cost the taxpayer over \$6 billion and has yet to meet the requirements of our warfighters.

Let me just tell you now, that is not acceptable. It is not acceptable to the taxpayers of America. It is not acceptable to the members of this committee.

Now, we have made several changes over the last couple years in the defense authorization bill, but we do not want any more of these failures. You lose credibility with the American people when a program has to be canceled but it cost the taxpayers over \$6 billion.

Please keep that in mind, and we will be exercising careful scrutiny. We just cannot keep wasting billions of dollars like this. We just cannot. I hope that is the message that you get from every member of the committee on both sides.

Could I ask, Dr. Esper, you have an end-strength of over 1 million soldiers. The Army remains the one service in the greatest demand by the combatant commanders. All the while, it works to build readiness.

Is the current budget adequate to support operations, maintain readiness, and modernize the Army for 21st Century warfare?

Dr. ESPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the current budget is adequate to maintain current readiness or prepare for future readiness.

Chairman MCCAIN. Mr. Wilkie?

Mr. WILKIE. No, sir, it is not.

Chairman MCCAIN. And, Mr. Kernan?

Mr. KERNAN. No, Chairman. I do not believe it is sufficient.

Chairman MCCAIN. May I just say, again, Dr. Esper, for over 2 years, Army leaders have asserted readiness is priority number one. Do you believe that the Army is at a level of readiness to conduct combined arms maneuver warfare against a peer competitor?

Dr. ESPER. Mr. Chairman, I think the Army faces many readiness challenges right now, not least of which, most importantly, is to engage a near-peer competitor in a high-end fight. I think with only one-third of the brigade combat teams and 25 percent of the combat aviation brigades ready, engaging in such a conflict would be conducted at significant risk.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you.

Mr. Kernan, almost every day, we hear of another issue concerning cyber, either revelations of old attacks, an increase in the knowledge that we have concerning what Russians did to try to affect the outcome of our elections. As far as we can tell, for the last 8 years, there has not been a strategy on cyber, which then would be translated to policy, which would then be translated to action.

Now, we have provisions in the defense authorization bill, and we have a cyber subcommittee.

How serious do you think this issue is?

Mr. KERNAN. Sir, I think the cyber threat is probably one of the most concerning threats that face our Nation today, certainly in terms of what it can do to malicious activity inside of our infrastructure for our Nation, but as well cyber activities that are occurring inside the Department of Defense.

We have to commit ourselves to protecting our networks, to mitigating the impacts of malicious activity. We also need to develop an offensive and a defensive capability.

Again, I think it is a very, very serious threat that we have to take seriously. It is a warfare domain in my mind. It is a borderless warfare domain. There are actors out there that are taking advantage of that domain that is difficult to be tracked, to undermine

our democracy, again, whether it be stealing our technology or whether it be trying to influence our elections.

Chairman MCCAIN. I thank you, and we look forward to working with you, because, still to this day, we do not see a discernible strategy on confronting an issue that could have, under certain circumstances, undermined democracy and are our fundamentals of selecting our leaders.

Could I just add, finally, we intend to move your nominations through as quickly as possible. We need you to get to work.

Senator Reed?

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Again, gentlemen, thank you for your testimony and for your service.

Dr. Esper, let me associate myself with the chairman's initial remarks about the unfortunate—and that is a mild term—failures on programs going all the way back to the Crusader, the fighting systems, the land systems, et cetera, with the Army.

Can you give us a sense of how you are going to approach this issue, how you are going to take it on?

Dr. ESPER. Senator, first of all, I share your and the chairman's concerns, and the rest of the committee's, with regard to the Army's modernization record. It is certainly fraught with a number of mistakes in the past that not only cost the taxpayers billions of dollars but, maybe more importantly, have left the soldiers without the tools and equipment and weapons they need to be successful on the battlefield.

My view is that the era of minor fixes is over. We need to fundamentally relook the whole acquisition process, beginning with the requirements piece of it and all the way through the testing part, and fielding.

To do that means you need to take a holistic approach, which looks at processes, programs, people, policies. What you are trying to eventually get at is a fundamentally new system that, in the end, changes culture as well.

There have been a number of reports in the past to give us a nice roadmap as to how to do that, the Decker-Wagner report of 2011. There was a very good report by the Homeland Security Governmental Affairs Committee, which I think Chairman McCain was part of in 2014, which outlined that. It begins, first of all, with requirements, getting all the right players to the table at the same time, putting a warfighter in charge of that, and making sure that your requirements process that incorporates all those folks is stable. Then from there on, as you move through the acquisition process, doing things such as lining up the assignments of program managers and PEOs [program executive officer] with the milestone process so that there is clear accountability across-the-board.

I think with what the Army announced recently, I think those steps are all in the right direction with regard to what you need to do. But to me, the key is the layering process; getting rid of bureaucratic habits; closer engagement with industry, both private and commercial sector; look more to the commercial sector for off-the-shelf or things that can be developed; prototyping, demonstrating, using other transactional authorities that the com-

mittee provided in legislation; and really, again, fundamentally overhauling the system as it is now.

Senator REED. Thank you.

Mr. Wilkie, again, thank you for your service both here and in many other places.

Mr. WILKIE. Thank you, sir.

Senator REED. One of the issues that this Committee has struggled with, and the Department of Defense has struggled with, and in fact it is a societal issue, as we are seeing in the headlines every day, is sexual harassment. The department has not yet promulgated a comprehensive policy in that regard. Can you give us a commitment that you will work on that and get a policy out in a reasonable time?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes, sir. There are several items in that vein. The report or the policy that you refer to was set in place, or the requirement was set in place by the fiscal year 2015 NDAA [National Defense Authorization Act]. I think, given the current climate, it is now, more than ever, and it should not have been that long, but I will give you my commitment to make sure we move on it.

Senator REED. Thank you very much.

Chairman MCCAIN. You view it as a serious issue, Mr. Wilkie?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes, very serious issue, sir.

Senator REED. Admiral Kernan, one of the issues I alluded to, and one of the issues that we see every day, is just the lack of overhead ISR [intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance]. That was one of the factors, I don't know how dispositive, in the Niger situation. In fact, General Waldhauser has indicated he is only at 20 percent of what he needs.

You were in U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM). You probably had zero percent of what you thought you needed.

How do we fix that quickly? Because we now have other demands, particularly the Korean Peninsula, that are going to put more pressure on the allocation of ISR.

Mr. KERNAN. ISR, overhead ISR in general, there is an insatiable demand for that, and, honestly, for the right reasons, because ISR provides you the higher opportunity for mission success, and it markedly protects your force. So those assets are absolutely critical.

The adjudication process that we go through, again, my top priority is providing more fighter support. Those ISR assets that are under my charge, they are going to be in support of the warfighter.

That is not to say there are opportunities where we can support other organizations. I have not seen the investigation on Niger, but I do believe that, certainly, ISR assets probably could have benefited that. They certainly could have benefited us in SOUTHCOM.

Senator REED. Thank you.

Finally, Mr. Roberts, thank you for your service and what you propose to do.

Let me just stress again concern about the ability for the NNSA, principally, to support DOD through the plutonium pit production process. We are looking at a recapitalization of our nuclear enterprise, which is roughly about \$1.5 trillion to \$1.9 trillion over the next decade or so. Part of that necessarily is getting the plutonium pits for the warheads.

Can you give us a sense of that?

Mr. ROBERTS. Senator, when I first started this process, I was actually very surprised to find out that we do not have the capability for pit production right now. This Committee has looked at and raised this issue.

Certainly, if confirmed, one of the highest priorities that I will have is to work with NNSA to find out what the delays have been. Frankly, I find it very perplexing because the Nuclear Weapons Council earlier, back in I think it was 2014, had indicated that there was a solution to work forward on this. Then subsequently, there was a series of looking at other alternatives by NNSA.

I have seen the letter that this committee sent raising those concerns, and I believe those concerns are legitimate, and we need to work on them.

Senator REED. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Inhofe?

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have to say, I want to blow a little smoke at you guys, because in the 30 years I have been on either the House or the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have never seen a group of nominees come in more qualified than you four. I think we are going to turn this corner now, because we have the right people at the helm.

I want to ask one question, the same question of all four of you. Because one of our problems, when I was trying to explain to people over the last 8 years what is happening to our military, the threat that we are facing and different than any kind of threat that we have faced before, I didn't have the credibility to sell that. But when the uniforms start talking about it, then that makes a big difference.

So we have had that happen, and I am very proud of them to tell the unvarnished truth about the problems we have.

General Allen testified before this committee that only a third of our brigade combat teams were working or ready, a fourth of our air brigades, and half of our divisions were ready. Then General Dunford said to this committee—this was pretty shocking—he said, “If we don't address this dynamic with sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding over the course of several years, we will lose our qualitative and quantitative competitive advantage.” That is a pretty shocking statement.

I would like to ask two questions of each one of you, just yes or no questions. One, do you agree with the statements by Generals Allen and Dunford?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes.

Dr. ESPER. Yes.

Mr. KERNAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes.

Senator INHOFE. Secondly, the question I have had, would you be as just as straightforward and honest about very uncomfortable subjects, such as the threat that we are facing, as these uniforms?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes.

Dr. ESPER. Yes.

Mr. KERNAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes.

Senator INHOFE. I believe you will, too. It is not just—the uniforms are important, but the secretaries are important. I have very much of a concern about that.

Dr. Esper, General Milley wrote, talking about the goal of the sustained readiness, he said that the goal of the Army's sustained readiness model is to have 66 percent, and this is not to maintain because we are not there now, but to achieve 66 percent of the force in a combat ready status at any moment by the year 2023.

Now, would you say that, under this model, do you think that we are on track to reach that goal?

Dr. ESPER. Senator, my understanding is that the Army is on track to reach that goal. My personal view is that is not fast enough. If confirmed, I would like to look at ways, working with the chief and senior Army leaders, to find if there are ways to accelerate that, particularly given the challenges we face right now in the international scene.

Senator INHOFE. Let me also compliment you, because the answers you gave to Senator Reed's questions, talking about what our acquisition problems are, and a definitive answer on how to address that, I thought was a very good answer.

Mr. Wilkie, I remember so well, and the guy that has always been a real hero to me was Jesse Helms. I remember going to his funeral. You and I sat next to each other, and we talked about that.

I would say to my friend Senator Tillis, that is one of the main things that I look at when I look at you and your extensive service that you have had in the past.

I am grateful to know that you understand our readiness challenge. I chair the Readiness Subcommittee, and I have been very concerned about where we are today.

In terms of your top priority going forward, how has our budget cuts and the BCA [Budget Control Act] affected our military readiness capacity and capabilities?

It is important to answer this question now because of what we are in the midst of and the debate that is going on today.

Mr. WILKIE. Senator, if we start from the premise that we have never faced the breadth of the strategic challenges that we have now, that leads you to only one answer, that unless the Department of Defense has a steady and understandable stream of financing to plan for years ahead, as any other business would have, then it will not be capable of playing in a field where we continue to have an unfair advantage over our adversaries.

Senator INHOFE. It is a good answer, but it is unfortunate.

I am concerned, though, about a statement that was made, or a fact that is out there and we don't seem to talk about, and that is that only about a quarter of today's 17- to 24-year-olds are eligible for military service. Of that population, even a smaller number are interested in enlisting or commissioning.

Now, I was a product of the draft. I would like to see what are some of the innovative opportunities we have to expand that pool. What are some of the options we have out there?

Mr. WILKIE. Sir, as you say, it is a society-wide problem. What I don't believe the department has done, as we have moved into the 21st Century, is adopt the modes of information collection that

America's young people have. We have not mastered social media. We have not mastered something that I consider to be fundamental, and that is online recruiting across the country.

We have also had situations in the last 15 to 20 years where the first experience that our youth at one time had with the military, if they were not from a community tied to an installation, was Junior ROTC. We are losing those units across the country.

Now, obviously, in a time of budget crunching, that is probably low on the list. But if you are looking at the long term, if you are looking at trying to change the perception of young Americans, those kinds of interactions and the ability of the government through the department to adapt to the way young people think is vital or we will never get caught up.

Senator INHOFE. My time has expired, but that is a great answer. I appreciate that very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Shaheen?

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Congratulations to all of you, and thank you for being willing to consider taking on these positions.

Dr. Esper, in your testimony, you said that your first priority will be readiness and ensuring the total Army is prepared to fight. Can you elaborate on, specifically, how you would improve readiness and modernize the National Guard?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator. As I noted in my opening statement, I had the privilege to serve on Active Duty and in the Guard and Reserve.

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

Dr. ESPER. I know all three components fairly well.

Clearly, in the last 16 years of fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq, if we have learned anything, we have learned that the Guard and Reserve are not just a strategic reserve but a really critical operational component of that.

With that context in mind, I think it is critical as we try to put readiness on a better footing, we look at, in my mind, four key areas: improving our munitions stockpiles; that our equipment is better maintained and ready to go; that training for the high-end is conducted, particularly through the combat training centers; and in terms of personnel, units are fully manned.

I think that applies to all three components as well. When it comes to pushing units through the combat training centers, like NTC, we need to make sure that National Guard brigade combat teams are there as well, and that they are working closely with the Active.

I think what most people do not appreciate is that the majority of the total Army is in the Guard and Reserve. It is critical that, as we train, we train as a total Army in all those regards across the spectrum of conflict.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. I appreciate that, and I look forward to having you come up to New Hampshire to see the challenges that we face with our Guard and Reserve in New Hampshire.

Mr. Wilkie, first of all, thank you very much for your work for Senator Tillis on the special immigrant visa program. That was

very helpful. As you know, that is very important as we support our men and women who are still on the battlefield.

I want to ask you about the health care system in the military. You mentioned that in your opening remarks.

KidsVax is a universal vaccine program that purchases vaccines at a discounted rate from the CDC [Centers for Disease Control] to ensure that they go to children regardless of a family's income. Now the only health insurance plan that does not reimburse or pay the KidsVax or similar programs to States for vaccines is TRICARE.

Will you commit to this committee that you will focus on this issue and help get this matter resolved?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes, Senator. The KidsVax program impacts 10 States, New Hampshire having the largest complaint against the system. I will pledge that I will look at that, as well as a number of other things with TRICARE. But getting our children vaccinated would be a top priority for any Under Secretary.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Kernan, Senator McCain talked about the importance of cyber, and you agreed with that in your response.

Can you tell me who is in charge of a cyber strategy for the United States, not just within the Department of Defense but throughout the Federal Government?

Mr. KERNAN. I would just say that I am familiar, certainly, with the Department of Defense building a cyber strategy, and that we are fundamentally committed to that.

Senator SHAHEEN. Can you tell me who is in charge at the Department of Defense in doing that?

Mr. KERNAN. I think right now it is a collective responsibility. I certainly have responsibility for cyber in the intelligence realm. I certainly believe I have a responsibility for developing the strategy that Chairman McCain discussed.

I think the issue, it is such a prolific and important issue to be addressed because it involves everybody in our country, not just civilian, not just military, our infrastructure, our networks, all those things have to be addressed. I believe it is going to be a whole-of-government approach to the cyber, and we have to collaboratively work together to leverage technology to address the problem.

Senator SHAHEEN. I certainly agree with that.

Chairman MCCAIN. Could I just add, somebody has to be in charge, Mr. Kernan.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. That was my point exactly, Senator McCain.

Chairman MCCAIN. Right now, no one is.

Senator SHAHEEN. Right now, we do not have somebody who can be held accountable and who everyone knows is the person in charge, if something goes wrong.

Mr. Roberts, in your testimony, you talk about working to develop a nuclear posture that is responsive to today's threats and challenges, and instituting declaratory policies that credibly convey that aggression of any kind is not a rational option.

What do you mean by that? What kind of policies do we need to have in place?

Mr. ROBERTS. The concern there is not only having the capabilities to indicate to our adversaries that aggression is not a rational option but also the political will to make it clear that, indeed, if you attack us, you will pay a terrible price.

Having that posture—which right now I feel is difficult to convey because of the fact that we have for so long undercapitalized our nuclear deterrent. Now we are approaching a time where we have to replace all of those things at a very high cost, and that is going to be a challenge.

Senator SHAHEEN. Are you suggesting that we should be prepared to engage in nuclear war against our enemies?

Mr. ROBERTS. Senator, I believe we should be prepared to engage so we never have to engage. I have often said that nuclear weapons—we use nuclear weapons every single day, because it is a political tool more than a military one.

Senator SHAHEEN. I certainly think that deterrent made sense against the Soviets and was very effective. I am not sure it makes as much sense against North Korea.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Rounds?

Senator ROUNDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me also add my surprise to that of Senator Shaheen and Chairman McCain with regard, Mr. Kernan, to the concern expressed and your response, or rather, I would say perhaps a non-response with regard to who would actually be responsible for the cyber challenges that our Nation faces.

I think it points out—and I would not suggest that you were wrong in your response. We actually requested members of the White House to actually participate in one of our hearings here to discuss this specific issue, and they declined to even attend. That type of an attitude is the wrong attitude with regard to finding the appropriate way to respond to attacks and the defense of our country in the cyber realm.

Mr. Kernan, what I would ask you is this, a commitment with regard to your responsibilities to participate and to be able to respond the next time that we ask you to come back in terms of laying out a plan to at least identify a person to be responsible for cyber defenses within the whole-of-government within the United States Government system.

Would you commit to that, sir?

Mr. KERNAN. I am absolutely committed to that, and I would second, coming from the military, there needs to be somebody in charge to make it work. I am absolutely committed to doing that and bringing the Department of Defense, cyber concerns, cyber perspectives into helping the whole-of-government effort.

Senator ROUNDS. Once again, would you agree with us or would you concur with us that, right now, it is difficult to determine who is actually responsible for that area or that responsibility today?

Mr. KERNAN. I would concur that it is difficult to address who that is. I would say there are lots of activities going on, but it is not focused under one person that I am aware of.

Senator ROUNDS. Thank you.

I am just curious, and this is for Mr. Roberts and Dr. Esper, North Korea's nuclear weapons have gotten a lot of attention late-

ly, but I think we should also be mindful of their chemical weapons stockpile. Open source documents estimate that North Korea has 5,000 tons of chemical weapons and is likely to use them if a conflict breaks out.

In 2009, the Army published a report on counter-weapons of mass destruction (WMD), which stated that the Army lacks the full range of capabilities required to support the joint force commander in a tactical and operational chemical weapons of mass destruction mission expected in the future.

Additionally, in 2015, a RAND report identified a serious gap between the magnitude of the weapons of mass destruction threat and DOD's resource priorities for counter-WMD missions.

Can either of you speak to the Army's or DOD's readiness to mitigate the impact of potential North Korean use of chemical weapons?

Dr. ESPEY?

Dr. ESPEY. Senator, I will take a first stab at that.

That is an area of concern to the Army. As I understand it, much like the rest of the Army, the forces are not fully prepared. Of the 130 or so CBRNE [chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and high-yield explosives] teams, a quarter are ready to go, are deemed ready. And so work needs to continue in that area because, much like the Army is preparing to engage a near-peer adversary at a high-end threat, this is one of the threats you face.

That is something I experienced when we went to the Gulf War in 1990, the clear threat of chemical weapons use by Saddam Hussein. We were in a different training posture at that time, and, clearly, the Army needs to get back to a similar posture as we look at adversaries, potentially, in Asia and Europe.

Mr. ROBERTS. If I can add, Senator, that is an area of concern that I am certainly very concerned about. We looked at the threat, and the focus has been on the nuclear side. But clearly, the North Koreans have, as you pointed out, a large chemical capability.

Frankly, I am very much worried about the biological capability they have as well. We know, again, from unclassified reporting that they have a program, from defectors who have told us that. And frankly, this is one area we really are not well-prepared for, to deal with.

That is one of the things that, if confirmed, I plan on addressing very strongly.

Senator ROUNDS. Would both of you commit that perhaps time is of the essence with regard to that particular issue?

Dr. ESPEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Senator ROUNDS. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Blumenthal?

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join the previous comments of my colleagues, most particularly the chairman calling attention to the importance of our personnel. For all of the extraordinary equipment and advanced technology that we bring to bear to the battlefield, it is, at the end of the day, our people who are our greatest resource.

I would second, Senator, the remarks made previously about the excellent qualifications of these nominees.

I want to thank and congratulate each of you.

Before I ask any questions, I want to just raise for the committee's consideration news about the ruling in a case now pending in Guantanamo, in fact, Camp Justice, as it is perhaps incorrectly called there, a ruling by Air Force Colonel Vance Spath, who is presiding over the al-Nashiri case, holding in contempt of court Brigadier General John Baker, a 28-year Marine Corps veteran, the second highest ranking Marine Corps lawyer, sentencing him to 21 days of confinement and a \$1,000 fine, simply for raising the issue about a potential conflict of interest or ethical problem with the three lawyers who are assigned to that death penalty case at Guantanamo.

I am deeply troubled by this decision. I find it very, very questionable; indeed, potentially contrary to our justice system. I hope that our committee will bring oversight to this matter in this case and to the conduct of military justice at Guantanamo.

The Chairman led this committee in requiring of the last Administration a comprehensive plan to end the use of the Guantanamo detention facility. Unfortunately, the last Administration failed to follow through on the Chairman's direction. This job now belongs to the present Administration, and this Committee has expressed very constructive interest in making sure that the justice system works there, in accordance with our due process requirements.

Obviously, I am not asking the witnesses to respond, but I hope that the Department of Defense will turn its attention and give us a briefing on what is happening there. I also recognize its possibilities for intervention may be limited.

I know all of our thoughts and prayers go out to the victims of the recent terrorist attack in New York City. I am troubled by the President eliminating funding to a lab in New York City whose sole purpose is to train and support first responders who defend our Nation's great city, the National Urban Security and Technologies Laboratory, known as NUSTL, has worked for over 65 years to keep our communities safe from nuclear, biological, and radiological attacks.

If enacted, these cuts—in my view, they are careless and contradictory—would weaken our defenses against terrorist attacks. I sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee urging \$3.4 million for NUSTL in fiscal year 2018.

I would like to know whether you will support the funding for this laboratory, which is essential to our national defense.

Mr. KERNAN. Senator, I am not familiar with the lab or the issue, but I will certainly look into it and am more than willing to work with you on this issue.

I believe that we need to continue making investments. Research and development is critical to the Army's future readiness. On this particular issue, I would like to follow up with you on it, if confirmed.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I appreciate that.

Mr. Roberts, I think you will have, in particular, jurisdiction over this issue.

Mr. ROBERTS. Senator, I believe that lab is under the Department of Homeland Security. But saying that, of course, dealing with a potential attack to our Homeland, the Department of Defense will work closely with the Department of Homeland Security and identify particular gaps that, frankly, if this closure would result in a gap, it is something we need to address. I certainly will commit to looking into this, if I am confirmed.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I appreciate your saying that you will look into it. I would like you, if you would, after you look into it, to respond in writing and tell me what your position will be.

Mr. ROBERTS. If I am confirmed.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Ernst?

Senator ERNST. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for your willingness to continue your service to our great United States. I appreciate it very much.

Dr. Esper, before I began, I would like to ask you just some simple yes or no questions.

Question number one, do you commit to cutting wasteful spending and making it a priority?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator.

Senator ERNST. Do you commit to working with me to combat and prevent military sexual assault and retaliation in the Army?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator.

Senator ERNST. Will you provide me with advanced notice should changes to the gender integration policies be considered?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator.

Senator ERNST. Do you commit to upholding an unbiased and transparent approach throughout the acquisition process?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator.

Senator ERNST. I appreciate those answers very much.

Now on to a more open discussion. In your advance policy questions (APQs), you state, "I also believe small arms modernization is an area very suitable for outreach to the commercial sector for an off-the-shelf or easily adaptable solution for a new weapon."

I do agree with that wholeheartedly. However, I also feel that full and open competition is paramount to making sure that our soldiers get the very best weapons into their hands.

Can you speak to the importance of full and open competitions? Can I get your commitment that you will make this a priority?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am. First of all, let me give you the commitment up front that, if confirmed, my aim would be to pursue full and open competition on everything we can, because, answering your first question, my experience both on this side, on the government side, from my time on the Hill, and more recently, of course, my time in industry, I have witnessed firsthand that competition does two things. It drives quality, and it drives lower price.

In my mind, the more we can open up the aperture to include the widest number of participants, whether it is traditional defense industry, commercial, commercial off-the-shelf, or off-the-shelf that is easily adaptable, we should pursue it.

In my mind, the key thing is getting the soldiers the tools, equipment, and weapons they need as soon as you can at the best price, best value being the key criteria.

Senator ERNST. I appreciate that. At a time when our near-peer competitors are outpacing us in small arms, we have to figure out the best way to get those weapons into our soldiers' hands. So thank you very much.

Dr. Esper, I am sure you know that the military has made progress in reducing the number of sexual assaults from 26,000 down to just slightly less than 15,000 over the past 4 years, while keeping adjudication of sexual assault cases within the chain of command. Yet we need continued improvement. There is no doubt about that.

Given your many years of leadership in the Army, I am confident that you understand the responsibility and accountability commanders assume on a daily basis.

What I would like you to do is talk a little bit to that. Do you think further reductions in sexual assault like we have seen over the past 4 years will be possible without the ability to hold our military commanders accountable? And can you outline how the commanders' role in the process has placed them in a position to be held accountable?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am.

First, let me say up front that there is no room whatsoever in the Army for sexual harassment, sexual assault, or retaliation against anybody in that regard. It is a terrible thing. It cannot be tolerated. All it does is undermine readiness of individuals, of units. It breaks down cohesion and esprit, and so there must be zero tolerance for sexual harassment whatsoever.

As I did note in my APQs, and you mentioned, I was a commander. I understand well a commander's duty is to maintain good order and discipline. In my view, having that full toolkit of authorities available to him or her is critical to maintaining good order and discipline.

It is also critical that the commander understands that it is his or her responsibility to maintain the right culture in a unit to make sure that the soldiers under their command understand that sexual harassment, assault, retaliation of any type will not be tolerated.

My concern is, if we consider pulling some of those tools out of the toolkit, that the commander will be less able to deal with it and may feel like it is less of their responsibility, which my concern would be it would set us back rather than set us forward.

I think the Army has put a number of programs in place. Senior leadership is working this issue hard. We see, in some cases, the numbers moving in the right direction with regard to reductions and increasing in reporting. In other cases, we do not.

I think it is something that I will take very seriously, if confirmed. Certainly, my aim is to continue to drive that number down.

Senator ERNST. Thank you. While we have seen a decrease in those numbers, they are not yet good enough.

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am.

Senator ERNST. So we have to continue. I hope that you will be willing to continue working on this issue with me. We do need our commanders to set that level and culture of dignity and respect in our Army units.

Thank you very much for your commitment.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman MCCAIN. I would like to thank the Senator for all her hard work on this very important issue. Thank you.

Senator Heinrich?

Senator HEINRICH. Thank you, Chairman.

Welcome, gentlemen.

I want to start with you, Mr. Roberts. As you know, Los Alamos National laboratory is the Nation's Center of Excellence for Plutonium research and is currently the only facility in the country capable of meeting the Pentagon's pit production cost and schedule requirements.

I have a copy of a July 2014 letter from the Nuclear Weapons Council where, in response to section 3114 of the NDAA, they tell Congress that the National Nuclear Security Administration will begin the process of designing and building modular buildings for pit production at Los Alamos because it meets those requirements.

I know my staff has shared that letter with you, and I understand that Senator Reed may have actually raised it earlier in the hearing as well while I was at Energy and Natural Resources.

I want to ask you, do you support the continuation of the plutonium pit mission at Los Alamos, as endorsed by the Nuclear Weapons Council, for which you will be the executive director?

Mr. ROBERTS. Thank you, Senator. And thank you for the letter. I had not seen that before. It is clear what the Nuclear Weapons Council had decided.

Frankly, once I looked into it and saw the letter that this committee sent in response in September, I was a little surprised that nothing had happened. In fact, I agree with your statement, or the committee's statement in the letter, that the analysis of alternatives by NNSA is a rehashing of the decisions that have already been made.

If confirmed, this is, again, a high-priority issue I think we need to look at, because it has a major impact on our ability to produce plutonium pits. I think we are falling behind the mandate of being able to do that, produce up to 80 by 2027. I will look into that.

Senator HEINRICH. That is exactly my concern. I would ask you that, if there is any deviation or delay from what the Nuclear Weapons Council endorsed back in July 2014, that I have your commitment to simply instruct the Pentagon's independent CAPE [Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation] office to look at the independent analysis to make sure that the assumptions and conclusions of any proposed alternative actually stack up.

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes, Senator. While I am not quite familiar, to the extent that I can tell them what to do, I will do it. Thank you.

Senator HEINRICH. Thank you.

Dr. Esper, this committee has authorized significant funding to train and advise foreign security forces so that they can take a greater responsibility for their own security. I certainly welcome

the Army's decision earlier this year to set up five additional brigades that will specialize in this growing mission area.

As you know, currently, there are \$170 million worth of new, modern facilities currently sitting vacant at White Sands Missile Range.

Given the budget constraints that we are under, I would just simply ask you that, as you look as to where to station Security Force Assistance Brigades, or SFABs, that you will take into account the ability to use existing facilities rather than build brand-new facilities, if they meet the requirements for those locations.

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator, I will.

Senator HEINRICH. I want to thank you for that.

White Sands Missile Range also has exceptional training areas. It has a close proximity, obviously, to existing personnel and infrastructure at Fort Bliss, Texas, as well. I want to thank you for your work on this.

I also just want to take a moment and thank the Army broadly for its assistance on legislation that we have been working on for the last several years regarding some boundary adjustments between White Sands Missile Range and White Sands National Monument, to support the missions of both of those units and deconflict some issues they have had over the years. The Army staff at the Pentagon and at White Sands has been very, very helpful during the process of putting that legislation together.

I want to shift gears really quickly in my last seconds to Mr. Kernan. One area of technology that we are seeing a lot of increase in activity in is commercial space activity. I just want to ask you, how should the department and the intelligence community broadly leverage commercial space as part of our overall portfolio addressing space issues?

Mr. KERNAN. I think it is critically important that we leverage commercial technology in a multitude of forms, to include cyber and to include space. I think space is a unique domain now that we ought to treat just like we treat the land domain, the sea domain, because we need to be able to operate freely in space. Space provides incredibly important ISR support to military operations and to a multitude of other things that we do.

I am an advocate of the mission and what requirements that we are trying to fill. We should pursue those requirements from wherever. I will certainly do that, if I am confirmed.

Senator HEINRICH. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Wicker?

Senator WICKER. Thank you.

Dr. Esper, I appreciate you being here, and I appreciate your testimony and your willingness to serve both in the past and in the future. I wish you well.

I have to ask today about two items involving my home State of Mississippi where we manufacture helicopters and also uniforms. I mention this because it involves the industrial base, but also, it involves items that our troops need.

The first one is the Lakota training helicopter, which Airbus makes in Columbus, Mississippi. Now, in 2015, there was an award

of Lakota helicopters. A contract dispute ensued, and those helicopters are being held up pending the court case.

In 2017, the Appropriations Committee appropriated for 28 Lakotas, a separate matter entirely. They gave clear directive language and instructed the Army to purchase the 28 Lakotas.

I brought this up in a previous hearing with Acting Secretary of the Army Robert Speers as to why this clear language by the Appropriations Committee and passed by the Congress had not been followed. He said something to the effect, it is all involved in a court case.

Well, that is not true. There are 16 Lakotas from 2015 involved in a court case. Subsequent to that, this Congress ordered the Army to purchase 28 Lakotas, and that is not being held up in a court case. It sounds like an excuse to me.

I want you to be aware of the detrimental impacts this situation is having on the industrial base but also on Army pilot training.

I want to ask you, do you believe that the Army Secretary is required to follow career and directive language expressed in legislation?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator, I do.

Senator WICKER. Okay. Are you familiar with this case?

Dr. ESPER. I am a little familiar with the case, yes, sir.

Senator WICKER. Okay. Have I got it wrong at all?

Dr. ESPER. Senator, I trust you have your facts accurately.

Senator WICKER. Okay. Well, if confirmed, will you do all in your power to expedite the contracting actions required and to issue a production contract as outlined in the congressionally enacted and signed into law fiscal year defense appropriations act?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator. If confirmed, I will certainly look into this issue, work it. I want to work closely with your office to resolve it as quickly as possible.

Senator WICKER. Okay. We really do need to resolve it.

Now the other thing involves uniforms and treating the uniforms with insecticides. We have been doing this in Mississippi for years. They manufacture the uniform, and then they put the insecticide on.

Now someone in their wisdom in the Department of the Army decided that we should treat the fabric first and then cut it and sew it into a uniform.

I can tell you, the people working at the plants do not like this, because, obviously, you have a chemically treated piece of fabric. You are cutting it, and it gets out into the air that they breathe and becomes a problem.

I cannot fathom why the Army would want to change an efficient and proven process that leaves no environmental waste, and that is to make the uniform and then treat it.

If confirmed, will you get somebody to look into this issue and get back to us and try to make some sense out of that?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, sir. For sure.

Senator WICKER. All right. Good.

I will yield back the remaining 15 seconds of my time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Peters?

Senator PETERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to each of our nominees here today for your willingness to serve in what are certainly very important positions.

Dr. Esper, I would like to ask about ground vehicle modernization, particularly the Abrams platform. I believe modernization of the Army's ground combat vehicles is probably one of the most pressing national security issues that we currently face as a Nation.

Earlier this year, at an Airland Subcommittee hearing on Army modernization, Lieutenant General Murray testified that the Abrams tank now remains only towards the top of its class with parity and not overmatch, compared to our allies and competitors.

This is very concerning I think to all of us. I know it is concerning to you as well, because we want to make sure that our soldiers always have the advantage, never a fair fight. This information is of great concern.

Last year, General McMaster testified before the Airland Subcommittee that, at the current funding levels, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and Abrams tank, this is a quote, "will soon be obsolete, but they will remain in the Army inventory for the next 50 to 70 years."

Our allies and near-peer competitors alike are investing significant resources into rapid modernization, but current projections estimate it is going to take us 20 years to upgrade the existing armor fleet unless we fast-track ground combat vehicle modernization strategy.

As was discussed earlier, there are a number of options to modernize the fleet at a much faster pace, which could save billions of dollars over the lifecycle of the modernization program. Multiyear procurement and block buy contracting are options that offer potential savings.

My question to you, Dr. Esper, is how do you believe the Army should increase the armored force structure and upgrade the Abrams fleet to address known vulnerabilities and emerging threats?

Dr. ESPER. Senator, first of all, I share your concerns about the age of our current ground combat vehicles. They have been in service as long as I have been, going back to the early 1980s. Of course, the Army has made a number of upgrades through the years to keep them as effective on the battlefield as possible.

But nonetheless, with the projections that you cited from General McMaster, I am deeply concerned about at what point we are no longer able to upgrade them and to ensure that they have overmatch on the battlefield.

One of the things, if confirmed, I hope to look at are those timelines and look at ways to accelerate that, so that we can field a new ground combat vehicle and tank sooner rather than later. I know this committee has put important language into the fiscal year 2018 NDAA on this matter, which I think is helpful, which calls for prototyping and demonstrating vehicles. I think, in this regard, we should look at what other militaries, our partners, are developing to see if there are designs we could adopt or build from.

In the meantime, I think it is critical that we continue with the upgrades that are happening to both the Bradley and to the Abrams.

With the Abrams, it is obviously the v3 upgrades that are enhancing its power, its survivability, its optics, its lethality. I think those are all critical to ensuring overmatch.

All of those need to continue in the meantime. But we cannot wait another 10, 15, 20 years to design, build a new vehicle either.

Senator PETERS. I am encouraged about that answer, as well as your mention of prototyping. So you see prototyping as something that we can use to accelerate this process?

Dr. ESPER. Absolutely, Senator. I think we should prototype on almost any program we can. I think it is critical. We could prototype earlier in the process, which means, if we had those prototypes, we can test them and evaluate them using soldiers either in training scenarios or real-world deployments, where we might be able to use them.

I think prototyping is the way we need to continue to go.

Senator PETERS. Dr. Esper, when we had the opportunity to meet in my office, we also had a pretty detailed discussion about autonomy, robotics, some of the advanced capabilities that come out of artificial intelligence and other types of technological advances. As I spoke with you in our office and talked about the work we are doing in Michigan with TARDAC [U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development, and Engineering Center] and the Army's research and development arm in Michigan, which is engaged in some pretty cutting-edge technology, we also talked about how we need to capitalize on innovation that we are seeing in the private sector.

For example, in TARDAC, working closely with General Motors. TARDAC has a wonderful prototype in hydrogen fuel cell technology for special forces operations. But there is a host of other types of areas that we need to explore as well.

How do you believe the Army can best capitalize on the leaps in technology by working with the private sector? And how would you do that, if confirmed?

Dr. ESPER. Senator, I think we absolutely need to do that. The Army needs to engage the private sector research facilities, companies and entities that are actually looking at robotics in autonomy. I think one of the things we discussed, which a vision for me would be looking at ground convoys, you can envision a future whereby rather than scores of trucks moving between destinations, much as we had during the Iraq war between Kuwait and Baghdad hauling supplies and whatnot, you can now do that autonomously, no longer putting at-risk soldiers to do such tasks, and yet completing them probably more efficiently. What that does is also free up manpower to fill out your ranks in other areas.

That is just one example of a future I can envision, which would buy us greater effectiveness and efficiency. I think we need to look across-the-board. The Army is doing this in a number of areas, not just autonomy but robotics to help the soldier. The drones, of course, are critical in terms of providing tactical ISR capabilities.

All of these things are critical. In many ways, the commercial, the private sector, is outpacing what the military can do on its own. There needs to be greater outreach, greater partnership between the private sector and DOD on these matters, if we are really going to obtain the overmatch we need on future battlefields.

Senator PETERS. Thank you very much.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator King?

Senator KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. ESPEr, I serve as ranking member with Chairman Tom Cotton on the Airland Subcommittee, and we have had a number of hearings about issues such as readiness and modernization.

I agree with Senator McCain and Senator Reed that, after current readiness, modernization is your number one priority. In fact, I would venture to say it may be your legacy.

We have had a series of failures over the past dozen or 20 years. It just cannot continue. Modernization is the future of readiness. If we do not have that, we are not going to get there. I just want to have your earnest commitment to this significant challenge.

Dr. ESPEr. Absolutely, Senator. Modernization is critical to future readiness. I am convinced, however, we will not be able to modernize the force unless we completely overhaul the current acquisition system.

Senator KING. You anticipated my next question.

Dr. ESPEr. My commitment is to working with the Army senior leadership to do just that. I think they have gotten off to a good start with the ideas that have been discussed and that they are putting into play, and I think that will help us get the current system into a position where we could do a much better job in terms of delivering to the soldier the tools, equipment, systems, weapons they need when they need it, the best value at a good cost.

Senator KING. Over the past 4 or 5 years, I have probably been to a dozen hearings or more, maybe 20, that have touched on procurement in one way or, and I keep hearing certain themes.

One is build off a stable design, get a design before you build.

The second is likened to it. Do not do R&D [research and development] while you are in the middle of building. Quite often, that is an issue, where you are trying to do R&D in the middle of constructing large objects like aircraft carriers.

Third, use off-the-shelf technology as often as possible. Senator McCain has made a very strong point in the past about the 200-page spec for a new handgun. Let's talk about off-the-shelf. That should be the first option rather than the last option.

Number four, design platforms with an open architecture that are modular. When you are doing a large platform like a new tank or a land combat vehicle, the danger is the technology in that vehicle will be obsolete by the time it is built. Therefore, it should be designed in such a way as to be able to pull out technological parts and replace them.

Finally, and this is one I have heard repeatedly, you really have to take some care as to who is in charge of this procurement process and provide continuity. See if you can keep people in with the program for some period of time, so it does not stop and start.

Do you concur with those suggestions? That is just based on what I have been hearing.

Dr. ESPEr. Senator, absolutely. I think you have hit many of the key elements that I outlined in my APQs with regard to the approach.

I think your last one is probably the most important. It is accountability, making sure you know who is in charge. That re-

quires, again, changing, I think, the personnel system so that, from the top down, particularly when you get to program managers, there is clear alignment and responsibility and hand-off of milestone to milestone or from phase to phase in the process.

Senator KING. Part of that is also making the procurement process reasonably timely so people do not reach retirement age while they are still waiting for a system to move through.

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator. The challenge in the past is that the reach exceeds the grasp, in terms of requirements. So rather than striving for the perfect, I think we need to get away from—we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the better.

Senator KING. Exactly.

Dr. ESPER. Pursuing the 80 percent solution now, and then building in modularity so we can upgrade in later iterations is critical.

I think the success of the big five systems, Apache, Abrams, Bradley, et cetera, going back to the 1980s, was so because Secretary Marsh protected them in terms of funding and protected them in terms of good ideas that came up later in the process. Without that, and there is a classic story about the Apache and Apache Longbow, those systems would not have been filled in time for Desert Shield, Desert Storm.

I think the many things that you outlined, we need to pursue. I have outlined them in my APQs [advance policy questions]. There have been more than enough studies on this. It is time to get to work and get the system right.

Senator KING. When my people talk to me about how long things are going to take, I always find it salutary to remind them that Eisenhower retook Europe in 11 months. That is a good time frame.

Final question, Mr. Kernan, not really a question, but you are taking on a very important position, and my main concern as a member of this committee and the Intelligence Committee is redundancy and overlap in terms of military intelligence and civilian intelligence. We are talking about \$70 billion a year between the two functions.

I just hope that that can be a focus, and where there is an overlap or redundancy, that we can work to reduce that.

Mr. KERNAN. Yes, if I am confirmed, I will be completely committed to that. We are in such a resource-constrained environment that we cannot afford to do that, that we should look across the intelligence community and leverage those capabilities. Collectively, we ought to have what we need, but we should not have duplicity.

Senator KING. I appreciate that, and we will continue to keep in touch with you on that very subject. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Senator Warren?

Senator WARREN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Esper, I appreciate the chance we had to meet in my office. Like Chairman McCain, I am concerned about the number of defense appointees coming from the big five defense contractors. As you know from our meeting, avoiding conflicts of interest is very important to me.

First, I just want to clear something up. Your letter to the DOD General Counsel Ethics Office states that you will not participate in particular matters involving your former employer Raytheon for

a period of 1 year. But your letter also states that you will comply with the White House ethics pledge, which requires you to recuse yourself for 2 years.

Can you confirm for the record that you will recuse yourself for 2 years from all particular matters involving Raytheon?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, Senator, 2 years for those matters as outlined in my ethics agreement.

Senator WARREN. So for all matters involving—

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am.

Senator WARREN.—Raytheon? Good.

Also, I would like to ask you about the specifics of your job at Raytheon. When you served as vice president of government relations for the last 7 years, which particular Army programs did you lobby on behalf of during your time there?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am. I engaged the Hill on a few Army issues. But let me first say, as vice president for government relations, I actually spent an overwhelming majority of my time on the business-end of the company, so doing everything from program deep dives, monthly—

Senator WARREN. Fair enough, but I would like to know about the programs that you lobbied on behalf of.

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am. There were three Army programs that were of such importance to my CEO [chief executive officer] that I personally engaged the Hill on over the past 2 years, and they were, first of all, the Patriot radar system in support of the Army's budget request for that, and also pushing the Army to accelerate its development of its next-generation radar because the company felt that we could provide a capability to the soldier sooner than what was on the current timeline.

The second was the JLENS [Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated netted Sensor System] program, which is elevated aerostat with surveillance and fire control radar designed to protect the National Capital Region. That program is now ended.

The third program I worked on in the past couple years was the DCGS-A, Distributed Common Ground System-Army, Increment 2. The Congress was pushing for a commercial-only solution, and Raytheon had asked that we open up that aperture, so that the competition be open not just to commercial but to traditional defense industry and others as well as a way to drive competition, to drive down price, and quality.

Those were the three programs.

Senator WARREN. Those were the three, and you used the word "personally," so those were the three you personally lobbied on. Did you oversee lobbying in other areas?

Dr. ESPER. Ma'am, the lobbyists that reported—the team that reported to me, I oversaw all their activities across all services, NDA, nondefense activities.

Senator WARREN. So everything that Raytheon lobbied on, basically.

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am.

Senator WARREN. All right.

Dr. ESPER. That was one of my responsibilities out of several.

Senator WARREN. Thank you. The ethics law that you cited in your letter allows you to seek a waiver or a regulatory exemption

from your recusal for matters involving your former employer. I know you have had some conversations about this with the chairman, and you have pledged not to seek a waiver, and I appreciate that. But I hope that you might go further than the 2-year recusal requirement.

Would you be willing to commit to recuse yourself from the particular matters that you identified for the duration of your time in office?

Dr. ESPER. Senator, I do not see that being a problem right now. Senator WARREN. Is that a yes?

Dr. ESPER. No, it is not. What I would like to do is—what I would like to do is, if confirmed, is come back to you, maybe in a couple years, to see if there was an issue, and then revisit the issue with you at that time, if at all possible.

Senator WARREN. You know, I just want to say, Dr. Esper, I think it is important to take these ethics obligations seriously. The American people need to have confidence that the top officials at the Pentagon are working for them, and that starts with completely and fully stepping back from decisions that will have a financial impact on the former employers of those officials.

If I can, I would like to ask one other question really quickly.

I have received several complaints from the Massachusetts National Guard officers in recent months about the delays in Federal recognition of their promotions. According to a letter my office received from the National Guard Bureau, the current processing time is about 6 to 8 months.

This is becoming a morale issue for the Massachusetts Guard. I imagine it is a problem in other State Guard units as well.

If confirmed, will you commit to looking into this issue promptly and then getting back and briefing me and my staff on why these delays are occurring?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, ma'am, if confirmed, I will.

Senator WARREN. All right. We have to find a way to speed this up before this morale problem spreads.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. I would like to say to my friend from Massachusetts, we will look into that, but it seems that—I am not that familiar with it, but it seems to me that it is a problem that is not directly connected to the Guard promotion but other aspects of it. Is that your understanding?

Senator WARREN. Fair enough. I have heard about this more specifically from the Guard. They have brought it directly to my attention, so that is how I have seen it. But if it reflects a larger problem, then we need to deal with the larger.

Chairman MCCAIN. I would be eager to engage with you on this issue. We cannot have these kinds of delays and keep people serving. Honestly, this is the first I have heard of it. I would be glad to get to work on it with you.

Senator WARREN. Good. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MCCAIN. Thank you.

I want to say to the nominees thank you for appearing. We will convene the committee probably tomorrow, if we have all the paperwork done, so that we can report out your nominations to the full Senate. And then it will be a matter, obviously, of scheduling,

which there seems to be some problems with lately. But I hope, given the aspects of these responsibilities, that we could go ahead and move them, rather than 30 hours of non-debate debate, so I thank you all.

Jack? Do you have—

Senator REED. No, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Chairman MCCAIN. I thank the witnesses, and this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:51 a.m., the Committee adjourned.]

[Prepared questions submitted to Mr. Robert L. Wilkie by Chairman McCain prior to the hearing with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REFORMS AND OVERSIGHT CONCERNS

Question. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 included the most sweeping reforms since the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

Do you support these reforms?

Answer. Yes

Question. What other areas for defense reform do you believe might be appropriate for this Committee to address?

Answer. Continued reform of civilian workforce management should be on the table for both the DOD and the Committee—focusing on training and education required to keep pace with developments in technology, including cyber, and as important, in human resource management.

Section 214 of the FY 2017 NDAA, already authorizes both DAU and the National Defense University to enter into cooperative agreements with universities and non-profit research institutions to support their missions. However as the Chairman has stated that is only a first step.

Senior civilian workforce higher education requirements do not match those of senior military leaders. With a civilian workforce of over 700,000 it might be profitable to establish advanced education guidelines particularly in the field of human resource management and in line with Secretary Mattis' vision to imbed and educate our senior civilian leadership at cutting edge companies and leading universities.

Question. Section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 required that the Secretary of Defense establish cross-functional teams to address critical objectives of the Department.

What are your views on the potential focus areas and uses for future cross-functional teams?

Answer. Cross-functional teams that report directly to the Secretary of Defense, as stipulated in Section 911, are essential to delivering and implementing valuable recommendations on priority issues and opportunities facing the Department. Within the purview of the USD(P&R), and given the complexity, scope, and importance of the Military Health System, I believe ample opportunities exist in the system for the targeted use of Secretary of Defense-empowered cross-functional teams. If confirmed, I will make it a priority to engage with DoD partners to identify areas where cross-functional teams provide the greatest potential for increased efficiencies that result in substantially enhanced care for Service members and their families, as well as the more effective allocation of resources.

Question. What is the role of the Under Secretary and Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness in overseeing the personnel-related defense agencies?

Answer. The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness currently has the authority and control over four defense agencies, namely the Defense Health Agency (DHA), Defense Human Resources Activity (DHRA), Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA), and Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA). The role of the Under Secretary and Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness is to ensure the policies and programs of these four agencies are designed and managed to improve the standards of performance, economy and efficiency, and to

strengthen the agencies' responsiveness to the requirements of their organizational customers, both internal and external to DoD.

Question. Are further authorities or resources required for effective oversight of these agencies?

Answer. I believe the authorities for oversight are adequate.

DUTIES

Question. Section 136 of title 10, United States Code, provides that the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R)) shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe in the areas of military readiness, total force management, military and civilian personnel requirements, military and civilian personnel training, military and civilian family matters, exchange, commissary, and non-appropriated fund activities, personnel requirements for weapons support, National Guard and reserve components, and health affairs.

If confirmed, what duties do you expect to be assigned to you?

Answer. Secretary Mattis has been clear that his priorities are the lethality and deployability of the force—which means that total force management and personnel training will be at the top of the list.

I expect the other responsibilities to feed into those priorities. Readiness is holistic—it includes the family. In the all-volunteer force, if the family is not happy, the soldier walks.

QUALIFICATIONS

Question. What background and experience do you have that qualify you for this position?

Answer. I come from a family with military service going back over 175 years. I was raised at Fort Bragg.

I have been privileged to see military life from every imaginable angle, as a dependent; as the dependent of a gravely wounded combat soldier; as an officer (in both the Navy and Air Force); as an officer on active duty with a family in the military health care system; as a senior staff member in the United States Senate and as a senior leader in the White House and the Pentagon. I have advanced through every level of professional military education.

In the private sector, I was part of senior corporate teams managing complex military and engineering projects overseas for one of the world's preeminent engineering and program management firms.

MAJOR CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES

Question. In your view, what are the major challenges confronting the next USD(P&R)?

Answer. The priority is continuing to improve warfighter readiness begun in FY 2017, filling in the holes from trade-offs made during 16 years of war, and six years of continuing resolutions and Budget Control Act caps.

The Secretary's first budget request, as directed by the National Security Presidential Memorandum "Rebuilding the U.S. Armed Forces" issued on January 27, 2017, identifies and improves shortfalls in readiness, specifically in training, equipment, maintenance, munitions, modernization, and infrastructure. The 30-Day Readiness Review, completed as part of the development of the FY 2017 Request for Additional Appropriations, identified significant challenges to recovering readiness, including budget uncertainty, high operational tempo, and the time required to rebuild readiness properly. As a result of this review, the Department submitted the FY 2018 budget request to enable the Joint Force to counter national security threats, fulfill steady-state demand, and implement readiness recovery plans.

Question. If confirmed, what broad priorities will you establish?

Answer. My priorities would include increasing the readiness of our force, including family readiness, and ensuring its effective employment in accomplishing the missions directed by Secretary Mattis. I intend to work closely with the Deputy Secretary of Defense to bring business-management reforms to the Department, ensuring that we gain the greatest possible return for our tax dollars.

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Question. What are your views on the state of the relationship between the USD(P&R) and the Senate Armed Services Committee in particular, and with Congress in general?

Answer. USD P&R is the one DOD Under-Secretariat with the most immediate and visible relationship with the entire Congress.

The defining experiences of my professional life have been in the United States Senate, including five years as the Counsel and Advisor on National Security Affairs to the Senate Majority Leader, Trent Lott. In addition, as a former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, I take Article 1 sec. 8 of the Constitution seriously and consider the Armed Services Committee to be the Senate's foundational committee. It is my belief that the Department of Defense cannot accomplish its mission unless it maintains a symbiotic relationship with this Committee.

Upon returning to Senate with Senator Tillis in 2015, it was apparent that the relationship between the Committee on Armed Services and USD P&R and OSD (in general) was at best strained in addition to OSD P&R having an indifferent relationship with the individual services.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and the USD(P&R)?

Answer. I am in the unique position of having a close professional relationship with the Chairman of the SASC Personnel Subcommittee as well as with the professional staff and will maintain that.

My first decision will be to ensure that OSD LA is integrated into all operations of P&R. The current ASD LA was my deputy when I held that position under Secretaries Rumsfeld and Gates.

TORTURE AND ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES

Question. Do you support the standards for detainee treatment specified in the revised Army Field Manual on Interrogations, FM 2-22.3, issued in September 2006, and in DOD Directive 2310.01E, the Department of Defense Detainee Program, dated August 19, 2014, and required by section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92)?

Answer. I fully support using the Army Field Manual as the single standard for all U.S. military interrogations. I am in full agreement with the Chairman and Ranking member of the Committee and the Secretary of Defense as to the prohibition on the use of torture.

NATIONAL SECURITY BUDGET REDUCTIONS/SEQUESTRATION

Question. The original discretionary caps imposed by the Budget Control Act (BCA) will be in effect for Fiscal Years 2018 through 2021, unless there is agreement to change budget levels.

In your assessment, what would be the impacts of continued implementation of the BCA discretionary caps through 2021 on the Department of Defense and national security?

Answer. I agree with Secretary Mattis' assessment, made before the House Armed Services Committee in June: "For all the heartache caused by the loss of our troops during these wars, no enemy in the field has done more to harm the readiness of our military than sequestration."

The impacts weaken the military. As the Secretary has stated, "We have a strategic mismatch between the political ends we espouse and the military means we have available to confront and deter threats. While our military remains the best fighting force in the world, these cuts have created damage that will take time to repair." Unless the Department of Defense receives funds above the caps imposed by the Budget Control Act, it will not be able to achieve the readiness, modernization, and force structure required to meet emerging threats.

Question. Do you believe that any future budget agreements must maintain parity between non-defense and defense discretionary funding?

Answer. If confirmed, I would be responsible for a large portion of the DOD budget—any comment beyond my duties within the Department and the national security arena would be beyond my competency as those are policy determinations made by the Congress and White House.

Question. In your view, what is the impact on the Department of Defense and on the nation's ability to meet national defense requirements if these budget caps continue to be imposed on non-defense security agencies, such as the Department of State, Department of Justice, Department of Homeland Security, and the non-defense elements of the intelligence community?

Answer. I agree with Secretary Mattis that the military must be a hand that fits in the glove of American diplomacy. Underfunding of the agencies listed above increases pressure on our troops and increases the likelihood that they will be forced

into action and perform duties that would otherwise be undertaken by separate federal agencies.

Question. If confirmed, by what standards would you measure the adequacy of personnel and readiness funding?

Answer. Secretary Gates in testimony before this Committee, was correct that annualized real defense budget increases and efficiencies of two to three percent above inflation are needed to sustain the All-Volunteer Force in a way that keeps personnel, modernization, and readiness accounts in balance. In the six years since the passage of the Budget Control Act, a period of declining, flat, or modestly increasing budgets, the balance has not been kept.

OVERALL READINESS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Question. How would you assess the current state of readiness?

Answer. Inadequate. We are seeing the impact of sixteen years at war. We are short 1500 pilots in the Air Force. On any given day 14 percent-20 percent of the Army is medically unable to deploy. General Milley states that only three brigade combat teams are fully combat ready and some BCTS are at 80 percent strength. Marine Corps combat units are down to a dwell time of 1:1.4 years. The all-volunteer force performs miracles but it is under tremendous strain often exacerbated by sequestration.

Question. How would you plan to restore full spectrum readiness and under what timelines?

Answer. I pledge to work with the Secretary and this committee on a budget that restores full spectrum readiness, ensuring that our military's size and composition are adequate to the tasks at hand. Even sitting with this Committee for the last two years, I am unable to provide a detailed timeline without access to readiness data held by the services. I agree with Secretary Mattis that "... the military must look at every week as its last week of peace if it is going to be sufficiently prepared for the unexpected".

Question. Additionally, how would you enforce those timelines to ensure that goals are met?

Answer. I will enforce any timelines set by the Secretary.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS

Question. The Defense Department is the only federal agency that cannot present auditable financial statements showing where and how it spends its annual budget. It has also been at high risk for waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement by the Comptroller General.

Answer. Despite much effort and billions spent to fix these problems, they have remained for decades.

Question. What actions would you take or direct that will achieve a better outcome than past actions and initiatives for financial auditability in organizations under the authority of the USD P&R?

Answer. I support the Department's audit readiness goal. If confirmed, I commit to doing everything possible to contribute to Department wide audit in FY 2018. Achieving a clean audit opinion is dependent upon having a range of incentives in place to build and sustain Departmental support. I am not aware of the incentives currently used or how effective they are.

SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Question. What is your assessment of the Department of Defense's sexual assault prevention and response program?

Answer. Sexual assault is a crime—and the only acceptable outcome is zero. If confirmed, I will examine the adequacy of the training and resources currently in place to get the Department to zero.

Question. What is your view of the provision for restricted and unrestricted reporting of sexual assaults?

Answer. I intend to examine the provisions and assess whether further improvements are needed.

Question. What is your view of the adequacy of the training and resources the Department has in place to prevent and respond to sexual assaults?

Answer. If confirmed, I will examine the adequacy of the training and resources currently available, and I will work with the Congress to address this or any problem that affects the readiness of the force.

Question. What is your view of the adequacy of the Department's oversight of military service implementation of the Department and service policies for the prevention of and response to sexual assaults?

Answer. I have not been privy to the Department's inner workings on oversight. However the incidence of sexual assault cases is still too high and thus the problem continues to be serious and threat to readiness.

Question. What is your assessment of the potential impact, if any, of proposals to remove the disposition authority from military commanders over violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, including sexual assaults?

Answer. I will take proactive steps to ensure the Services hold leaders accountable at all levels of the military chain of command for carrying out their responsibilities to investigate and adjudicate any potential violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I was raised in the military world. I believe in a principle enunciated by Admiral Nimitz when addressing a meeting of new destroyer commanders—"if you can't point to the man in charge then no one is in charge". Military law invests responsibility for good order and discipline and for leading the fight with the commander. If any of his responsibility is re-moved and given to those outside of his command that in long run will diminish command authority.

That said, I agree with efforts by Senators McCaskill, Ernst and Gillibrand to create specialists within the JAG Corps to investigate and prosecute sexual crimes and abuse. This will also give commanders another tool to address this matter.

Question. What is your assessment of the Department's protections against retaliation for reporting sexual assault?

Answer. The military's protections against retaliation are not completely effective or sufficient.

The Department must do more to ensure Service members can report any crime, including a crime involving sexual assault, without fear of retaliation. If confirmed, I intend to examine the early implementation of the Department's efforts in this area and assess whether improvements are needed.

Question. What is your view of the role of the chain of command in maintaining a command climate where sexual harassment and sexual assaults are not tolerated?

Answer. Vital. Commander's attitudes permeate the entire chain.

Question. In your view, do military and civilian leaders in the Department have the tools and resources needed to hold commanders accountable for these issues? If not, what additional authority do they need?

Answer. Yes

ABUSIVE ONLINE CONDUCT

Question. Recently, this Committee considered testimony on reports that certain members of Marines United, an unofficial Marine Corps Facebook group, were found to be posting degrading comments and sharing nude photos of female service members. Members of the group included a number of active-duty service members, former military members, and military retirees.

Do you believe that the behaviors typified by these events, and the attitudes and beliefs they represent, are confined to the Marine Corps?

Answer. I have not been privy to any studies or investigations on this matter within the other services.

Question. What is the current Department of Defense policy for use of social media by civilian employees and service members?

Answer. For civilian members, Title VII Equal Employment protections may apply, depending on the issue. For Service members, it is my understanding there are existing DoD policies that provide guidance on online social media misconduct. Specifically, it is my understanding the Department updated its Sexual Harassment and Response policy in 2014, and updated its Hazing and Bullying Prevention and Response policy in 2015, which discusses the prohibition of unacceptable electronic communications.

Question. In your view, are these policies adequate to address abuses such as what occurred in the Marines United incident?

Answer. I have not reviewed all of the Department's policies and plans that address social medial conduct. However, I believe the Department's policies are designed to address problematic behaviors and, if confirmed, I will ensure the Department continues to adapt policies to emerging social trends. The actions of this committee by placing such incidents within the purview of the USMJ is an important step.

Question. If confirmed, what action would you take to ensure that civilian employees and service members are not subjected to abusive online conduct?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure the Department continues to adapt policies to emerging social trends. In addition, I will hold senior leaders accountable and make sure they place emphasis on this issue.

Question. In your view, do the Department and the services have sufficient legal authority to hold offenders accountable for such misconduct?

Answer. It is my understanding there are several Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) Articles that could address social media conduct. In addition, I believe the Department is currently in the process of reviewing Article 134 offense involving the nonconsensual distribution of intimate images.

Question. What legislative authorities, if any, do you believe are necessary to address this problem?

Answer. I am unaware of any additional legislative authorities needed at this time. Currently for civilian members, Title VII protections may apply, depending on the issue. Likewise, for Service members, it is my understanding there are several Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) Articles that could address social media conduct. The Department is currently in the process of reviewing Article 134 offense involving the nonconsensual distribution of intimate images.

Question. Do you believe the Department needs to make policy or regulation changes in order to facilitate the investigation and accountability process?

Answer. I believe it is important leaders are held accountable in these cases. I am unaware of any changes needed at this time but if confirmed, I will ensure action is taken if changes are needed.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Question. Department of Defense annual sexual assault reports consistently document that sexual assaults are more common in units where sexual harassment is prevalent. Section 579 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 required the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive policy to prevent and respond to sexual harassment in the armed forces and to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives no later than one year after January 2, 2013, setting forth a comprehensive policy. This Committee still has not yet received this report.

Do you agree with the premise that units with a command climate that tolerates sexual harassment is more likely to have increased incidents of sexual assault?

Answer. Yes, and that applies to all levels and offices within the DOD.

Question. What is the reason the Department has not complied with the requirement to develop a comprehensive sexual harassment policy?

Answer. I have not been privy to the deliberations within the Department or the reasons for not complying with the provisions of the 2013 NDAA.

Question. If confirmed, will you assure this Committee that the Department will promptly promulgate a comprehensive policy to prevent and respond to sexual harassment in the armed forces and to submit this policy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, as directed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013?

Answer. Yes.

SERVICE ACADEMIES

Question. What do you consider to be the policy and procedural elements that must be in place at each of the service academies in order to prevent and respond appropriately to sexual assaults and sexual harassment and to ensure essential oversight?

Answer. Zero tolerance is the Departmental policy and what is expected of the military by the American people. The same standard applies to all ranks—cadets, recruits, enlisted, officers, and senior leaders. That said, rates of assault at Service Academies are disconcerting.

Question. What is your assessment of measures taken at the service academies to ensure religious tolerance and respect, and to prevent sexual assaults and sexual harassment?

Answer. I would have to review such policies if confirmed to make a judgement.

Question. What is your assessment of the suicide prevention programs at each Military Service Academy?

Answer. I have not been privy to the programs at the Service Academies.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Question. Some have suggested that the success of the All-Volunteer Force has reduced the need for the United States to have a continuing authority and capability to conduct a draft. Further, a future national emergency may require that the military have the ability to identify citizens with unique and specialized skills to fill critical combat support requirements, both within the military and in the civilian sector. Currently, the Selective Service System does not identify individuals with

such skills, and does not address the need for critical skills among the civilian workforce.

Do you believe the Selective Service Act should be repealed?

Answer. No

Question. Do you believe Congress should amend the Selective Service Act to require the registration of women?

Answer. Yes

Question. Do you believe the Selective Service system, with its focus on supplying large numbers of replacement combat soldiers, meets the needs of today's military and the type of personnel that would likely need to be drafted in a future conflict, including skilled personnel in the medical, linguistic, cyber, and other specialist fields?

Answer. No. The current Selective Service is in many ways an electronic version of the system that has been in place since World War I. It provides little information beyond age and name.

Question. If not, what changes should Congress consider to the Selective Service system to meet the needs of today's national defense and security agencies, military and civilian?

Answer. We should look to a process that at least gives us basic information as to a young American's language skills, athletic ability, computer skills, and science background. The Congress might look to providing access for registrants to the ASVAB to provide DOD with a more tangible database.

MANAGING THE COST OF HEALTH CARE

Question. In the President's Fiscal Year 2018 budget request, the Department of Defense requested \$53.5 billion in operation and support funding for the military health system, about 9 percent of the total funding requested for the Department's base budget. CBO has calculated that those costs will reach \$64 billion by 2030 if their growth reflects anticipated national trends in health care costs.

In your view, what is the greatest threat to the long-term viability of the military health system?

Answer. It would be the inability to transform the military health system into a much leaner and more efficient organization that still meets the warfighters' and beneficiaries' needs.

Question. What is your assessment of the long-term impact of the Department's health care costs on military readiness and overall national security?

Answer. We need to remember we have health professionals in uniform to ensure we can meet our battlefield requirements for medical care. Also our military health care system provides medical care to those in uniform, their families, and retirees. Once we ensure our operational requirements are met, every opportunity for reform and efficiency must be pursued in the delivery of the health benefit, lest we divert essential resources from military readiness.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to mitigate the effect of the Department's medical costs on the Department's budget top-line while simultaneously implementing programs to improve health outcomes and to enhance the experience of care for all beneficiaries?

Answer. I believe we need to look at all options to managing the cost of DoD health care. It is my understanding that we are essentially running four separate health care systems within the Department of Defense and have for many years. The potential for greater efficiency and effectiveness is substantial. It also includes looking at how the Department buys health care from the civilian sector to emphasize outcomes and promoting healthy life styles among our beneficiaries to reduce the demand for health services. If confirmed, I will work both within and outside of the Department to eliminate duplication, increase productivity, and set goals, standards and incentives that emphasize medical readiness, excellent outcomes and exceptional return on investment.

Question. If confirmed, what would you do to create a value-based military health system—a system that creates value for beneficiaries and the Department by ensuring the delivery of quality health care and improving health outcomes for beneficiaries at reasonable costs to beneficiaries and lower costs to the Department?

Answer. We must be responsive to our beneficiary population, which includes the warfighter and all other eligible members. If confirmed I would work closely with military health system leadership to improve the experience of care and re-focus our attention on the customer. Additionally, I would capitalize on successes in the commercial health care industry that focus on successful outcomes rather than simply paying in a fee-for-service model.

Question. If confirmed, what reforms in medical infrastructure, benefits, benefit management, contract acquisition, military provider productivity, military-civilian provider mix, and medical personnel strengths would you implement to help control the per capita costs of health care provided by the Department?

Answer. I would re-double efforts to consolidate management, overhead, and support services from at least four separate medical entities into one. I would dramatically increase the standardization of operations across the system and put into place aggressive yet achievable production and efficiency targets. I would carefully scrutinize what is needed for operational requirements versus what is a pure benefit and determine the most cost effective strategy to provide those services. Finally, I would look at the benefit structure to see where reasonable changes could occur. In the long term, the promotion of healthy life styles and prevention among our beneficiaries will also help reduce the demand for health services.

MEDICAL PROVIDER PRODUCTIVITY

Question. The military services have established a very low provider efficiency (productivity) standard for military physicians—40 percent of the Medical Group Management Association median. This measure assesses provider currency and capacity, determining the readiness potential of providers. The most current data provided to this Committee show that only 39 percent of the Department's providers exceeded the goal in the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2017. In other words, most of the Department's providers failed to achieve an already very low efficiency standard.

If confirmed, what would you do to ensure that the Department's medical providers become more productive?

Answer. I will review the data to determine if this measure is the right measure for assuring a ready medical force and a force that is medically ready. Moreover, I will ensure that we develop policies and procedures to ensure that we are meeting our critical readiness mission along with providing for our robust health care benefit in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

I will review the data to determine the appropriate productivity standards for our providers given our readiness mission. I will communicate that both leaders and providers throughout our Department are responsible to provide quality and safe care to our beneficiaries with maximum efficiency and productivity.

Question. If confirmed, who would you hold accountable for the low productivity of the Department's medical providers?

An independent study by the Institute for Defense Analyses showed that it costs the Department about 50 percent less to purchase health care services in the private sector than to provide the same care in military medical treatment facilities.

In your view, how does low provider productivity contribute to the higher relative costs to provide medical care in those facilities?

Answer. If confirmed, I will review the data related to the relationship between provider productivity, cost of maintaining providers' military readiness, and any higher relative costs to provide medical care in MTFs to determine the relationship and any actions that may need to be taken.

MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM REORGANIZATION

Question. Section 702 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 transferred direct oversight and management of military hospitals and clinics from the military services to the Defense Health Agency (DHA). In March and again in June, the Committee received the Department of Defense's interim reports on section 702, which described the Department's intent to develop a component model to administer and manage military treatment facilities. Under this component model, the Department would establish service intermediary medical commands, and those commands would be subject to two separate lines of authority—the DHA and the services.

Do you believe that a component model, with establishment of new intermediary medical commands under two separate lines of authority, would make the military health system flatter, more agile, and more efficient?

Answer. Presently, the three Service Medical Departments and the Defense Health Agency (DHA) have four separate headquarters functions dedicated to the administration and management of the Military Treatment Facilities. It is my understanding that Department's proposed component model centralizes the Services' headquarters functions under DHA, which will be the single organization responsible for the Military Treatment Facilities in the specific areas identified in the FY 2017 NDAA.

Question. If confirmed, would you reevaluate the Department's decision to proceed with a component model to implement section 702?

Answer. I will review the actions of the Department and in conjunction with the Deputy Secretary of Defense evaluate the efficacy of the component model.

Question. If confirmed, would you urge the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the Department's decision to proceed with a component model to implement section 702?

Answer. It would be premature, at this stage, to comment as to whether the Department's decisions should be reevaluated. However, if confirmed, I will remain open to reevaluating the Department's approach, if it is warranted.

Question. If confirmed, would you ensure that military services reduce their medical headquarters staffs and infrastructure (including both regional command staffs and infrastructure) to reflect the more limited scope and size of their health care missions?

Answer. Yes—the goal with all headquarters reductions is to streamline decision making and get more people into the field.

Question. In your view, would a component model streamline the administration and management of military treatment facilities?

Answer. It has the potential to yield a flatter and more streamlined system.

Question. In your view, would a component model achieve the Committee's goal to eliminate multiple inefficient layers of management and bureaucracy in the Department's medical operations?

Answer. Cultural and operational changes would need to be made in order to fully implement the Committee's vision.

Question. In your view, would a component model eliminate the current stove-piped medical command structures of the services?

Answer. I am not sufficiently familiar with the details of the Department's component model to determine whether it would eliminate existing stove-pipes within the Services' medical commands.

However as noted above cultural and operational changes would need to be made in order to fully implement the Committee's vision.

If confirmed, I will review the model and make an assessment on its potential effectiveness.

Question. If confirmed, would you ensure a rapid and efficient transfer of the operations of military medical facilities to the DHA?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with the leaders of the Department, particularly the Deputy Secretary of Defense, to meet the FY17 NDAA timelines and if there are any concerns with the timelines, I will inform the Congress.

SERVICE OF TRANSGENDER INDIVIDUALS

Question. If confirmed, what would be your role in the implementation of the Administration's policy on the service of transgender individuals in the armed forces?

Answer. Based on the announcement made by Secretary Mattis on August 29, I would likely be part of a panel assembled by the Secretary to address accessions of transgender individuals and transgender individuals currently serving in the military.

Question. In your view, what would be the impact on military readiness of continued service by transgender service members who receive hormone therapy?

Answer. The guiding principles for this and any other personnel decision should be military fitness, readiness and loyalty. The services should have a say in this and any other readiness matter.

I am not privy to any of the medical and cost reviews begun by the services as per Secretary Mattis' direction. I agree with Senator McCain's statement in July that no policy decisions are appropriate until the study ordered by the Secretary is complete and reviewed by him, the military leadership and the Congress.

Question. In your view, what would be the impact on military readiness of requiring the separation of all transgender service members currently serving in our armed forces?

Answer. Until I have access to the study ordered by the Secretary I will not have sufficient data to with which to provide an answer to this question.

MENTAL HEALTH CARE

Question. In your view, are the Department of Defense's current mental health resources adequate to serve all active duty and eligible reserve component members and their families, as well as retirees and their dependents?

Answer. Secretary Mattis said, we have a moral obligation to sustain the mental health of the force as well as service members' families. If confirmed, it will be a priority to ensure that the Department is devoting appropriate resources to mental health, and working effectively with the Department of Veterans Affairs to identify

issues and close any gaps in coverage. I will advise the Committee if more resources are required.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to ensure that sufficient mental health resources are available to service members in theater and to service members and families upon return to home station locations with insufficient community-based mental health resources?

Answer. As an active Reservist, I always include the Guard and Reserve in any assessment. The health of the total force is a national priority. Understanding the uniqueness of their service, I will work to ensure members of the Guard and Reserve and their families are included in the equation and that the appropriate amount of resources are available to support their mental health care.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Question. If confirmed, how would you maintain a strong focus on preventing suicides in the active and reserve components and in their families?

Answer. Zero is the only acceptable outcome for the Department. We must do more to remove the stigmas associated with mental health issues. If confirmed, I will bring the broad resources of the Department to bear on this problem and will not hesitate to recommend relevant outside expertise as well. We need to be better wingmen for our troops.

VOLUNTARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Question. The Department of Defense continues to seek ways to improve oversight of its tuition assistance programs, including standardizing eligibility criteria among the services.

What is your assessment of the tuition assistance program in light of the needs of the services and the current budget environment?

Answer. It is important to ensure member access to quality post-secondary education that supports mission accomplishment and the eventual transition to civilian life.

Question. Do you believe this benefit contributes directly to recruiting and retention, or is it more of a nice-to-have benefit when resources allow?

Answer. DOD should provide members and families with this benefit. It is a strategic investment.

Question. What is your view of tuition assistance as a transition benefit for service members to obtain civilian licenses and credentials?

Answer. Important tool

Question. If confirmed, what would be your plan for improving the Department's Voluntary Educational Programs?

Answer. If confirmed I will review the program.

Question. If confirmed, what action would you take to ensure that the Department implements administrative procedures adequate for the fair and expeditious adjudication of complaints about educational institutions that have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department for a Voluntary Education Partnership?

Answer. I do not know enough about the DOD review and the MOU process at this time. I will review the program and ensure that the TA program truly serves the best interests of our members.

RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION

Question. On July 22, 2015, the Department of Defense Inspector General released a report on "Rights of Conscience Protections for Armed Forces Service Members and Their Chaplains." The Inspector General found that the services are not processing special religious accommodation requests promptly and, once accommodation requests are approved, they do not last for the duration of soldiers' military careers. In many cases, this has put individuals in the difficult position of being forced to violate their faith in order to join the military and they must resubmit accommodation requests every time they transfer. In some cases, these policies are unfairly burdening individuals specifically recruited by our armed forces for their unique language, culture, and technical skills.

If confirmed, what would be your role in addressing the recommendations in the Inspector General report?

Answer. I will review the report in conjunction with the President's Executive Order of May 4, 2017 regarding free speech and religious liberty.

Question. Do you support a policy to allow service members' religious accommodations to follow their service throughout their entire military careers—no matter where they are stationed?

Answer. DOD must consistently seek a balance between religious freedom and operational readiness.

Question. Do you support a policy that would allow prospective recruits to request accommodation prior to enlisting or accepting a commission for service in the armed forces?

Answer. Yes as long as the request does not impact readiness and the ability to deploy.

Question. In your view, do requirements for individuals being accessed into the military to first comply with military grooming and appearance standards that conflict with their sincerely-held religious beliefs before being considered for a waiver of those military standards constitute a constitutionally-valid restraint on religious expression?

Answer. DOD must consistently seek a balance between religious freedom and operational readiness, including entry level training.

Question. In your view, how do the military services justify strict adherence to military grooming and uniform standards in the case of religious observance, while authorizing tens of thousands of shaving profiles, including allowing beards for deployed service members, and tens of thousands waivers from tattoo policies that include religious-themed tattoos and tattoos of Bible verses?

Answer. I would have to examine this matter with the service personnel chiefs.

Question. Do you believe that allowing service members of certain faiths, such as Sikh, Orthodox Judaism, or Islam, to maintain beards or wear turbans or other religious headwear, while in uniform, would strengthen or weaken the U.S. military's standing in areas of the world where such religions predominate? Would such allowance help or hurt our coordination and engagement with such foreign nations?

Answer. I think America's values are the most potent force when servicemembers are deployed. I would rely on the judgement of the commander on the ground to determine if military necessity would warrant allowances for religious accoutrements while wearing the uniform in theater. That said the accession of new communities into the armed forces can only enhance America's strength.

U.S. military personnel routinely deploy to locations around the world where they must engage and work effectively with allies and host-country nationals whose faiths and beliefs may be different than their own. For many other cultures, religious faith is not a purely personal and private matter; it is the foundation of their culture and society. Learning to respect the different faiths and beliefs of others, and to understand how accommodating different views can contribute to a diverse force is, some would argue, an essential skill to operational effectiveness.

Question. In your view, do policies concerning religious accommodation in the military appropriately accommodate the free exercise of religion and other beliefs, including individual expressions of belief, without impinging on those who have different beliefs, including no religious belief?

Answer. Yes

Question. In your view, does a military climate that welcomes and respects open and candid discussions about personal religious faith and beliefs in a garrison environment contribute in a positive way to preparing U.S. forces to be effective in overseas assignments?

Answer. Yes

Question. Would a policy that discourages open discussions about personal faith and beliefs be more or less effective at preparing service members to work and operate in a pluralistic environment?

Answer. Less effective—the more servicemembers are exposed to cultural and religious issues the better they will be prepared to receive cultural training prior to deployment.

PERSONNEL SYSTEM REFORMS

Question. The Committee conducted a series of hearings last year on reforming the Department of Defense. A number of witnesses called for reforms to the Pentagon's personnel management system to ensure we recruit and retain the best and the brightest to work for the nation's defense.

If confirmed, what would be your priorities with regards to military personnel management?

Answer. Before changing any aspect of the Department's personnel policies, if confirmed I would need to review the specific military problem the change is meant to solve and then ask, "Will the change be consistent with maintaining the highest level of readiness for the force?"

I believe that there is a blueprint for prospective reform laid out by former Secretary Panetta, General Jones and Major General Punaro. If confirmed, I will also

review the Force of the Future initiatives. After a more in-depth look at this issue, I will assess whether continued personnel reform is necessary and will work with the Congress on specific proposals.

Question. Do you believe that the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) and the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act (ROPMA) need to be updated to better reflect the national security challenges that we face today and will face in the future?

Answer. Yes

Question. What do you believe is the biggest deterrent to young people considering a career in the military today?

Answer. Military-civilian divide.

Lack of exposure to the military culture and the value of service—people tend to stay away from something they do not understand.

I have seen in my service, young servicemembers leave due to inadequate support for their families—non-uniform childcare, too frequent moves that deprive a spouse from putting down roots and keeping a job.

ACTIVE/RESERVE PERMEABILITY

Question. The Commission on the National Guard and Reserves was chartered by Congress “to assess the reserve component of the U.S. military and to recommend changes to ensure that the National Guard and other reserve components are organized, trained, equipped, compensated, and supported to best meet the needs of U.S. national security.” One of their recommendations stated that the Department of Defense should merge DOPMA and ROPMA into “a single system, modified to base advancement on achievement of competencies.”

Do you believe consolidating DOPMA and ROPMA into an integrated officer personnel management system would be useful to the Department?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Would a single officer personnel management system facilitate increased permeability between active and reserve components, thereby allowing officers to repeatedly transition between active and reserve service?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What would be the desired outcome of an integrated active and reserve component officer military personnel system?

Answer. This creates a culture to support a continuum of service. This provides greater opportunity to transition among the active guard and reserve components. This also makes Reserve component service an option during a military career. We should also consider extending the reserve position vacancy window beyond the current strictures of date of separation.

Question. Are there other legislative or policy changes that would facilitate the transition of officers between active and reserve service?

Answer. I will have to consult with DOD officials to determine if additional authorities are needed.

Question. In your view, what are the pros and cons of a single commission for active and reserve service?

Answer. This cements the symbiotic relationship between the active and reserve component. I also think it can be part of a much-needed evaluation as to who we train the total force. In the reserve component there has more often than not been a singular focus on personal readiness which often comes to the detriment of training. It is important to ensure that larger Active Forces have the reserve enablers required to meet their mission; second, to ensure that the Reserve Components have ample combat capability to complement or reinforce the Active Force in the event of sustained combat. Removing any legacy barriers to full integration would be worthwhile.

A downside in such a program would be that the unique aspects of reserve service (workplace, travel etc.) might tend to get pushed aside.

MILITARY PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Question. The Department of Defense has traditionally compared Regular Military Compensation against comparable civilian salaries to devise a percentile as a way to assess the relative attractiveness of military pay versus civilian pay.

Do you agree that the primary purpose of a competitive military pay and benefit package is to recruit and retain a military of sufficient size and quality to meet national defense objectives?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What is your assessment of the adequacy of the current military pay package in achieving this goal?

Answer. I understand the current military compensation package is robust and compares favorably with the private sector.

Question. Does the military pay package adequately compensate individuals for their specialized skills and provide an incentive to recruit science, engineering, and other critical professionals into the military?

Answer. In addition to the current pay and benefits package, I understand the Department uses special and incentive pays and bonuses to target specific recruiting and retention concerns and to incentivize the development of specific occupational skills. If confirmed, I will evaluate the adequacy of these special pays and bonuses to ensure we are attracting the best skillset we need for the military.

Question. Do you believe the largely “one-size-fits-all” model for military pay is still the best model considering the specialized skills our military needs to defend, fight, and deter modern conflicts?

Answer. The current system has supported and sustained an All-Volunteer Force for over 40 years and has generated the superb fighting force we have today. However, I am, if confirmed, open to considering changes to the current system, but any changes need to be thoroughly analyzed and understood so that we do not jeopardize readiness or our ability to recruit, retain, and sustain our nation’s All-Volunteer Force.

Question. What changes, if any, would you recommend for the revision of military pay and benefits?

Answer. Although at this time I do not have any recommended changes, I am open to considering alternatives and am willing to work with the Congress to support and sustain the All-Volunteer Force.

Question. If confirmed, will you commit to working with the Committee on revisions to military pay and benefits with the goal of offering the best deal supported by the budget to attract, recruit, and retain military personnel?

Answer. Yes

Question. This Committee has taken great interest in the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) system over the last four years. The BAH system has devolved from its original purpose of providing adequate housing to service members and their families to a system that greatly benefits officers in special circumstances and provides less of a benefit to others who are primarily lower ranking enlisted personnel.

If confirmed, will you commit to submitting a comprehensive report that addresses all elements required in section 604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 with regard to establishing a single-salary system for members of the armed forces?

Answer. Yes

END STRENGTH

Question. In 2017, the Department of Defense began to grow total force end strength following seven consecutive years of end strength reductions. The Army and Air Force in particular have identified a need to increase the overall size of the force to better meet combatant commander needs.

Do you believe military end strength must continue to grow?

Answer. Yes

Question. How fast can the Army and Air Force responsibly grow without having to relax recruiting standards?

Answer. Accepting the need to grow—quality is still more important than quantity. This sometimes argues for more deliberation to match recruit skills with platforms and career paths.

The last time the Army tried to grow too rapidly, recruiting standards dropped. For the Air Force, increased bonuses have done little for recruitment and retention.

Question. If sequestration continues through 2021, what will be the impact on the active duty and reserve end strengths of all the services, and how would the mix between the active and reserve forces be affected?

Answer. Unless the Department of Defense receives funds above the caps imposed by the Budget Control Act, it will not be able to achieve the readiness, modernization, and force structure required to meet emerging threats and this means under-resourcing the total force. Each component will face the prospect of across the board cuts.

Question. What is your understanding of the need for additional force shaping tools requiring legislation beyond what Congress has provided?

Answer. I will consult with Secretary Mattis and the Chiefs to determine if authorities are adequate.

MILITARY ACCESSIONS VITAL TO NATIONAL INTEREST (MAVNI) PROGRAM

Question. If confirmed, would you recommend the continuation of the MAVNI program and the acceptance of new applicants? If so, what reforms, if any, would you recommend to ensure that the benefits of the program—recruiting those with critical skills and language/cultural backgrounds—outweigh the costs associated with conducting proper security screening of participants?

Answer. My understanding is that the DOD IG is conducting a thorough review of the MAVNI program and that new accessions are halted. I am not privy to the investigation.

This is first and foremost a military program designed to bring into the military those with critical skills. My read of the program is that many MAVNI enlistees were not subject to complete background checks and inadequately tracked post accession.

It is also my understanding that many MAVNI enlistees were brought into the service to perform basic MOS missions—truck drivers, logisticians etc., not the critical MOS' for which the program was created.

This is not to confuse the issue with one championed by Senators Shaheen and Tillis to protect and bring to America those Afghanis who have sacrificed for us on the battlefield.

Question. If confirmed, what actions, if any, would you take to address the issue of MAVNI participants' legal status expiring while they await entry into active duty?

Answer. I will consult with the General Counsel of the Department to make this determination.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION

Question. The Department of Defense has indicated that approximately 25 percent of today's youth population is eligible for military service. This number is alarmingly low.

What are the main reasons for such a small pool of individuals in the 17 to 24 years of age population being eligible for service?

Answer. Physical fitness

Question. What impact do current medical and other qualifications for enlistment in the armed forces have on the number of individuals eligible for military service? If confirmed, what changes to such qualifications, if any, would you recommend to increase the number of individuals eligible for military service without degrading the quality of recruits?

Answer. A review of current exclusionary childhood medical conditions should be conducted by the surgeons general.

Question. In your view, should the existing medical and other qualifications for enlistment be changed to accommodate certain new specialties, such as cyber or RPA pilots?

Answer. Lateral accessions for critical technical needs should be reviewed. All options should be on the table.

Question. What is your view of increasing the number of individuals eligible for service by recruiting individuals who are older than the typical core recruiting demographic?

Answer. The Department has in several instances advanced the accessions age for the military. Age should not be the sole limiting factor if a critical specialty is needed.

Question. Some services have recently relaxed grooming and appearance standards. In your view, how will this impact recruiting and retention?

Answer. I have not seen the data or the reasons behind the policy.

Question. What policies or tools are needed by the Department to increase the propensity to serve of today's youth?

Answer. We must expose as many young Americans as possible to the prospect of service. This includes making it easier for them to access recruiting information online and perchance have recruiting information on people interested in serving available to all components.

Recruiters should be given the flexibility of offering service in both the active and reserve components to increase a recruit's options.

Evaluate and if possible expand the reach of JR ROTC.

Expand the Warrant Officer program

Find more colleges for ROTC and put ROTC in touch with our junior colleges and community colleges.

PILOT RETENTION

Question. A number of Air Force officials have testified before Congress about the increasingly acute shortage of pilots the Air Force is experiencing. Secretary Wilson and General Goldfein recently testified that the Air Force projects a deficit of approximately 1,500 pilots, including approximately 1,300 fighter pilots. The Navy and Army have their own pilot retention issues. General Goldfein has described the problem as a national crisis that will require a national response.

What do you see as the role of the USD(P&R) in crafting a Department-wide plan to mitigate and ultimately resolve the pilot shortage?

Answer. USD P&R can facilitate a holistic view of the aviation culture and provide the Secretary of Defense with a comprehensive picture of the state of military aviation and what new ideas can be explored to address the pilot shortage.

Question. If confirmed, what steps would you take to coordinate a Department-wide, and national, response to the pilot shortage?

Answer. Bring the services together and explore opportunities for more creative career paths for pilots including options for pilots to move more freely amongst the active, reserve and Guard components—depending on how their particular life circumstances change.

Question. Do you believe that money is the primary reason that pilots choose to stay in military service?

Answer. No—pilots join the service to fly. Money is a factor but if pilots see their chances to fly continue to diminish because of budget cuts or dearth of platforms they will leave the service regardless of monetary incentives.

Question. What non-monetary ideas do you have for incentivizing pilots to stay and fly for the armed forces?

Answer. Provide pilots with a choice in career paths—if pilots want to concentrate on flying then they should be given that opportunity and not be forced into a higher command path which in many cases takes them away from flying. This is something that the British and Israelis do well and it is a solution that fits well into the reserve and Air Guard model.

Question. Do you believe a cultural change is necessary to deal with the pilot exodus facing the Department?

Answer. Yes

Question. Do you believe it is wise to apply business case analyses when determining who should receive a retention bonus and at what level?

Answer. The bonuses should be allotted based on the needs of the military community and the performance of the individual.

MOBILIZATION AND DEMOBILIZATION OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

Question. Over the past 15 years, the National Guard and Reserves have experienced their largest and most sustained employment since World War II. Reserve force management policies and systems have been characterized in the past as “inefficient and rigid” and readiness levels have been adversely affected by equipment stay-behind, cross-leveling, and reset policies.

What is your assessment of advances made in improving reserve component mobilization and demobilization procedures, and in what areas do problems still exist?

Answer. From personal observations, I do believe the process on both ends is too long. We still have not fully digitalized the process.

Question. What do you consider to be the most significant enduring changes to the administration of the reserve components aimed at ensuring their readiness for future mobilization requirements?

Answer. The most important aspect of the Reserve world is not mobilization but preparing in real time to enter the fight.

The Army is reviewing the amount of time Reservists and their commanders spend on mandatory personal readiness evolutions. Commanders are tasked with page after page of requirements that they must pass on to their troops. In an environment where one has two weeks in the summer to train and one weekend a month, this takes precious time away from training to fight. I have experienced this as a Reservist.

Question. What is your assessment of the Department of Defense programs to assist members of the National Guard and Reserves as they transition from a mobilized status?

Answer. DOD and the Congress should periodically review the adequacy of USERRA and the Soldiers and Sailors Relief Act to determine their viability in a 21st Century environment.

MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE

Question. The Committee remains concerned about the sustainment of key quality of life programs for military families, such as family support, child care, education, employment support, health care, and morale, welfare and recreation (MWR) services, especially as the Department of Defense's budget declines. The services have, for several years, failed to meet the minimum appropriated funding standard, as required by Department policy, for certain MWR programs.

If confirmed, what military quality of life programs would you consider a priority, and how would you work with the services, combatant commanders, family advocacy groups, and Congress to sustain them while eliminating some programs that may be ineffective?

Child care.

Answer. Ask the services for a status report on the state of child care services for their bases and the availability of those services off the base.

Question. Dependent medical care.

Answer. Childhood behavioral care—e.g., autism, ADD, ADHD treatment.

Question. Adequacy of Youth Sports

Cost effective PX/BX system

What would you do to ensure that the services meet the Department's minimum appropriated funding requirements for MWR programs?

Answer. Ensure that the DOD audit considers MWR programs.

FAMILY READINESS AND SUPPORT

Question. What do you consider to be the most important family readiness issues for service members and their families?

Answer. Currently, dwell time—the pressure on families of constant deployment and personnel rotation coupled with uneven access to childcare and the full range of medical care is a holistic family problem.

Question. If confirmed, how would you ensure that family readiness needs are addressed and adequately resourced?

Answer. I would follow the lead of this committee which has made family and health readiness a priority as reflected in the FY 18 NDAA.

Question. If confirmed, how would you ensure support is provided to reserve component families related to mobilization, deployment, and family readiness, as well as to active duty families who do not reside near a military installation?

Answer. Full integration of the support and mobilization and de-mobilization programs of the active force be provided to the Reserve component.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCHOOLS IN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Question. Some have questioned the continuing need for Defense Department-operated schools for military dependent children within the Continental United States (CONUS).

In light of the Administration's past requests for additional Base Realignment and Closure authorities and the Department's current fiscal constraints, should the Department update its criteria for the continued operation of Department schools within CONUS?

Answer. This is an issue that brings together a myriad of potential stakeholders—Military families, Congress, DOD, the Services, Governors, Mayors, County Commissions and City Councils.

Having been raised in the DOD School system, I understand the importance of the DOD Schools to the military culture. That said, the culture of the military has changed. In my youth, most families lived on the post—that has changed particularly at bases adjacent to major population centers. At remote installations, servicemembers have fewer opportunities. In addition, a comprehensive review of the DOD schools must include an assessment of the ability of states and localities to provide our military youth with the educational opportunities that their parents expect should the Department and Congress determine that reforms are needed.

Question. If confirmed, how would you approach the task of eliminating some Department-operated schools in CONUS?

Answer. Military dependents' education plays an important role in the success, stability, readiness, and retention of our service members and their families. If confirmed, I will work with all stakeholders, in collaboration and consultation with the Military Departments and Congress, to review the best options for providing education support for military families.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR MILITARY FAMILIES WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

Question. If confirmed, how would you ensure that service members with special needs family members relocate only to new duty stations where special needs services are available?

Answer. I have experienced a similar matter in my own childhood and in those days, it was up to the discretion of the chain of command to provide such services. I will work with the services to create policy to ensure that members are assigned to installations where such services are available.

Question. If confirmed, how would you ensure outreach to those military families with special needs dependents so they are able to obtain the support they need?

Answer. The community support system must be activated. This includes online information, unit personnel offices, hospitals, chaplains, schools etc.

COMMISSARY AND MILITARY EXCHANGE SYSTEMS

Question. What is your view of proposals to consolidate, eliminate, or privatize commissaries and exchanges in certain areas where they are duplicative of services readily available at reasonable cost in the community?

Answer. The Commissary is part of the earned benefit for active reserve and retired families. I grew up going to the Commissary and still use it as a Reservist. The quality of life value of these benefits is of great importance to our service members and their families. If confirmed, I am open to assessing whether the value provided by the commissary or exchange systems could be more effectively provided by a private party, with the understanding that regardless of outcome servicemembers will still have access to the benefit.

Question. If confirmed, would you approve a pilot program to test privatization of the defense commissary system?

Answer. As long, as the DOD is constrained by sequestration, all areas for cost savings should be explored. If confirmed, I am open to assessing whether the value provided by the commissary system could be more effectively provided by a private party.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL WORKFORCE

Question. As the Department of Defense draws down its management headquarters functions, managers will have to make tough choices on the consolidation of functions and employees.

What is your view of a civilian employee retention system that incentivizes performance above all other factors when considering which employees to retain in a limited headquarters environment?

Answer. Performance is the key metric in any organization. It is my understanding that the Department revised its reduction in force policy in accordance with Section 1101 of the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act.

Question. If confirmed, what would be your role in the consolidation and elimination of duplicative and unnecessary positions within the Office of the USD(P&R)?

Answer. Secretary Mattis' metric is that if a program does not contribute to the lethality of the force or readiness it must be considered for elimination. I believe I would have the mandate to eliminate such programs.

Question. What additional ideas do you have to more efficiently manage the Department's civilian employees?

Answer. Employ best practice skills from industry to better match talents with jobs. Provide better access to comprehensive education in modern business practices such as human resource management and follow the guidelines set by the Deputy Secretary in the implementation of his new business model.

Question. Do you feel the new performance management system will properly address the issue of employee performance reviews and ratings?

Answer. The Department must effectively manage the civilian workforce while ensuring the appropriate mix of skill sets and related expertise, which enhance the readiness and lethality of our military. We must also be sure sufficient levels of civilians are available to perform critical oversight, management, and performance of readiness functions of the Department.

Question. What, if anything, would you improve about the performance management system?

Answer. I do not have enough information about the new system at this time to make an assessment. If confirmed, I will review the Defense Performance Management and Appraisal Program to determine what, if any, improvements should be made.

Question. Do managers have adequate tools to incentivize employee performance?

Answer. I do not have enough information about all the incentive tools at this time to make an assessment. If confirmed, I will review the current tools in place and, if necessary, work with leadership and Congress to support increased flexibilities.

Question. What is your opinion of a renewable term appointment system for new employees rather than the current tenure system?

Answer. If confirmed, I am open to considering alternative civilian personnel systems and am willing to work with the Congress to support efforts that will improve the civilian workforce.

MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS REDUCTIONS

Question. The Department of Defense is currently under a statutory mandate to reduce headquarters staff by 25 percent.

What progress has the Office of the Secretary of Defense made thus far on the 25 percent reductions?

Answer. It is my understanding that DOD has not met the Congress' mandate. This is not new. Chairman McCain first raised the issue in 1999 and Secretary Rumsfeld's famous "Eliminate Bureaucracy" speech of September 10, 2001 argued that the Department had not met SASC goals of reducing headquarters overhead. If confirmed I will review SASC guidance with the Services.

I believe bureaucracy should be at the minimal level required to accomplish assigned tasks. At the same time, the role of the Department of Defense's civilian leadership is critical, and we must exercise a commitment to maintaining the principle of civilian control. I also agree with Secretary Gates and Chairman McCain that efficiencies can be gained by limiting contracted support to ensure that inherently governmental functions are performed by federal employees. I believe staff size should be based on assessments of the workforce needed to accomplish assigned tasks.

Question. Do you agree that the Department of Defense should strive to eliminate duplicative functions?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you believe that the process for deciding which functions are to be eliminated should be streamlined through each service or customized to fit each service's needs?

Answer. The needs of the force must always be given deference.

ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

Question. The Department of Defense acquisition workforce has been the subject of a large quantity of reports and legislation.

What is your view on giving more acquisition authority to the service chiefs?

Answer. Agree that acquisition policy and choices should be made closer to the warfighter.

Question. In what ways can we better train military personnel to be acquisition professionals?

Answer. The Committee has begun to move the Department toward modernizing its acquisition services. The acquisition corps in particular needs to be better trained and educated. There would be considerable value in expanding the Secretary of Defense Corporate Fellows program. Unlike many other DOD fellowship programs, which focus on providing personnel with a better understanding of government processes, the SECDef Corporate Fellowship provides up to twenty officers with the opportunity to spend a year in industry. This program should be increased across the board, allowing perhaps as many as sixty officers to benefit from this valuable experience in industry. It should also be expanded to include civilians as well.

Question. How do you envision an acquisition workforce that holds the leadership accountable for cost overruns on procurement contracts?

Answer. Yes—in line with the Secretary's vision to implement modern business practices within the DOD.

Question. Do you believe that the Acquisition Demonstration Project initiatives have been successful?

Answer. I have not been privy to the data gleaned from the Acquisition Demonstration Project.

GI BILL BENEFITS

Question. Congress passed the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act in 2008 ("Post-9/11 GI Bill") that provides generous educational benefits for service members who have served at least 90 days on active duty since 9/11.

What is your assessment of the impact of the Post-9/11 GI Bill on recruiting and retention, including the provision of transferability for continued service?

Answer. Transferability is a vital incentive for family readiness. In the interest of full disclosure, I have taken advantage of this program for my family.

Question. Would you recommend that the Department use transferability more sparingly as a retention incentive?

Answer. No.

PERSONNEL POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Question. What is your understanding of your responsibility, if confirmed, to inform and consult with this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress on the implementation of policies directed by law?

Answer. It is my responsibility after consultation with the Secretary to consult with and inform this committee on personnel policies.

Question. What is your understanding of the Department's obligation and authority to implement personnel policies to improve efficiency within the Department?

Answer. It has a legal obligation to implement policy set by Congress and a moral responsibility to improve efficiencies wherever possible.

Question. What is your understanding of the timeframe in which personnel policies directed by law must be implemented by the Department?

Answer. Within the expectations of and timelines set by the Congress.

READINESS MATTERS

Question. How do you see the USD(P&R) role in the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress? Specifically, do you see it as a way to disseminate information or as a way to proactively impact shortfalls and gaps in our military's force structure?

Answer. I see the USD (P&R)'s role in the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress (QRR) both ways. The QRR is an important mechanism allowing the Department to report the current state of readiness by identifying our most pressing issues. However, it must go further by providing the Department's plan to mitigate and address the issues we have identified. With today's challenging fiscal environment and global threats, the Department must provide Congress with responsible and effective ways to recommend readiness solutions instead of simply stating the problem.

Question. What is your assessment of the current metrics used to measure readiness? Do you believe the Department has any true metrics to accurately measure readiness from both a service and joint perspective?

Answer. I have not been privy to nor reviewed the Department's metrics used to measure readiness. However, I do know that in most cases when dealing with analytics, a combination of metrics, data analysis, and modeling must be used to accurately portray a given subject. If confirmed, I will look into the Department's process for measuring readiness to ensure an unbiased, fact-based approach is in place and I will ensure Congress receives value-added readiness information.

Question. What is your opinion of a commander's ability to subjectively override a unit's readiness rating?

Answer. Commanders play the central role in developing a trained and ready forces. Assessments of a unit's warfighting capability and organizational resources are done with the professional judgment of commanding officers, who ultimately ensure the quality of both assessment and resource reporting. I believe a Commander's ability to subjectively override a readiness rating under extenuating circumstances is a critical part of readiness reporting and one that should not be taken away.

However, I do realize that in rare cases this can present situations whereby an assessment falls outside the spectrum of normal and/or accurate reporting. I will continue to monitor and report these outliers, and ensure Commanders make overrides only when truly necessary and exercise sound judgment in their assessments.

Question. What is your assessment of how the 2017 federal hiring freeze impacted readiness?

Answer. I am aware that the Department was granted the flexibility to exempt from the hiring freeze any positions deemed necessary to meet national security or public safety responsibilities. It is my understanding that these flexibilities allowed the Department to weather the effects of the hiring freeze and minimize the impact to mission readiness and family programs.

Question. What is your assessment of how the USD(P&R) works with the Joint Staff to improve upon readiness challenges identified by the services?

Answer. In addition to being the advisor to the Secretary on total force readiness, USD (P&R) largely operates to provide strategic oversight of Military Service readiness. Its readiness products and processes achieve an optimal balance of assessing

readiness recovery and surge capability. These products inform the Defense Committees about the strategic and operational risks, in addition to planned mitigations challenging the Military Services. If confirmed, I will continue to strengthen the relationship between USD (P&R) and the Joint Staff to achieve their common goals, which is to create the most lethal, decisive fighting force our Nation has ever had.

Question. The Department relies on the organic industrial base to ensure that aging and damaged weapon systems and support equipment are available to warfighters when needed. In recent years, however, backlogs have plagued our armed forces' ability to train and fight. In your relationship with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness, what is your understanding of the current industrial base's ability to not only share best practices but to implement those practices on underperforming services?

Answer. Readiness touches all aspects of our Joint Force, including how the industrial base supports the Department of Defense. If confirmed, I will work directly with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness to address how the industrial base impacts readiness. I will ensure P&R does not operate in a silo and the logistics and materiel community understands where our readiness pressure points are so that we can create mitigation plans.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Question. In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the USD(P&R)?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings, and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate committees in a timely manner? YES Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee, or to consult with this Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If confirmed, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?

Answer. Yes.

[Questions for the record with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TOM COTTON

TRICARE PHARMACY PILOT PROGRAM

1. Senator COTTON. Mr. Wilkie, as you know, section 743 of the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) provided authority for the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct a pilot program to study the cost-saving benefits of offering TRICARE beneficiaries the option of purchasing brand maintenance medication at retail pharmacies. This would expand their choices beyond mail-order and military treatment facilities (MTF). It would be an especially helpful option for beneficiaries who live hours away from the nearest MTF.

Because DOD declined to exercise those authorities before the end of the fiscal year, 21 Senators and 67 Representatives signed letters supporting an extension of the deadline and encouraging DOD to move forward with the pilot program. It has come to our attention that some in DOD, including your future colleagues if you are confirmed, are nevertheless disinclined to pursue the pilot program. This program is important to me and many of my colleagues. If confirmed, can we count on you to use your skills and experience of your current position to push this pilot forward?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes. We must explore all options that make medical care more accessible to the military community. If confirmed, I will commit to work with you and the pharmaceutical industry to explore any option that increases beneficiary access to needed medications while not increasing costs to the American taxpayer.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MIKE ROUNDS

TRICARE PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED BY THE HOUSE PASSED NDAA 2018

2. Senator ROUNDS. Mr. Wilkie, as you know, section 743 of the Fiscal Year 2017 NDAA provided authority for DOD to conduct a pilot program to study the cost-saving benefits of offering TRICARE beneficiaries the option to purchase brand name maintenance medications at retail pharmacies. This would have expanded their choices beyond mail-order and military treatment facilities. It would have been an especially helpful option for beneficiaries who live hours away from the nearest military treatment facility as is the case for most South Dakotans. My State's only military treatment facility, at Ellsworth Air Force Base, is located 340 miles away from the State's largest population center in the southeast, i.e., about a 10-hour round trip. Because DOD was disinclined to exercise those authorities in fiscal year 2017, 21 Senators—including me—and 67 House members signed letters last June encouraging DOD to move forward with the pilot. This program is important to me and many of my colleagues. If reauthorized by Fiscal Year 2018 NDAA, can we count on you to push this pilot forward?

Mr. WILKIE. We must explore all options that make medical care more accessible to the military community. As an Air Force officer I am well aware of the burden on military families in states with one major installation. If confirmed, I will commit to work with you and the pharmaceutical industry to explore a pilot that increases beneficiary access to needed medications while not increasing costs to the American taxpayer.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAN SULLIVAN

ARMY RIGOROUS TRAINING STANDARDS AND CHALLENGES

3. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Wilkie, "This Kind of War" by T.R. Fehrenbach details the devastating loss of American lives at the start of the Korean War due to a lack of readiness. Would you agree that we must continue to ensure our military training standards are hard and rigorous to reflect the realities of combat, and that this standard should not be lowered or influenced by politics?

Mr. WILKIE. Absolutely, there is no sterner lesson to support your position than the example of the Korean War. Task Force Smith is the saddest paradigm.

READINESS CHALLENGES

4. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Wilkie, the loss of life and damage to equipment in just this year alone—in a variety of accidents—is staggering. How will you attack this problem from a personnel and readiness perspective?

Mr. WILKIE. It is important for the Department to have stable, predictable, adequate funding to ensure the readiness of our forces and their equipment. In addition, with sustained global commitments and a force structure that needs to grow, our Military Services are challenged to have sufficient time to train on the range and repair and upgrade vehicles and weapons. We will need to work with combatant commanders to balance meeting their demands with ensuring our Military Services have enough time at home to recuperate and train.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND

TRANSGENDER SERVICEMEMBERS

5. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Wilkie, what is your position on separating someone solely because of their gender identity?

Mr. WILKIE. The only conditions we should apply to any servicemember are physical and mental fitness and as General Dunford pointed out—worldwide deployability.

6. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Wilkie, under what circumstances do you think someone who is honorably serving and meeting the same standards as other servicemembers should be separated solely based on their identity?

Mr. WILKIE. The only conditions we should apply to any servicemember are physical and mental fitness and as General Dunford pointed out—worldwide deployability. That said as the CJCS said in his re-confirmation hearing we should not separate members the Services need who are serving honorably.

7. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Wilkie, with regard to your answer to the advance policy questions that “the guiding principles for this and any other personnel decision should be military fitness, readiness, and loyalty,” do you have any reason whatsoever to question the loyalty of transgender servicemembers or veterans?

Mr. WILKIE. Not at all. This is a coin of the realm word. As a soldier’s son and an officer I have been taught to use those three words in my career.

8. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Wilkie, if confirmed, will you commit to meeting with openly transgender servicemembers to learn about their experiences within your first month on the job and before the panel has completed its analysis?

Mr. WILKIE. I am told that the panel is to complete its analysis by mid-December. If confirmed, I will commit to meeting with openly serving transgender servicemembers as soon as possible.

COMBAT INTEGRATION

9. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Wilkie, how can the Services and Special Operations Command most effectively recruit young women to combat arms roles?

Mr. WILKIE. It starts with basic training and the first assignment, since no Service member can join Special Operations without passing through basic combat arms training. Anyone meeting those first standards, at initial training, and passing the test for Special Operations training accession, should be given the chance. The Military Services have begun to disseminate information on the openness of Special Operations billets at all levels including the Military Service Academies. I have witnessed such dissemination at the Naval Academy.

AUTISM

10. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Wilkie, during your service to the Senate, we worked together to ensure proper diagnosis and treatment for military children with autism. Do I have your commitment that, if you are confirmed, you will continue to work with my office to ensure that families with special needs dependents have access to the care they need?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes, autism services deserve our careful attention. It was a matter I highlighted in my confirmation statement.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

DIVERSITY OF THE FORCE

11. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, do you agree that our military and our country are made stronger with the ability to draw on all individuals that are able to meet the rigorous requirements that our Armed Forces demand?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes.

ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATION PROTECTIONS FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT SURVIVORS

12. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, do you believe veterans who are sexual assault survivors should be afforded the same administrative separation protections that are already applied to combat veterans?

Mr. WILKIE. I am not familiar with all separation protections afforded by combat veterans but all servicemembers, particularly those who are victims of sexual assault, should be afforded all legal protections.

DOD WORKING GROUP ON ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW BOARDS

13. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, practices of the Board for the Correction of Military Records and the Discharge Review Board are inconsistent across the Services and board members do not always review applications or final decisions personally. If confirmed, how will you address this issue and improve consistency among these boards?

Mr. WILKIE. It is vital that all cases be reviewed individually by all of those who are empowered to make such decisions. If confirmed, I will look into this matter.

14. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, do you believe a working group, established by the Secretary of Defense, would be helpful to improve communication with military law practitioners and veteran service organizations (VSO), as well as provide recommendations for consistent policies and best practices?

Mr. WILKIE. My understanding is that the Department started a working in this area a little over a year ago. I think it is a good idea, and if confirmed I will look into it further.

TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

15. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, training is necessary to ensure that members of Boards for the Correction of Military Records and DOD personnel who investigate claims of retaliation have the knowledge and skills necessary to properly review claims in which sexual assault is alleged to have contributed to the characterization of discharge. Variability in the application of evidentiary standards applied by members of boards and investigators has resulted in lack of a clear standards. Do you believe these individuals should be provided with guidelines for the consideration of evidence substantiating allegations of sexual assault?

Mr. WILKIE. They should be given all legal and policy training available within the Department on this issue.

BURDEN OF PROOF

16. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, currently, the burden of proof applied to military whistleblowers is significantly great than for similarly situated civilians. In military reprisal cases, servicemembers must prove retaliation occurred; in civilian cases, the agency must prove retaliation occurred. Do you support applying the burden of proof standard as defined by section 1221(e) of title 5 to provide a more consistent legal standard?

Mr. WILKIE. I am not sufficiently current on this aspect of the law, but protecting whistleblowers should be a priority for all leadership and I will see that those members of the Department family are afforded all available legal protections.

INDEXING

17. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Wilkie, currently, Boards for the Correction of Military Records do not index published decisions relating to cases where sexual assault is alleged to have contributed to the original characterization of the discharge or release of the servicemember. While cases are published, they are not indexed or summarized, making it difficult to track down. Do you support requiring the Boards for the Correction of Military Records to index decisions related to sexual assault cases in order to better ensure cases are easily accessible for review?

Mr. WILKIE. The Department should be transparent to the Congress and public. I am not a legal expert but if confirmed, I will review the legal and policy parameters you have set forth and look into this matter.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MAZIE K. HIRONO

LONG TERM TRAVEL BENEFITS

18. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Wilkie, effective November 1, 2014, the DOD's Per Diem, Travel, and Transportation Allowance Committee (PDTATAC) significantly reduced the per diem allowances for long-term temporary duty (TDY), reducing per diem and lodging rates by 25 percent for TDY longer than 30 days, and by 45 percent for travel longer than 180 days. This can significantly impact the effectiveness of our shipyards and depots. These reductions can impact shipyards capacity, the ability to perform high-quality work on time, and can be harmful to the recruiting of the highest-skilled professionals to volunteer for temporary duty assignments where particular skills are in demand. This policy has already negatively impacted naval ship maintenance and the civilian workforce that supports this critical mission as documented in a letter from Naval Sea System Command (NAVSEA) dated January 19, 2016. Section 604 of the House-passed Fiscal Year 2018 NDAA would repeal the DOD's unilateral implementation of these cuts. A bipartisan Senate letter was recently sent to the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) and Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) leadership supporting the House provision. If confirmed,

will you commit to closely looking closely at this issue including the impacts to readiness, recruiting, retention as well as the additional resources required to collect, submit, review, authorize and validate individual receipts now being required? I would like to hear about your findings.

Mr. WILKIE. Per Diem is a vital matter for all serving. If confirmed, I will commit to investigating this matter.

READINESS AND TRAINING

19. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Wilkie, the Navy just released the collision report for USS *Fitzgerald* and USS *John S. McCain* collisions which cited failures in training and standards as the root cause of the accidents. It also concluded that fatigue played a direct role as well. The Navy has confirmed that some sailors were working 100 hour weeks. The Services do not always have control over operational requirements but it is incumbent on leadership to create an environment where standards are maintained and servicemembers are given the opportunity to complete training and certification requirements to ensure that they are prepared for the battlefield. What do you plan to do to shape the overall readiness of our forces?

Mr. WILKIE. We will need to work with combatant commanders to balance meeting their demands with ensuring the Military Services have enough time to train on the range and repair and upgrade vehicles and weapons. A priority will be to balance training with the needs of forward deployed commands, while always being mindful of the dwell time demand on our Service members and their families.

TRICARE PHARMACEUTICAL OPTIONS

20. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Wilkie, section 743 of the Fiscal Year 2017 NDAA provided authority for DOD to conduct a pilot program to study the cost-saving benefits of offering TRICARE beneficiaries the option of purchasing brand maintenance medication at retail pharmacies. This would expand their choices beyond mail-order and military treatment facilities. It would be an especially helpful option for beneficiaries who live hours away from the nearest MTF. To localize the issue, I have many constituents who live on islands that do not have MTFs. Because DOD declined to exercise those authorities before the end of the fiscal year, 21 Senators and 67 Representatives signed letters supporting an extension of the deadline and encouraging DOD to move forward with the pilot. What is your intention relating to this pilot program?

Mr. WILKIE. We must explore all options that make medical care more accessible to the military community. If confirmed, I will commit to work with you and the pharmaceutical industry to explore any option that increases beneficiary access to needed medications while not increasing costs to the American taxpayer.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ELIZABETH WARREN

TRANSGENDER

21. Senator WARREN. Mr. Wilkie, do you think that otherwise qualified applicants should be denied the opportunity to serve based on gender identity alone?

Mr. WILKIE. The only conditions we should apply to any servicemember are physical and mental fitness and as General Dunford pointed out—worldwide deployability.

22. Senator WARREN. Mr. Wilkie, thousands of qualified transgender Americans will serve in the military whether or not there is a ban. Any potential ban will simply force those servicemembers to lie about their identity to avoid being discharged. This would essentially reinstate a “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” type policy. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified in 2010 that he was “troubled by the fact that we have in place a policy which forces... men and women to lie about who they are in order to defend their fellow citizens.” Do you share Admiral Michael Mullen’s view?

Mr. WILKIE. Society and the military has changed even since Admiral Mullen’s statement. I discussed those changes with Admiral Mullen as Assistant Secretary of Defense in 2009. It is my belief the standard articulated by Secretary Mattis at his confirmation hearing and the CJCS are accepted by all members of the military—mental and physical fitness and the ability to meet fighting standards and deploy. In my career that means if you perform your unit accepts you, period.

CAREER MANAGEMENT

23. Senator WARREN. Mr. Wilkie, the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) is nearly 40 years old and one of the key features of DOPMA is the up or out promotion system. Do you support any changes to that system, particularly for occupational specialties such as cyber?

Mr. WILKIE. We must stop limiting all members to an up or out system. We should provide career tracks that offer members a path to master what they enjoy doing as opposed to everyone being forced into a chief of staff track. I support changes that would give the Services flexibility to retain highly talented officers.

24. Senator WARREN. Mr. Wilkie, would you be in favor of creating separate career tracks for technical military occupational specialties?

Mr. WILKIE. The solution is in our military's past experience. During your brothers service in Vietnam they interacted with thousands of warrant officers. These were the Army's technical experts brought in for their singular skills in aviation, computers, etc. Re-opening the warrant officer track for cyber and technical is overdue. We also need to bring back lateral accessions to mine areas like Route 128 to offer interested Americans an opportunity to serve at a level commensurate with their skills, e.g. bring a professor or technical expert into the service for an amount of time, at an appropriate rank up to the grade of Colonel. This was done in World War II.

GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY

25. Senator WARREN. Mr. Wilkie, more than half of our enlisted recruits come from just six States. Much of New England and part of the upper Midwest are underrepresented in the force and I am concerned that this reinforces the divide between civilians and our military. What are some of the things we could do to increase the geographic diversity of the force?

Mr. WILKIE. New England has a proud tradition through the Yankee Davison and its Guard and Reserve units. One of the most fertile grounds for Marine Corps recruiting by historic trends is South and Central Boston. This is one of if not the most important questions we must address—getting young people excited about service. In response to a question from Senator Inhofe along these lines I noted that we need to open our aperture on social media and online recruiting. In my last position at the Department I reviewed several requests from New England schools who were looking for JROTC faculty—we did not have the funding. We need to get people in touch with the military life. JROTC is one way as is going into our community colleges (which are strong in New England) and offering those young people military positions to match their technical skills.

26. Senator WARREN. Mr. Wilkie, do you think geographic diversity is important?

Mr. WILKIE. Yes—national service needs a fifty state solution.

[The nomination reference of the Honorable Robert L. Wilkie follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 25, 2017.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert L. Wilkie, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, vice Jessica Garfola Wright, resigned.

[The biographical sketch of The Honorable Robert L. Wilkie, which was transmitted to the Committee at the time the nomination was referred, follows:]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT L. WILKIE

Education:

- Wake Forest University

- 1982 to 1985
- Bachelor of Arts, cum laude
- Loyola College of Law (New Orleans)
 - 1985 to 1988
 - Juris Doctor
- Georgetown University Law Center
 - 1989 to 1992
 - Master of Laws in International and Comparative Law
- United States Army War College
 - 2000 to 2002
 - Master of Strategic Studies

Military Education:

- College of Naval Command and Staff
 - 1999 to 2000
- United States Army War College
 - 2000-2002
- Joint Forces Staff College
 - 2005
- College of Air Command and Staff
 - 2009

Employment Record:

- Office of United States Senator Thom Tillis
 - Senior Advisor
 - February 2015 to Present
- Office of Presidential Transition-Cabinet Affairs
 - Advisor
 - November 2016 to January 2017
- United States Air Force (Active Duty)
 - Staff Officer
 - May 2014 to February 2015
- CH2M HILL Ltd.
 - Vice-President for Strategic Initiatives
 - June 2010 to February 2015
- United States Air Force (Active Duty)
 - Staff Officer
 - February 2009 to June 2010
- Department of Defense
 - Assistant Secretary of Defense
 - October 2006 to January 2009
- Department of Defense
 - Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense
 - May 2005 to October 2006
- Executive Office of the President-National Security Council
 - Special Assistant
 - January 2003 to May 2005
- Office of the Senate Majority Leader, The Honorable Trent Lott
 - Counsel
 - February 1997 to January 2003
- North Carolina Republican Party
 - Executive Director
 - June 1996 to February 1997
- Candidate for US House of Representatives
 - 1996
- Office of Representative David Funderburk (R-NC)
 - Legislative Director
 - January 1995 to December 1995
- Office of Senator Jesse Helms
 - Counsel
 - August 1988 to January 1995
- Office of Senator Jesse Helms
 - Intern

- May 1987 to August 1987
- Loyola University College of Law
 - Research Assistant
 - August 1987 to May 1988

Honors and Awards:

- Military Awards
 - Meritorious Service Medal
 - Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal
 - Joint Meritorious Unit Medal
 - National Defense Service Medal
 - Armed Forces Reserve Medal
 - Global War on Terrorism Service Medal
 - Air Force Longevity Ribbon
 - Air Staff Identification Badge
- Federal Civilian Awards
 - Department of Defense-Distinguished Public Service Medal
- Academic Awards
 - Bustamante Award of the Society of Jesus for Excellence in International Law
 - Lisko Lewis Scholarship for Appellate Advocacy
 - American Jurisprudence Awards in: *International Law, Latin American Law, Legislation, Comparative Law, Western Legal Tradition.*
 - Moot Court Board

[The Committee on Armed Services requires all individuals nominated from civilian life by the President to positions requiring the advice and consent of the Senate to complete a form that details the biographical, financial, and other information of the nominee. The form executed by The Honorable Robert L. Wilkie in connection with his nomination follows:]

UNITED STATES SENATE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ROOM SR-228

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6050

(202) 224-3871

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FORM

BIOGRAPHICAL AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION REQUESTED OF
NOMINEES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Complete all requested information. If more space is needed, space is needed, use an additional sheet and cite the part of the form and the question number (i.e. A-9, B-4) to which the continuation of your answer applies. Unless otherwise required, an answer of yes, no, or not applicable is appropriate.

PART A—BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Biographical information furnished in this part of the form will be made available in Committee offices for public inspection prior to the hearing and will also be published in any hearing record as well as made available to the public.

1. **Name:** (Include any former names used.)
Robert L. Wilkie, Jr.
2. **Position to which nominated:**
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
3. **Date of nomination:**

July 25, 2017

4. **Address:** (List current place of residence and office addresses.)

[The nominee responded and the information is contained in the Committee's executive files.]

5. **Year and place of birth:**

August 6, 1962, Frankfurt, West Germany (father was a First Lieutenant in the 3rd Armored Division)

6. **Marital status:** (Include full name of current spouse including any other names used, including maiden name.)

Julia Bullard Wilkie, Married

7. **Names of children (if over age 18):**

Adam S. Wilkie

8. **Education:** List names of secondary and higher education institutions attended, type of school (vocational, technical, trade school, college, university, military college, correspondence, distance, extension, and on-line) dates attended, degree received, and date degree granted.

- United States Army War College-Master of Strategic Studies, 2002
- Georgetown University Law Center-Master of Laws in International and Comparative Law, 1989-1992
- Loyola University College of Law (New Orleans)-Juris Doctor, 1985-1988
- Wake Forest University-Bachelor of Arts, *cum laude*, 1982-1985
- Tulane University 1980-1982
- Reid Ross Senior High School (Fayetteville, North Carolina) 1977-1980

Military Education:

- Air Command and Staff College, 2009
- Joint Force Staff College, 2005
- United States Army War College, 2002
- College of Naval Command and Staff, 2000
- Navy-Marine Corps Expeditionary Warfare Intelligence Course 1999
- Naval Special Warfare Intelligence Course 2000

9. **Employment record:** List all jobs held since college or in the last 10 years, whichever is less, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of employment. If the employment activity was military duty, list separate employment activity periods to show each change of military duty station.

- Office of United States Senator Thom Tillis
 - Senior Advisor and Counsel
 - 2015 to Present
- CH2M HILL, Limited
 - Vice President for Defense Integration and Strategic Initiatives
 - 2010 to 2015
- Department of Defense
 - Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs)
 - 2005 to 2009
- The National Security Council
 - Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs,
 - Senior Director of the National Security Council
 - 2003 to 2005
- Office of the Senate Majority Leader, The Honorable Trent Lott
 - Counsel and Advisor on International Security Affairs
 - 2000 to 2003
- Office of the Senate Majority Leader, The Honorable Trent Lott
 - Counsel and Advisor on Appropriations and Senate Rules and Procedure
 - 1997 to 2000

Military Service

- Lieutenant Colonel, United States Air Force (Reserve) Operational and Staff Responsibilities: Highlights
 - 2008 to Present
 - Special Assistant to the A-9 of the United States Air Force

- Special Advisor to the Chief of the Air Force Quadrennial Review Office and editor of the Air Force chapters.
 - (Active Duty 2009 to 2010, 2014 to 2015).
 - Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy (Reserve) Operational and Staff Responsibilities:
 - 1997 to 2008
 - Directed and Managed Maritime Intelligence Team tasked with supporting forward deployed forces engaged in interdicting terrorist forces using the seas to smuggle weapons and drugs.
 - Developed planning and template for execution of non-combatant evacuation operations across the SOUTHCOM and EUCOM theaters.
 - Member of three man team tasked with creating the first Naval Special Warfare Intelligence Reserve Unit (Reserve) within Naval Special Warfare Group Two. Upon formation became the unit Psychological and Information Warfare Officer. Supported operations in Liberia, Albania, and the Middle East.
 - Served as Intelligence officer and operational planner for the Atlantic Intelligence Command; Joint Forces Intelligence Command; and the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.
 - Named as Intelligence Officer of the Year for the Office of Naval Intelligence Reserve unit, 2003 to 2004.
 - Nominated for the Vice Admiral Rufus Taylor Award as the Outstanding Intelligence Officer in the United States Navy, 2003.
 - First junior officer requested by name to serve on the Commander Naval Reserve Force Policy Board for three years, 2003 to 2005.
10. **Government experience:** List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments, other than those listed above.
- Presidential Transition Office 2016-2017--Cabinet Affairs-Responsible for the nomination and confirmation of the Secretary of Defense
11. **Business relationships:** List all positions currently held as an officer, director, trustee, partner, proprietor, agent, representative, or consultant of any corporation, company, firm, partnership, or other business enterprise, educational or other institution.
- None
12. **Memberships:** List all memberships and offices currently held in professional, fraternal, scholarly, civic, business, charitable and other organizations.
- Member of the Board—Jesse Helms Center and Foundation, Monroe, North Carolina (Congressional Archive-not compensated for service)
 - Member of the Board—North Carolina Chapter of the United States Global Leadership Coalition
 - Member—Council on Foreign Relations
 - Member—Royal United Services Institute
 - Member—The Henry Jackson Society
 - Member—The Air Force Association
 - Member—Association of the United States Army (Braxton Bragg Chapter)
 - Life Member—United States Army War College Alumni Association
13. **Political affiliations and activities:**
- (a) If you have ever been a candidate for or have been elected or appointed to a political office, list the name of the office(s), whether you were elected/appointed/candidate, the year(s) the election was held or the appointment was made, and the term of office (if applicable).
- Candidate for Congress-7th District of North Carolina 1996
- (b) List all memberships and offices held in and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last 5 years.
- Author and Editor of the National Security Chapter of the 2012 Republican Presidential Platform.
 - Author and Editor of the National Security Chapter of the 2016 Republican Presidential Platform.
 - *Presidential Transition Office 2016-2017—Cabinet Affairs*
 - *Responsible for the nomination and confirmation of the Secretary of Defense*

(c) Itemize all individual political contributions of \$100 or more to any Individual, campaign organization, political party, political action committee, or similar entity for the past 5 years. List each individual contribution and not the total amount contributed to the person or entity during the year.

None

14. **Honors and Awards:** List all scholarships, fellowships, honorary society memberships, military medals and any other special recognitions for outstanding service or achievements.

- Bustamente Award of the Society of Jesus for Excellence In International Law
- American Jurisprudence Awards in: International Law, Latin American Law, American Jurisprudence Awards in: International Law, Latin American Law, Legislation, Comparative Law, Western Legal Tradition
- Lewis Scholarship for Appellate Advocacy.
- Loyola College of Law Moot Court Board
- Defense Distinguished Public Service Medal-the highest civilian award of the Department of Defense.
- Intelligence Officer of the Year for the Office of Naval Intelligence Reserve unit, 2003-2004

Military Awards

- Meritorious Service Medal
- Navy Marine Corps Achievement Medal
- National Defense Service Medal
- Global War on Terrorism Service Medal
- Reserve Forces Service Medal
- Air Force Longevity Ribbon
- Air Staff Identification Badge

15. **Published writings:** List the titles, publishers, and dates of books, articles, reports, or other published materials which you have written including articles published on the internet.

- What Would Curtis Do? Reform and the Survival of the United States Air Force, *Royal United Services Institute*. London: July 2014.
- “Where is Dick Nixon When You Need Him”, *Richard Nixon Presidential Library Forum*, April 2014.
- Hybrid Warfare: Something Old, Not Something New, *Air and Space Power Journal*, Winter 2010.
- The Air Force at a Crossroads, *Armed Forces Journal International*, April 2009.
- “Fortress Europa”, *Strategy for Empire: U.S. Regional Security Policy in the Post-Cold War Era*, Brian Loveman, ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2004.
- Fortress Europa: European Defense and the Future of the North Atlantic Alliance, *PARAMETERS*, Winter 2002.
- Balancing Star Wars and Muddy Boots, *PROCEEDINGS*, vol. 126, issue 10, October 2000.
- Navy 2001: Back to the Future, *The Naval War College Review*, Spring 2000.

16. **Speeches:** Provide the Committee with two copies of any formal speeches you have delivered during the last 5 years of which you have copies and are on topics relevant to the position for which you have been nominated.

- Helms Lecture with Senator Ted Cruz—Heritage Foundation September 13, 2013
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A6l2ridcJxl>
- Helms Lecture with Ambassador Ron Dermer-Heritage Foundation May 14, 2015
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OPkMLulsKoQ>

17. Commitments regarding nomination, confirmation, and service:

(a) If confirmed, will you adhere to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

Yes

(b) Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

No

(c) If confirmed, will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

Yes

(d) Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to Congressional requests?

Yes

(e) Will you promise to enforce or ensure whistleblower protections for all those witnesses?

Yes

(f) Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this Committee?

Yes

(g) Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted Committee, or to consult with the Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Yes

[The nominee responded to Parts B–F of the Committee questionnaire. The text of the questionnaire is set forth in the Appendix to this volume. The nominee’s answers to Parts B–F are contained in the Committee’s executive files.]

SIGNATURE AND DATE

I hereby state that I have read and signed the foregoing Statement on Biographical and Financial Information and that the information provided therein is, to the best of my knowledge, current, accurate, and complete.

Robert L. Wilkie

This 1st day of August, 2017

[The nomination of The Honorable Robert L. Wilkie, was reported to the Senate by Chairman McCain on November 7, 2017, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on November 16, 2017.]

[Prepared questions submitted to Dr. Mark Esper by Chairman McCain prior to the hearing with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REFORMS

Question. The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017 included the most sweeping reforms since the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

Do you support these reforms?

Answer. Yes, I support the Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act reforms. If I am confirmed, I will work with senior Army and DOD leaders to ensure these reforms are fully implemented, and will keep the Committee apprised on our progress.

Question. What other areas for defense reform do you believe might be appropriate for this Committee to address?

Answer. While I have no specific reforms to propose at this time, I anticipate some will be necessary given the ever-changing global security environment and the premium I intend to place, if confirmed, on maximizing the effectiveness and efficiency of the Army in all that it does. My intent is to closely monitor the implementation of ongoing reforms, and work closely with Congress on any other reforms that could improve the readiness and effectiveness of the Army.

QUALIFICATIONS

Question. What background and experience do you possess that qualify you for this position?

Answer. I have spent nearly three decades working to advance our Nation's security in the military, in government, and in the private sector. The foundation of this service is my twenty-one years as an Infantry officer in the U.S. Army, with over ten years on active duty, and another eleven years in the National Guard and Army Reserve. During my military career, I had the privilege of leading soldiers in both wartime and peace, in a broad range of command and staff assignments, and in locations extending from the United States, to the Middle East, and to Europe. All of this experience gives me an invaluable understanding of the Total Army—its culture, organization, and functions—and the critical role that our soldiers, their families, and the civilian workforce play in defending our country.

My experience on Capitol Hill as a Professional Staffer, working a broad range of national security issues in the Senate and House—to include on the House Armed Services Committee and in Senate Leadership—provides me a solid understanding of the challenges facing the Army from a Hill perspective, and a deep appreciation of Congress' vital Article I responsibilities with regard to the Armed Forces. To that end, I understand the importance of the Army's leaders partnering with the defense committees to address the challenges facing the Department.

I also believe that my prior experience working in the Pentagon as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense in OSD Policy, leading senior military and civilian professionals to advance important national security policy objectives, and my earlier assignment as a war planner on the Army Staff, gives me a good understanding of how the Pentagon works, the roles of the OSD, Joint, and Service Staffs, and how to maximize success in a large organization.

Finally, I believe my broad private sector experiences, especially as a senior executive at a major defense company, have provided me a good sense of the Army's acquisition challenges, ideas on how Industry can do better, practical knowledge of modern-day business practices that maximize effectiveness, and how best to lead others in a way that can drive positive, long-term results that best support our soldiers.

All of these experiences—coupled with the extensive leadership training and the broadening experiences I have had over the years at West Point, in the Army, in government, and in the private sector—have provided me with the background, skills, knowledge, and values that I believe have prepared me well to be Secretary of the Army.

DUTIES

Question. Section 3013 of title 10, United States Code, states the Secretary of the Army shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of the Army may prescribe.

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Secretary of the Army?

Answer. The Secretary of the Army is the head of the Department of the Army. Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Defense, the Secretary of the Army is responsible for all the affairs of the Department including, but not limited to, recruiting, training, organizing, and equipping the Army to meet its global requirements; most importantly, this means fulfilling the current and future operational requirements of the unified and specified combatant commands.

Question. What recommendations, if any, do you have for changes in the duties and functions of the Secretary of the Army, as set forth in section 3013 of title 10, United States Code, or in Department of Defense regulations pertaining to functions of the Secretary of the Army?

Answer. I do not currently have any recommendations to change title 10. If confirmed, I will continually assess the Secretary's duties and functions. If I believe changes are required, I will consult with the Secretary of Defense and, as appropriate, work closely with the Committee on any proposed legislative changes.

Question. What additional duties, if any, do you expect will be prescribed for you?

Answer. I am not aware of any additional duties that the Secretary of Defense may be considering for me if I am confirmed.

MAJOR CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES

Question. If confirmed, what broad priorities will you establish?

Answer. A foundational priority of every Army leader must be to ensure the Army's soldiers, families, and civilian employees are well led, well supported, and well cared for. People are the essence of the Army, so it is absolutely imperative that we recruit and retain a high-quality force, and that we provide them with the professional opportunities and quality of life they deserve.

The next priority I would address if confirmed is Readiness—making sure the Total Army can deploy, fight and win across the full spectrum of conflict today. This means that units are fully manned, weapons and equipment are well maintained, munitions stocks are sufficient, and training—particularly for high end combat—is ample, rigorous and realistic.

Another priority I would address if confirmed is Modernization—building the capacity and capabilities of the Total Army over the longer term. This involves growing the size of the force, strengthening its combat formations, and providing it with the best weapons and equipment available to ensure clear overmatch in future conflicts against near-peer competitors. To do this, my personal challenge will be to articulate a clear vision of where the Army needs to be in the future based on the defense strategy, and to greatly improve the Acquisition system.

The final priority I would address if confirmed is Efficiency—reforming the way the Total Army works to free up time, money, and manpower to reinvest or utilize elsewhere. This includes conducting an audit; reforming the acquisition system; eliminating unnecessary bureaucratic processes; delayering, reshaping, and/or right-sizing organizations; empowering leaders at all levels; increasing engagement with the commercial sector and the defense industry; and borrowing the best business practices from the private sector, to name a few.

Question. In your view, what are the major challenges facing the Army today?

Answer. The Army faces many challenges. Some of the most important ones are recruiting and retaining a high-quality force, and ensuring it is well led, as we grow the force. A second challenge is readiness, meaning the capability to deploy, fight, and win today along the full spectrum of conflict. A third challenge is advancing the future readiness of the force through modernization, which includes increasing the capacity and capabilities of the Total Army in the long term to ensure clear overmatch in future conflicts against near-peer competitors. Critical to modernization is a clear vision of the future Army, a comprehensive modernization strategy, and the need to greatly improve the Acquisition system. A fourth challenge is changing the way the Army operates on a daily basis to increase its efficiency, and thus free up time, money and manpower to invest or utilize in other priorities. And finally, a major challenge is the lack of sustained, predictable, and higher/sufficient levels of annual funding that would ensure the Army could well execute the full range of its title 10 responsibilities.

Question. If confirmed, how would you prioritize your work to solve these challenges?

Answer. If confirmed, the readiness of the Total Army to deploy, fight, and win today against a near-peer threat would be my top priority. This means prioritizing the Army's budget, leadership focus, and all associated efforts to ensure units are fully manned, weapons and equipment are well maintained, munitions stocks are sufficient, and training is ample, rigorous and realistic.

At the same time, long term readiness—also known as modernization—must be tackled. This will require a clear vision of the future Army and hard choices on which programs and initiatives to fully fund, partially fund, or forego. In addition, the Army Acquisition process needs to be reformed, from organizations, policies, procedures, and participants, to organizational and individual behaviors, expectations, and authorities. There also needs to be greater engagement with industry, and a closer partnership with the commercial sector, to ensure that the weapons and equipment our soldiers need are delivered on cost and schedule.

Finally, the Total Army needs to become more efficient in all that it does, so as to free up time, money, and manpower that can be reinvested or utilized in priorities such as readiness, modernization, and taking better care of our soldiers and their families.

Question. What do you consider to be the most serious problems in the performance of the functions of the Secretary of the Army?

Answer. The most serious problem confronting the Secretary of the Army in performing the office's title 10 duties and responsibilities is the lack of sustained, predictable, and higher/sufficient levels of annual funding.

Question. If confirmed, what management actions and timelines would you establish to address these problems?

Answer. The near term readiness of the Total Army is the immediate priority. With the rise of near-peer threats around the world that could draw the Nation into a high-end confrontation, funding and leadership focus must be on accelerating the readiness of deploying units when it comes to manning, maintenance, munitions stockpiles, and training for such contingencies. The Army leadership must communicate this prioritization throughout the force, understand the metrics by which readiness is measured and monitor its progress, leverage all necessary resources to facilitate success, and convey a clear sense of urgency in meeting this goal. I understand the Army is currently pursuing many of these actions. If confirmed, I intend to take an active, constant, and personal role in advancing the Army's readiness.

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Question. What are your views on the state of the relationship between the Army and the Senate Armed Services Committee in particular, and with Congress in general?

Answer. I believe the current relationship between the Army and Congress is good, and that the relationship between the Army and the Committee is even better. My aim, though, if confirmed, would be to take the relationship to the next level.

Having served in various capacities in the legislative branch, to include on the House Armed Services Committee, I know well the fundamental Article I responsibilities of the defense committees when it comes to the Armed Forces. Further, I understand the committees' critical oversight role and the premium they place on the full and timely provision of information. If confirmed, I would like to build a partnership with the defense committees that treats its Members as partners in helping solve many of the challenges facing the Army. Doing this requires a continuous, candid, and collaborative dialogue between the Army's senior leaders and the defense committees.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and the Army?

Answer. A strong and collaborative relationship between Congress and the Army is vital to advancing the Nation's security. If confirmed, I intend to maintain a continuous and candid dialogue with the defense committees on a broad range of Army issues before Congress. I am personally committed to meeting with Members on a routine basis to update them on Army issues, to answer their questions, and to seek their ideas and thoughts on some of the complex matters facing the Department. Finally, I hope to broaden and deepen the engagement between the Army's leadership and Congress across the board.

TORTURE AND ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES

Question. Do you support the standards for detainee treatment specified in the revised Army Field Manual on Interrogations, FM 2-22.3, issued in September 2006, and in DOD Directive 2310.01E, the Department of Defense Detainee Program, dated August 19, 2014, and required by section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016 (Public Law 114-92)?

Answer. Yes, I fully support the detainee treatment standards specified in the Army Field Manual on Interrogations, the DOD Directive, and the fiscal year 2016 NDAA. These standards ensure adherence to our domestic and international obligations with regard to the humane and proper treatment of detainees.

HEADQUARTERS STREAMLINING

Question. The National Defense Authorization Acts for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 direct reforms to consolidate the headquarters functions of the Department of Defense and the military departments.

If confirmed, what would be your role in streamlining functions in the Department of the Army headquarters?

Answer. If confirmed, I will be responsible for ensuring the Department of the Army accomplishes its title 10 responsibilities as effectively and efficiently as possible. Streamlining the Department's functions, an ongoing task, could free up time, money, and manpower to reinvest or utilize in higher priority areas such as readiness, modernization, and soldier welfare.

I will work with senior Army leaders to effect a number of initiatives designed to further streamline the headquarters, and the broader Department. These include

an ongoing Army effort to reduce all two-star and above headquarters by 25 percent over the 2015 to 2019 timeframe; layering headquarters and increasing supervisors' span of control; bringing best business practices to the Department's operations, especially the Acquisition system; and getting rid of bureaucratic processes and policies that drive inefficiency. Finally, I will push to identify additional opportunities to streamline the Army's headquarters and commands while maintaining overall effectiveness.

Question. What areas and functions, specifically and if any, do you consider to be the priorities for possible consolidation or reductions within the Department of the Army?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to look closely and continuously for any opportunity to reduce or consolidate Army functions and organizations that do not improve the readiness or lethality of the force. My focus will be on headquarters, non-warfighting activities, and functions that are redundant and/or not making a material contribution to readiness.

Question. To the extent that the Department of the Army has functions that overlap with the Department of Defense, Joint Staff, or other military departments, what would be your approach to consolidating and reducing redundancy?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with DOD and Joint Staff leaders, the other Services' leadership, the Army Secretariat and Staff, and others to identify redundancies among headquarters and staffs, and then work with these same leaders to consolidate, reduce or eliminate these overlaps in a manner that does not impact either DOD's or the Department of the Army's title 10 responsibilities, or the ability of the military to fight and win the Nation's wars.

END STRENGTH

Question. In this year's budget request, the Department of Defense proposes sustaining the increased active-duty Army end strength of 476,000. Meanwhile, included among the Army Chief of Staff's unfunded requirements are an additional 10,000 active-duty soldiers and 7,000 reserve component soldiers.

In your view, can the Army meet national defense objectives at its current end strength levels proposed under the current budget? If not, what should be the Army's end strength and why?

Answer. I believe that current national defense objectives necessitate a higher Total Army end strength. General Milley has expressed his concerns to Congress about the Army's ability to accomplish its assigned tasks at its current size. I share these concerns.

The Total Army's end strength should be based on the National Defense Strategy and the National Military Strategy. The Secretary of Defense is currently conducting a strategic review. I believe the results of this review will inform the Army of its updated Defense Planning Guidance tasks, the capabilities required to accomplish these tasks, and the size and organization of the force necessary to ensure success across the full spectrum of conflict.

Question. The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017 authorized an active-duty Army end strength of 476,000 soldiers. Will the Army reach that authorization by the end of fiscal year 2017? How will these additional soldiers be employed? Will this additional force structure be ready to fight, or will it be hollow?

Answer. It is my understanding the Army believes it met its active-duty end strength goal of 476,000 in fiscal year 2017. The Army intends to employ these soldiers in a variety of ways, but with a clear focus on near-term readiness. This end strength increase will allow the Army to improve the manning of select combat units that are high on the deployment list; grow the capabilities of the BCTs by, for example, increasing the number of air defense and long-range artillery assets; and, build Security Force Assistance Brigades. If confirmed, I will continue to focus the Army on increasing the readiness of Total Army units to deploy, fight, and win across the entire spectrum of conflict.

Question. Will increased end strength be used to solve current readiness problems or build force structure for future requirements?

Answer. My understanding is that Army end strength increases will do both. The increase in end strength will first fill personnel manning levels in deploying units. This end strength increase will also be used to build Security Force Assistance Brigades, and add capacity in long-range field artillery, short-range air defense, and cyber capabilities, for example. These investments will increase readiness, address known capability gaps that the Army may have when facing a near-peer adversary, and satisfy combatant commanders' operational demands.

Question. Would the Army be able to adequately meet recruitment standards and train and equip the additional 10,000 active-duty and 7,000 reserve component soldiers requested in the Army Unfunded Requirements?

Answer. I understand the Army believes it was very close to meeting the Total Army accession and retention requirements to achieve the increased force levels in fiscal year 2017, falling a little short in its reserve accession goals. To ensure a successful increase at the requested level next year, I understand the Army needed full funding early in the fiscal year in order to meet the training, manning, and equipping needs for this increased accession mission and to sustain a highly capable and ready force.

Question. Recently, the Army reported 12 percent of soldiers assigned to combat and combat support units cannot deploy with their units. What are the contributing factors leading to this situation? What does this mean to unit readiness and the Army's ability to both support combatant commanders and achieve Army readiness objectives?

Answer. As a former Infantry commander myself, I fully appreciate the challenges of meeting both training and combatant commander requirements with a unit that is not 100 percent deployable. Although I am unaware of all of the contributing factors, I understand that the leading cause of non-deployable soldiers in the Army stems from medical conditions, primarily musculoskeletal injuries.

This is a major readiness issue. Every soldier must be deployable, and leaders must play an active role in ensuring this is the case. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Army's senior leaders to understand all of the contributing factors, to reduce their prevalence and impact, and to close the readiness gap when it comes to soldier deployability. The ability of individual soldiers to deploy, and of combat units to train and fight at full strength, has a direct impact on mission success.

Question. What are your plans to improve personnel readiness?

Answer. If confirmed, I first want to better understand how the Army defines and measures individual readiness, and what factors would cause a soldier to be non-deployable. Next, I would work with Commanders, personnel experts, medical professionals, and other key leaders on how best to reduce the current non-deployable rate as quickly as possible, and how to prevent its resurgence going forward. Individual readiness, to include the ability to deploy, is absolutely critical to unit readiness, and thus success on the battlefield.

Question. What is your understanding of needed authorities to improve personnel readiness requiring legislation beyond what Congress has provided the past few years?

Answer. I am unaware at this time of any additional legislative authorities that are needed to improve personnel readiness.

Question. In your view, should the number of general and senior field grade officers in the Army be reduced? Does the ratio of leaders-to-led strike a proper balance?

Answer. I believe the number of general and senior field grade officers should be based on the leadership and management requirements of an Army that is operating globally in a number of domains, functions, and environments. As such, I do not believe that a leader-to-led ratio is the best way to determine how many senior officers the Total Army needs. If confirmed, I will work to right-size the operational and institutional Army, and the various functions required of the Department, as a first step to ensuring the total number of general and senior field grade officers is appropriate to mission requirements.

Question. What are your views on the appropriate size and mix of the active-duty Army, and the reserve components?

Answer. I believe the size, capabilities, and mix of the active duty and reserve components should be based on the requirements driven by the National Defense Strategy, the National Military Strategy, and the Defense Planning Guidance (DPG). While I believe the Total Army needs to grow, it needs to be done in a manner that ensures quality individuals are recruited and retained, that unit readiness is enhanced, and that an appropriate balance is maintained between all Army components.

Having served in the Active, Guard, and Reserve components of the Army, I understand the role each plays in meeting the Total Army's DPG tasks. If confirmed, I will work with the Secretary of Defense and the Army's leaders to assess the optimal size, capabilities, and mix of active duty and reserve units required to support the defense strategy.

ARMY RECRUITING AND RETENTION

Question. The retention of quality soldiers, officer and enlisted, active-duty and reserve, is vital to the Department of the Army.

How would you evaluate the ability of the Army over the past several years in a budget-constrained environment to successfully recruit and retain high-caliber personnel?

Answer. It is my understanding the Army has been successful in recruiting and retaining high caliber individuals over the last few years. The Army has done this by offering recruits an attractive career path and the opportunity to serve the Nation, and it has retained quality soldiers in critical specialties through selective bonuses.

Recruiting and retaining high quality soldiers in the future will likely be more challenging as the Army endeavors to grow the force. This is because the Army is competing with the private sector, in a growing economy, for talent from a finite pool of qualified 17 to 24 year olds (only some of whom are also interested in military service). In order to meet the recruiting mission in this environment, while also maintaining the quality of the force, additional resources will likely be required to continue attracting and retaining high quality individuals.

If confirmed, I look forward to the challenge of growing the capacity and capabilities of the Total Army, and doing so in a way that continues to attract and retain the high quality individuals that make the U.S. Army the most effective fighting force in the world.

Question. What impact do current medical and other qualifications for enlistment in the Army have on the number of individuals eligible for military service? If confirmed, what changes to such qualifications, if any, would you recommend to increase the number of individuals eligible for Army service without degrading the quality of recruits?

Answer. Maintaining the quality of Army recruits must be a priority; doing so is essential to the Army's readiness. It is my understanding that current medical and other qualifications standards for enlistment in the Army have not prevented the Service from achieving its accession mission since 2006.

I am currently unaware of the need to change any enlistment qualifications, and would not support lowering standards. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders, the accession command, and the medical community to ensure that if adjustments are required to increase our potential pool of eligible personnel, it is done so without degrading the quality of recruits.

Question. What initiatives would you take, if confirmed, to further improve Army recruiting and retention, in both the active and reserve components?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders on a variety of strategies to improve the recruitment and retention of quality individuals as the Service builds capacity. Based on the needs of the Total Army, I would look at initiatives that could offer a greater return on investment, such as variable enlistment terms, lateral entry from the private sector, and more robust sign-up bonuses for certain critical skills.

To increase the retention rates of high caliber soldiers and improve the quality of life for them and their families, I want to look at options that will provide soldiers with greater choice in their follow-on assignment (to include home stationing for an extended period of time) and offer them refined retention inducements that might be more attractive to them and their families.

Finally, my private sector experiences have taught me the power of an effective marketing strategy. I believe the Army needs an updated marketing strategy that not only reaches a much broader cross section of eligible youth and their influencers, but also one that appeals more to their aspirations and sense of patriotism.

READINESS

Question. What is your assessment of the current readiness of the Army to meet national security requirements across the full spectrum of military operations?

Answer. As I understand it, the Army is currently able to meet its global commitments at the lower end of the spectrum of conflict, but is increasingly challenged to respond with sufficiently trained and ready forces for conflict with a near-peer adversary at the higher end. While the Army is taking actions to improve its ability to deploy and fight across the full spectrum of conflict, this will take time, funding, and leadership.

Question. How do you assess the readiness of units in the Army National Guard and Army Reserves?

Answer. I understand that the readiness of all Army units—Regular Army, National Guard, and Army Reserve—is assessed using criteria that measure personnel,

equipment on hand, training, and equipment readiness. These standards apply to all components based on requirements from the United States Code, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Staff. Having personally served in all three components of the Total Army, I appreciate the important role that each plays in the Army's plans. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that current readiness criteria are sufficient, that readiness is being properly measured, and that the readiness of all units in the Total Army is paramount.

Question. What are the Army's readiness objectives? When will the Army achieve its objectives?

Answer. The Army designs its force structure and readiness objectives to meet Combatant Commanders' force requirements for ongoing and planned contingency operations. The National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy, and Defense Planning Guidance informs the Army's readiness objectives which, as I understand it, currently equates to having nearly two-thirds of Regular Army units and select Army National Guard and Army Reserve units ready for a high-end conflict with a near-peer adversary. Army leaders have stated that the Service will achieve this objective between fiscal years 2021 to 2023 with sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding, and provided there is no significant increase in the demand for forces.

Question. What is the Army getting ready for?

Answer. The Army must be ready to deploy, fight, and win across the full spectrum of conflict today. It is currently challenged to respond with sufficiently trained and ready forces for conflict with a near-peer adversary at the higher end. While the Army is taking actions to improve its ability to deploy, fight, and win across the full spectrum of conflict, this will take time, money and focused leadership attention at all levels of the Army.

Question. Does the Army have all the capacity and capabilities it needs to be ready to deter war? Does the Army have what it needs to decisively win a war against a peer adversary?

Answer. I do not believe the Army has all the capacity or the capabilities it needs to win decisively against a near-peer adversary today without considerable risk. To win decisively, the Total Army needs to be larger, more ready, better trained, and more capable when it comes to the robustness of its combat formations and the effectiveness of its weapons systems. If confirmed, I intend to work closely with the Army's senior leaders and Congress to ensure we can meet this standard as quickly as possible.

Question. What capabilities does the Army need to ensure future readiness?

Answer. To ensure future readiness, the Total Army must be sufficiently sized, trained, organized, and better equipped to fight and win on the modern battlefield. It must also be well led.

A key to future readiness is modernization—ensuring our soldiers have the best weapons and equipment available to ensure clear overmatch against a near-peer adversary in a high-end fight. Doing so means significantly upgrading or replacing many of our current combat platforms to maximize mobility, protection and lethality. Future readiness also means that our combat formations are as robust as possible, with capability gaps closed and force multipliers enhanced. My initial assessment is that the Army needs more heavy forces and greater capabilities when it comes to, among a number of things, short range air and missile defenses; long-range fires; electronic warfare; offensive and defensive cyber operations; and, assured communications.

If confirmed, I intend to begin closing many of these capability gaps by giving them my personal attention; by placing a clear priority on them in the budget; by reforming the Acquisition system to ensure better systems are delivered on cost and schedule; by working more closely with industry and commercial partners; and by adopting or adapting systems currently used by our sister services or allies.

Question. Can the Army simultaneously maintain readiness and modernization?

Answer. If adequately resourced with increased, sustained, and predictable funding, and with the focused attention of leaders at all levels, I believe the Army can simultaneously improve readiness and modernize the force.

Question. How will you improve the readiness of the Army? How will you hold the Army's leaders accountable?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with the Department's senior leaders to improve readiness across the Total Army by ensuring units are fully manned, weapons and equipment are well maintained, munitions stocks are sufficient, and training—particularly for high end combat—is ample, rigorous and realistic.

Based on my 21 years of service in the Army, to include a combat tour during the Gulf War, I understand well the importance of readiness. Central to that is empowering and holding leaders accountable at all levels for the readiness of their soldiers and units. As such, if confirmed, I intend to take a thorough look at how readi-

ness is defined, measured, and assessed to ensure we are getting a full and accurate picture of every unit's readiness to deploy, fight and win, and the readiness of their leaders to drive success.

ACQUISITION

Question. The National Defense Authorization Acts for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 emplaced myriad changes to defense acquisition processes, including reinserting service chief influence and accountability into acquisition processes.

Do you support the acquisition reform provisions in the recent National Defense Authorization Acts?

Answer. Yes, I support the acquisition reforms outlined in the recent National Defense Authorization Acts, and I applaud the Committee's efforts to improve the acquisition process. If confirmed, I will work diligently to implement these provisions and look forward to partnering with Congress on other improvements.

Question. What is your assessment of the Army's recent performance in acquiring needed capabilities? Has the Army's acquisition effort achieved results on time and on budget? What has it put into the hands of soldiers?

Answer. The U.S. Army is the best ground combat force in the world, but has had a mixed record when it comes to delivering the weapons and equipment its soldiers need to be successful. The Army has had several high profile acquisition failures over the last 2+ decades that have squandered billions of dollars and many years. But the Army has had its share of successes as well.

Personal Protective Equipment, such as better body armor, is one area where I am informed the Army has made substantial improvements in recent years. Another is aviation, where I understand the Army has worked hard to upgrade its AH-64E Apache, CH-47F Chinook, and UH-60M Black Hawk helicopters to make them more capable. And finally, I understand the Army is improving the lethality of its Stryker Family of Vehicles against near-peer threats by arming them with a 30mm cannon or the Javelin anti-tank missile system.

If confirmed, I intend to make reform of the Acquisition process a top priority. Without reform of the current system, it will be extremely challenging for the Army to modernize the force. I believe the Army can do much better when it comes providing our soldiers with the weapons and equipment they need to be successful, and I intend to lead that effort if confirmed.

Question. What additional acquisition-related reforms do you believe this Committee should consider?

Answer. The fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Acts included a significant number of reforms. I understand the Army is committed to these reforms.

At this point, I believe that many of the additional Acquisition reforms that need to be made are internal to the Army, and do not necessarily require policy changes or increased funding. A number of studies performed on this topic over the years have made this point, and have identified specific actions that promise to make the process more effective.

If confirmed, I intend to pursue many of these actions, but will remain on the lookout for other changes that would require action by the Congress.

Question. How can the Army better access and integrate non-developmental commercial or governmental technology to modernize the force with greater efficiency?

Answer. There are a number of ways the Army can modernize the force with greater efficiency. One path is to work more closely with industry on technologies that are available now/quickly to upgrade existing systems. A second approach must include greater outreach to the commercial sector for items they may be able to provide either "off the shelf" or with minimal modification; critical to this is ensuring military specs are not unreasonably rigorous. A third approach is to look at what weapons and equipment our allies are successfully using, and either incorporating them in whole or adapting them to the Army's specific needs. Each of these approaches is viable, and has been used successfully in the past; all should be considered when seeking to procure a new or improved capability.

A second step is to prototype and demonstrate these systems as quickly as possible, and create opportunities for soldiers to use them in the lab, in realistic training exercises, and/or in real-world deployments. Leveraging soldier feedback from these experiences provides great insight into the effectiveness of the systems, how they integrate with other systems, and soldier satisfaction with them, among many things. All of this information and more is critical to assessing the viability of integrating the technology into the force.

If confirmed, I intend to pursue these approaches to modernize the force so that the Army is prepared to deploy, fight and win on future battlefields.

Question. If confirmed, how will you hold Army acquisition authorities accountable? What will be your measures of effectiveness?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to reform the Army's current Acquisition process, beginning with clarifying the lines of responsibility for each phase and function of the process—especially with regard to developing requirements—outlining the duties, expectations, and limitations of stakeholders at each of these key points, and integrating these functions on a continuous basis.

Next, I would aim to ensure the alignment of the duty assignments of PMs with the Milestones established for their programs to ensure there is a clean handover of the program at critical points, and so that clear measures of effectiveness—cost, schedule, and performance—can be assessed. I would aim to do the same with PEOs and their responsibility for the highest priority programs in their portfolio.

Additional measures of effectiveness should also be incorporated. Army leaders and acquisition authorities must be accountable for setting and adhering to system requirements that enhance capability, but are affordable and realistic; for working with industry and the commercial sector on ready-now/soon solutions; for testing systems against their established requirements; and for providing key deliverables at established timelines that are more aggressive because they place a premium on delivering weapons and equipment to the soldier as quickly as possible, for example.

Question. What is your assessment of the size and capability of the Army acquisition workforce?

Answer. I understand that the workforce is trained and capable, but may not be right-sized to the tasks at hand, or, sufficiently empowered to make smart decisions about equipping the force. I intend to work closely with the Army's senior leaders on addressing these questions and any other issues I may find, such as additional professional development opportunities, to ensure the Army's acquisition workforce is positioned to deliver what the force needs at cost and on schedule.

Question. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that the Department of the Army has an acquisition workforce with the size and capability needed to improve acquisition?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to take a close look at the size, capabilities, and performance of the acquisition workforce, working closely with the Army Acquisition Executive to understand the needs and challenges of the workforce. I will also make sure the Army can compete with the private sector for talent to attract and retain the highest quality of professionals for the acquisition workforce. Additionally, I will ensure the Army leverages all authorities granted by Congress to improve the acquisition workforce and how it procures weapons and equipment. Finally, if confirmed, I intend to get personally involved in many of the Army's top programs to not only ensure they are completed on cost and schedule, but to signal to the acquisition workforce and the Army the importance I place on them and the critical work that they do.

Question. If confirmed, how will you synchronize your acquisition responsibilities with the Army Chief of Staff (CSA)? Should the CSA have greater authorities, including decision authorities, for limited and full rate production?

Answer. I support the Chief of Staff's new authorities to concur with cost, schedule and performance trades for Milestone A and B decisions for Major Defense Acquisition Programs. So if confirmed, I intend to work closely with the CSA to ensure there is a proper balance among resources and priorities, and that trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance on major defense acquisition programs are fully informed and subjected to rigorous analysis. I will also review and assess program objectives on a recurring basis—and especially before program milestone and production decisions—with the CSA and the Army Acquisition Executive.

If confirmed, I will work with the Chief of Staff, DOD and this Committee to assess current authorities and recommend any other legislative changes that might be required.

Question. If confirmed, do you anticipate any restrictions that may impact your ability to oversee the Army acquisition system?

Answer. No. I do not anticipate any restrictions that will impact my ability to oversee the Army acquisition system if I am confirmed.

AUDIT

Question. The Department of Defense remains unable to achieve a clean financial statement audit. The Department also remains on the Government Accountability Office's list of high risk agencies and management systems for financial management and weapon system acquisition. Although audit readiness has been a goal of

the Department for decades, it has repeatedly failed to meet numerous congressionally directed audit-readiness deadlines.

What is your understanding and assessment of the Army's efforts to achieve a clean financial statement audit?

Answer. It is my understanding the Army achieved its goal to be ready for a full financial statement audit by 30 September 2017. I believe the Army officials responsible for the audit fully understand the importance and value of conducting audits, and are committed to full disclosure and discovery as a key step in identifying problem areas and issues that warrant being addressed as quickly as possible.

If confirmed, I am committed to ensuring the Army works hard towards its goal of achieving a clean financial audit. My experience in the private sector has given me important insights into the value that detailed and comprehensive audits can provide in helping leaders achieve their goals, lead their organizations, manage budgets, identify problem areas, and improve the overall efficiency and effectiveness of their teams.

Question. In your opinion, is the Department of the Army on track to achieve these objectives, particularly with regard to data quality, internal controls, and business process re-engineering?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army is making progress towards improving its data quality, internal controls, and business process re-engineering because the Army has learned it must improve in these areas if it wants to achieve a clean audit opinion.

If confirmed, I intend to look more closely into the Army's audit preparations and implementation, and at the specific items above in particular, as I am fully committed to ensuring the Army works hard at achieving a clean financial audit as soon as possible.

Question. If not, what impediments may hinder the Army's ability to achieve this goal and how would you address them?

Answer. It is my understanding that the largest impediment to audit compliance is a combination of the number of legacy systems feeding into new enterprise systems, and the lack of compliance these legacy systems have with current accounting standards. If confirmed, I will work to ensure the Army receives the resources necessary to address audit needs, that Army leaders have a good plan to address all identified impediments, and that they are held accountable for remedying them so that the Army can achieve a clean audit opinion.

Question. What steps will you take, if confirmed, to ensure that the Army moves to achieve these objectives without an unaffordable or unsustainable level of one-time fixes and manual work-arounds?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure the Army's leaders and all persons involved in conducting an audit understand the importance I place in audits, and the value I see in conducting and completing them. In doing so, the standards must be based on transparency, accuracy, thoroughness, and sustainability. I am committed to providing the leadership, authorities, and resources required to create a sustainable audit environment and a culture of financial transparency and accountability. The Army's success in this endeavor will require continued diligence in our execution of business processes, strengthening of our internal controls, and a relentless focus on improving our IT systems and environment.

ARMY MODERNIZATION

Question. In general, major Army modernization efforts have not been successful over the past decade or more. Since the mid-1990s, Army modernization strategies, plans, and investment priorities have evolved under a variety of names from Digitization, to Force XXI, to Army after Next, to Interim Force, to Objective Force, to Future Combat System and Modularity. Instability in funding, either as provided by the Department of Defense or Congress, has been cited by the Army and others as a principal cause of program instability. For the most part, however, the Army has benefited from broad Department of Defense and Congressional support for its modernization and readiness programs even when problems with the technical progress and quality of management of those programs have been apparent—the Future Combat System is a recent example.

What is your assessment of the Army's modernization record?

Answer. The U.S. Army is the best ground combat force in the world, but has had a mixed record when it comes to delivering the weapons and equipment its soldiers need to be successful. The Army has had several high profile acquisition failures over the last 2+ decades that have squandered billions of dollars, but has been successful at incrementally modernizing existing systems to meet the needs of our soldiers.

I believe the Army is moving in the right direction by fundamentally reforming the requirements process and involving senior Army leaders more in the prioritization of required capabilities. Additionally, the acquisition workforce needs to be sufficiently empowered, intelligent risk taking should be encouraged, and a closer partnership with the private sector must occur. More can be done in this last area in particular, and throughout the Acquisition process. If confirmed, I intend to get personally involved in improving the Acquisition process so that the Army has the weapons and equipment it needs to deploy, fight, and win against across the entire spectrum of conflict.

Question. Does the Army have a clearly stated modernization strategy? If so, what is its vision? What are its key objectives? What are the requirements? What is the timeline?

Answer. It is my understanding the Army provided Congress a final draft of a comprehensive modernization strategy entitled, 'Future Force Development Strategy.' The vision guiding this strategy is for the Army to possess decisive overmatch to defeat enemy formations, control terrain, secure populations, and consolidate gains.

I further understand that in the near term, the Army plans to continue upgrading existing weapons, fleets and systems. In the longer term, the Army is planning to build a force capable of countering future challenges and maintaining overmatch against potential higher-end adversaries. This will require the Army to invest more in research and development, and align all of these efforts against known capability needs.

If confirmed, I intend to take a thorough look at this strategy and adjust it as/ if necessary. This strategy will need to fulfill a clearly defined vision of the future Army. I will work with the Chief of Staff, Congress, and a wide array of civilian and military leaders and experts to this end. I will then apply the leadership focus and all required resources to effect this strategy, which will likely involve publishing, explaining, and promoting this strategy broadly; investing more in R&D; expanding the Army's engagement with the private sector; greatly improving the entire Acquisition process; making hard choices on some current programs and the budget; and holding leaders accountable for the success of this strategy.

Question. If modernization is fundamental to future readiness, what must the Army be ready for? What key capabilities must the Army have? What will the Army need in future reconnaissance, weapons, communications, logistics, and other key capabilities? What will the Army need in future force structure and all-arms combat formations?

Answer. I believe the Army must be ready to deploy, fight, and win along the entire spectrum of conflict. Most urgent is the need to prevail against a near-peer threat in a high-end fight. This will require growing the capacity and capabilities of the Total Army.

To be successful in the future, I understand the Army is developing proposals for the capabilities that will ensure overmatch in environments where communications, air superiority, and maneuver, for example, are not guaranteed. I further understand that the Army has already identified the top capabilities it needs to close near-term gaps and be successful in future fights. These range from longer range fires and improved air/missile defenses, to robust networks and much better vertical lift assets, for example.

At the same time, I understand the Army is working on a future force structure concept called the "multi-domain task force." This concept is envisioned as not only an "all-arms" approach to warfighting, but also an "all-domain" combat formation that will be essential to winning decisively in the future. The combat formations will also likely need to be more robust when it comes to traditional combat and combat support functions. To do all of this, the Army must have dependable funding and the appropriate level of sustained investment to turn these concepts into capabilities.

If confirmed, I intend to take a close look at all of these critical issues to ensure that the Army is meeting its important title 10 responsibilities when it comes to future readiness.

Question. What is your understanding and assessment of the Army's modernization investment strategy?

Answer. My understanding is that, due largely to budget constraints, the Army sacrificed modernization investments to pay for near term readiness. The Army has been working hard, nonetheless, to build, train, and sustain a ready force by incrementally modernizing existing systems.

It is important that the Army start investing more in modernization to ensure its future ability to deploy, fight, and win against a near-peer threat in a high-end fight. To do this, I believe the acquisition system must be greatly improved, more

engagement with the commercial sector and defense industry must take place, and more funding should be allocated to research and development efforts, among many things, to address critical capability gaps. If confirmed, I will work hard to ensure the Army has the right investment strategy, and hold leaders accountable to ensure the Service delivers world class equipment to its soldiers in an effective and efficient manner.

Question. If confirmed, what actions, if any, would you propose to take to achieve a genuinely stable modernization strategy and program for the Army?

Answer. I intend to work with senior Army leaders to set a clear vision for what the Army should look like in the future, and then work closely with senior Army leaders and Congress to develop a modernization strategy that will deliver on that vision.

This vision will be consistent with the results of the strategy review currently being conducted by the Secretary of Defense. It will inform the Army of the capacity and capabilities it will need to deploy, fight, and win in the future as part of a joint force across the entire spectrum of conflict.

As the future capabilities are set, programs need to be aligned against them. To achieve a stable modernization strategy, the requirements process for each of these programs must include all key stakeholders upfront and throughout the process, have clear lines of authority, must be quicker, and must be less bureaucratic. I understand the recently-announced Army “modernization command” aims to achieve these same ends. The requirements that are developed must be aggressive, constituting an improved capability, but reasonable and affordable as well. And once approved by the Army’s senior leadership, they must also be stable.

Next, acquisition officials must be empowered to manage these programs in a way that allows them to deliver programs on cost and schedule. They must engage with the defense industry and the commercial sector more, looking for technology solutions that can be taken either “off the shelf” or used with some modification. As part of this process, they must pursue more creative ways to rapidly test, demonstrate, and field these technologies to the soldier.

Critical to all this is holding leaders accountable, from meeting more aggressive deadlines for action and empowering subordinates, to aligning the assignments of PEOs/PMs to program milestones, and from reshaping organizations and processes, to making the hard choices about the Army’s funding priorities. These and other best practices can help deliver a more stable modernization strategy and program for the Army, and I intend to work hard on these initiatives if I confirmed.

Question. In your view, does the Army’s modernization investment strategy appropriately or adequately address current and future capabilities that meet requirements across the spectrum of conflict?

Answer. My sense is that the Army has made insufficient investments in current and future capabilities given the limited resources available the last several years. However, I believe the Army made the right decision by prioritizing readiness—the ability to deploy, fight, and win today against a near peer adversary—and incrementally modernizing existing equipment so that it is more capable across the entire spectrum of conflict.

Future capabilities have been deferred as a result. As readiness improves, the Army must address critical capability shortfalls to ensure its ability to deter and defeat near-peer adversaries in a future high end conflict. If confirmed, I will work with the Army’s senior leaders to develop a vision and implement a modernization strategy that will meet the Army’s future needs.

Question. What is the Army Rapid Capabilities Office? What are its objectives, priorities, and authorities?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army Rapid Capabilities Office is designed to execute high-priority, threat-based projects where the materiel solution does not exist today. My understanding is that its primary objective is to expedite critical technologies to the field to meet Combatant Commanders’ immediate needs. Its other objectives include identifying disruptive emerging technologies and integrating them for military use. The RCO’s initial focus areas for rapid prototyping are electronic warfare, survivability, cyber, and positioning, navigation and timing. The RCO also performs as a change agent for innovation and process improvements that can be applied to other Army efforts.

I understand the Army Rapid Capabilities Office receives its priorities and authorities from a Board of Directors led by the Secretary of the Army, and includes the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Army Acquisition Executive. As such, it is uniquely authorized to combine multiple research and development efforts, programs of record, and emerging technologies from industry and government to meet warfighters’ urgent needs in a quicker and more comprehensive manner.

Question. In your view, should the Army trade off requirements within the execution of a program in order to make that program affordable and timely?

Answer. That depends on the program, what the requirements are, and how the tradeoff might impact cost, schedule or performance. I think it is important to maintain the authority to be able to trade off requirements within the execution of the program, which speaks to the importance of the Chief of Staff's involvement in the process. Ultimately, I believe the Army must provide soldiers the best equipment available at an affordable cost and in time to meet their warfighting requirements, but sometimes you need to work to find the right balance between capability, affordability and speed of development.

If confirmed, I will assess the effectiveness of recent Army initiatives to improve decision making when it comes to setting requirements, making tradeoffs, and improving the overall efficiency and discipline of the Acquisition system.

Question. Does the Army need a fully resourced all-arms force to experiment with new weapons and technologies to help develop future fighting concepts? Could this experimental unit give direction to technology development? Like the Marine Corps experimental unit, should this all-arms force be ready to deploy as well?

Answer. The concept definitely warrants a good look. I understand the Army had a dedicated unit at Fort Bliss that did similar work, but was forced at some point to put the unit in the deployment rotation due to worldwide demand from our Combatant Commanders.

New capabilities should be developed in concert with the soldiers and formations that will use them. This provides for immediate feedback and concept refinement. A force like that could study, test, and refine requirements in an operational setting to help leaders make decisions in building the Army of the future could be a game changer. If confirmed, I will explore this concept with senior Army leaders.

Question. Is there a choice between current readiness and future readiness? Can the Army simultaneously meet short-term readiness standards and modernize for future readiness? If so, what are the risks? How would you recommend managing these risks?

Answer. The Army must find a way to meet short-term readiness needs while also modernizing for the future. This does not mean that both will be done at the same levels of effort or funding, but it does mean that risk in each may need to be balanced more carefully, and that hard choices will need to be made.

Based on operational demands and fiscal constraints, the Army chose in prior years to invest in current readiness and incrementally modernize its existing equipment while delaying future readiness and modernization. It is my understanding that the Army is now on a trajectory to improving current readiness by increasing unit manning, improving maintenance, and putting more emphasis on training for high-end conflicts.

I believe the Army can also modernize, but it must have a detailed modernization strategy and increased funding that is also more predictable. At the same time, the Army must become more efficient by getting rid of practices and policies that create bureaucracy; delayering, reshaping, and/or right-sizing organizations; engaging more closely with the commercial sector and the defense industry; and incorporating sound business practices. Doing all of this and more could free up time, money, and manpower to reinvest or utilize in other priorities, such as research and development, prototyping weapons systems, or adapting technologies that are currently available to close capability gaps. Failure to do this could mean the Army losing its qualitative overmatch in the long run.

Question. Unity of command ensures unity of effort in war and combat. If the Army is challenged by the lack of effective acquisition and modernization, would strong leadership empowered with command authority improve the situation? Does the Army need a modernization command?

Answer. I think strong leadership empowered with command authority can improve most situations. The Army recently announced plans to establish a Task Force that would fundamentally reform Army modernization efforts by bringing key functions and all the various stakeholders under a single roof. Additionally, I understand the Army recently launched a pilot program to establish cross-functional teams, each led by a brigadier general with recent command experience, focused on six core capability areas critical to future readiness. I support the fundamental outline of this plan because it promotes accountability, brings stakeholders together up front, ensures unity of effort, and eliminates a good deal of bureaucracy. If developed and implemented well, I believe this "modernization command" with its cross-functional teams will constitute a major step forward in reforming the requirements and Acquisition process, and in thus providing soldiers the weapons and equipment they need, when they need it. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Chief and senior Army leaders to study, further develop, and implement this plan.

ARMY WEAPON SYSTEM AND EQUIPMENT PROGRAMS

Question. What is your understanding and assessment of the following research, development, and acquisition programs? Are all programs delivering or sustaining capabilities that are suitable, reliable, and survivable? Are all programs within cost, timeline, and performance?

Answer. I acknowledge that my current employer, Raytheon, has various levels of involvement with some of the Army weapon systems and equipment programs listed below. If confirmed, I will not personally and substantially participate in any particular matter that will have a direct and predictable effect on Raytheon or the company's financial interests pursuant to 18 USC 208, SASC policy, and my Ethics Agreement.

Question. Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV)

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army ended the GCV program at the conclusion of the Technology Development phase in June 2014. In my view, the Army needs to be able to better manage and balance its investments and continue its modernization across the complete combat vehicle portfolio. This means ensuring that the vehicles that are already in the warfighters' hands are as capable as possible, and includes the Abrams, Bradley, and Stryker Engineering Change Proposal programs, as well as, development of the Armored Multipurpose Vehicle (AMPV) and other efforts to address emerging requirements for the Infantry Brigade Combat Team and Stryker Brigade Combat Team.

It is my understanding that the Army is conducting an analysis of the 2035 operational environment of future threats to identify any gaps for inclusion in the design for a Next Generation Combat Vehicle. This analysis will inform the Combat Vehicle Modernization Strategy and will drive the organization of combat Brigade formations in the 2035 and beyond timeframe. The Army currently plans to make a decision in the 2022 to 2023 timeframe whether to proceed with a Next Gen Combat Vehicle or to continue with the Engineering Change Proposals for the Abrams and Bradley fleets.

If confirmed, I intend to take a close look at the Army's combat vehicle modernization strategy and timeline and make any necessary adjustments.

Question. Stryker combat vehicle, including the Stryker Lethality Upgrades

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army has retrofitted Stryker vehicles with a more survivable Double V-Hull in response to an urgent operational need and an aggressive Improvised Explosive Device (IED) threat, and that this upgrade has saved lives in Afghanistan.

The Army is also in the process of integrating a 30mm cannon and is testing an Active Protection System for the 2nd Cavalry Regiment Stryker vehicles stationed in Germany. I understand these upgrades will increase the fleet's lethality and survivability. It is my understanding that the Stryker Combat Vehicle program is meeting its objectives.

Question. Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV)

Answer. A Joint Army and Marine Corps program, the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) is currently undergoing product quality testing prior to its operational testing scheduled to begin next year. I understand the JLTV provides operational improvements in force protection, payload, mobility, fuel efficiency and reliability, along with the growth potential to meet future mission requirements.

It is my understanding that this vehicle fleet will provide more off-road mobility, better fuel efficiency, and more reliability than the Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected All-Terrain Vehicles (MRAPs). It also addresses the force protection, performance and payload limitations currently in High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles.

It is my understanding that the JLTV program is meeting its objectives.

Question. M1 Abrams tank modernization

Answer. The Abrams Tank has been an essential part of the Army's force since it entered service in 1980. Its combat capability is necessary to close with and destroy enemy forces on the modern battlefield.

It is my understanding that there are several upgrades to the Abrams fleet that will enhance its capabilities into the future. The first of those modifications will include an improved armor suite and greater on-board electrical power, the latter of which will accommodate modernizing the tactical communications network and employing an Active Protection System. A second modification, which will begin its development cycle this year, will upgrade the Abrams aiming and fire control systems to enable faster and more accurate engagements.

It is my understanding that the Abrams tank modernization program is meeting its objectives.

Question. M2 Bradley infantry fighting vehicle modernization

Answer. It is my understanding that the M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicle has been an essential part of the Army's force structure since 1981, and that the Bradley fleet continues to be upgraded to enhance its capabilities. Key modifications include upgrading the suspension and improving the service life of the track to regain mobility lost due to adding armor and other survivability kits during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Another modification will increase the engine's ability to generate power and cool both the crew and electronics, while simultaneously modernizing the tactical communications network.

It is my understanding that the M2 Bradley infantry fighting vehicle modernization program is meeting its objectives.

Question. Mobile Protected Firepower (MPF)

Answer. It is my understanding that, at present, Infantry Brigades do not have sufficient options for engaging defending enemy forces at long range with direct fire weapons. As such, one of the priorities for the Army is to provide Infantry Brigade Combat Teams with a mobile, protected, direct-fire combat vehicle to engage at long-range, on the move, against enemy vehicles, hardened fortifications, and dismounted personnel.

I have been informed the Army is refining some of the performance requirements and anticipates releasing a Request for Proposal in the near future to ensure it can deliver improved capability to the warfighter.

It is my understanding that the final Analysis of Alternatives report is nearing completion and the funding profile is being refined.

Question. Paladin Integrated Management self-propelled howitzer modernization

Answer. It is my understanding that beginning in fiscal year 2018, the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) program, also known as the M109A7 Family of Vehicles, is expected to begin replacing the current M109A6 Self-Propelled Howitzer and its accompanying ammunition supply vehicle.

I understand that in October 2016, the program suspended its Initial Operational Test and Evaluation due to a combination of breech malfunctions, improper crew procedures, and improper maintenance that generated noxious levels of toxic fumes. I have been informed that these issues have all been addressed, and that the Program Office is now incorporating vehicle upgrades, updating training, and improving maintenance and operating procedures. I understand these improvements will be retrofitted to the existing fleet after demonstration in testing.

The Army will conduct a second operational test in early 2018 to determine the suitability, reliability, and survivability of the system. The program is funded to conduct the second operational test, and I understand that the Army is planning to equip its first unit later in 2018.

Question. Armored Multipurpose Vehicle (AMPV)

Answer. The AMPV is a critical component of the Army's Combat Vehicle Modernization strategy for replacement of the M113 Family of Vehicles within the Armored Brigade Combat Team. The AMPV is designed to improve the mobility, lethality, and force protection across five mission variants: General Purpose, Mortar Carrier, Mission Command, Medical Evacuation, and Medical Treatment.

It is my understanding that the Army delivered its first prototype General Purpose Vehicle in December 2016. I further understand the AMPV program is meeting its objectives, and will begin developmental testing this year to assess the vehicle's suitability, reliability, and survivability.

Question. Ground Mobility Vehicle (GMV)

Answer. I understand that to fill a significant mobility gap facing Infantry Brigade Combat Teams, the Army initiated the Ground Mobility Vehicle (GMV) program to provide enhanced tactical mobility that allows soldiers to minimize the time, exposure, and energy required to close on a mission objective.

It is my understanding that the Army intends to pursue the GMV by initially focusing on filling the most urgent operational needs to five Airborne IBCTs, to include the Global Response Force of the 82d Airborne Division and Special Operations Forces. The Army will subsequently assess fielding this capability to the remaining IBCTs.

Question. Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS)

Answer. I understand that ATACMS provides the Army with all-weather, rapidly deployable, surface-to-surface, precision strike capability against point and area targets at extended ranges. The Army has used ATACMS for decades, and they are still being used effectively today. An ATACMS Service Life Extension Program effort is ongoing to qualify obsolescence updates and reset the missile shelf life.

I understand the ATACMS program is currently meeting its performance objectives.

Question. Stinger surface to air missile

Answer. The Stinger is a man-portable, shoulder fired missile that provides the Army's short range air defense capability against manned and unmanned aircraft systems. The Stinger can also be fired by the Avenger weapon system.

I understand that a Stinger Service Life Extension Program effort is ongoing to qualify obsolescence updates and reset the missile shelf life. As part of this effort, the Stinger Proximity Fuze is an additional effort to improve lethality against UAS targets. By integrating a Proximity Fuze modification, the fuse will detonate the warhead as the missile passes within lethal distance of a target to ensure destruction. The Army plans to begin fielding the Stinger Proximity Fuze capability in 2018.

Question. MIM-104 Patriot surface to air missile

Answer. I understand the PATRIOT modernization effort is intended to ensure the defeat of evolving aircraft, cruise missile, large caliber rockets, and ballistic missile threats. The currently fielded interceptor, the Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE), provides improved range and maneuverability to mitigate and defeat evolving and advanced threats.

I am aware the PATRIOT modernization efforts include developing the Lower Tier Air and Missile Defense Sensor (LTAMDS), which is intended to provide the required sensing capabilities within the lower tier portion of the ballistic missile defense battlespace. LTAMDS aims to provide increased capability over the existing radar through improved battlespace management and enhanced sensor performance to mitigate and defeat evolving threats.

Question. Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

Answer. It is my understanding that Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) is a globally-transportable, rapidly-deployable capability designed to intercept and destroy ballistic missiles inside or outside the atmosphere during their final, or terminal, phase of flight. The Missile Defense Agency continues to develop the THAAD weapon system in response to the United States Strategic Command Prioritized Capabilities List to maintain and improve performance against new and emerging threats. THAAD currently has six operational U.S. Army batteries and two United Arab Emirates batteries. It is my understanding that a seventh U.S. Army battery will complete New Equipment Training in the first half of 2018.

Question. AH-64E Apache modernization and Manned-Unmanned Reconnaissance (MUR)

Answer. The Apache is the Army's only heavy attack helicopter and is a critical asset on the modern battlefield, providing close air support to our warfighters in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Apache dates back to the 1980s, and the latest version, the AH-64E, is the second remanufacture of that proven system.

I understand that Manned-Unmanned Teaming (MUM-T) is a force-multiplying capability for the Apache. During MUM-T, the AH-64E Apache receives video feeds and target coordinates from an Army Gray Eagle or Shadow unmanned aircraft. By providing the pilot increased situational awareness prior to engaging the threat, I understand the MUM-T greatly increases the Apache's combat lethality and survivability.

I understand the Army entered into a 5-year multi-year procurement contract this year for substantial savings on 284 Apaches, of which 251 will be remanufactured and 33 will be new builds.

I understand the AH-64E Apache modernization and Manned-Unmanned Reconnaissance programs are meeting their objectives.

Question. Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T)

Answer. The Army's Tactical Network is one of the first areas I intend to closely review if confirmed. I am aware the Army's intent is to halt the procurement of WIN-T Increment 2 at the end of fiscal year 2018. While WIN-T components have provided important communications capabilities in Afghanistan and Iraq, I understand that not all elements are performing as needed to meet the operational requirements against a near peer adversary. However, I further understand the Army has identified purposed-capabilities of WIN-T Increment 2 to "fight tonight" as they work on an acquisition strategy to achieve the objective state tactical network. Any system the Army fields needs to be reliable, resilient, protected, and mobile.

I understand that the tactical network is only a portion of the Chief of Staff of the Army's review of all Army networking programs to confirm existing and future requirements and ensure the Army is able to field the best capability to our soldiers. I understand that this review will include an assessment of cost, schedule, and performance of the program. If confirmed, I aim to work closely with the Chief of Staff and other senior Army leaders to review the status and future of this program.

Question. Distributed Common Ground System-Army

Answer. I understand DCGS-A is intended to synergize intelligence operations by synchronizing, integrating, and disseminating intelligence information at multiple

levels throughout the full range of military operations. I am aware, however, that there have been a range of complaints about DCGS-A's ease of use by soldiers at the tactical level.

I understand the Army is working hard to ensure compliance with fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The fiscal year 2017 NDAA seeks to improve Increment 1's usability to tactical echelons through a competitive commercial off-the-shelf procurement, using Firm Fixed Price contracts, and fielding the capability quickly. It is my understanding that the Army is currently assessing how to restructure the program in accordance with the fiscal year 2017 NDAA.

Further, I understand that the Chief of Staff is currently reviewing all Army networking programs, including DCGS-A. I understand that this review will include an assessment of cost, timeline, and performance of the program. If confirmed, I aim to work closely with the Chief and other senior Army leaders to review the status and future of this program.

Question. Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS)

Answer. I understand that tactical radios for the Army are now comprised primarily of the Handheld, Manpack, & Small Form Fit (HMS), Airborne Maritime Fixed-Station (AMF), and SINCGARS radios. Tactical Radios are part of the overall network modernization effort for the Army's tactical network. The radios provide man-portable, vehicle-mounted, aerial communication and data transport services for the Tactical Network.

I understand the Army is committed to developing and fielding the Army Tactical Network as part of a modernized Army network that improves effectiveness, security, and efficiency, while providing the connectivity from home station to the deployed tactical unit.

I further understand the Chief of Staff is conducting a review of all Army Networking programs, and that this review will include an assessment of cost, schedule, and performance of the tactical network programs. If confirmed, I aim to work closely with the Chief and other senior Army leaders to review the status and future of this program.

Question. Joint Multi-Role rotorcraft program (JMR)

Answer. I understand the objective of the Joint Multi-Role (JMR) Technology Demonstrator research is to inform the Army's Future Vertical Lift (FVL) program of transformational vertical lift capabilities. The aim of the FVL program is to develop the next generation of more capable vertical lift aircraft for all military services.

I also understand the JMR Demonstrator science and technology effort intends to reduce risk for the planned FVL Program of Record by showing that enabling technologies are achievable, and by informing capabilities and requirements. Having these results available to the Department of Defense as it makes decisions regarding the modernization of the current vertical lift fleet should be extremely valuable to all the Services.

Question. Small arms modernization (SAM)

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army plans to modernize its small arms weapons to enhance their lethality, range, reliability, and weight reduction. The Army continuously assesses weapon system capabilities with the goal of over-matching any adversary, while ensuring solutions are effective, suitable, reliable, and survivable.

I am informed that ongoing modernization programs include the newly awarded XM17 Modular Handgun System, and upgrades to/replacements for the M4A1 Carbine, M2A1 Machine Gun, and the M240 Machine Gun.

I believe the Army's efforts to upgrade its combat service rifle and machine guns must be far more effective and efficient than the process by which it selected its new handgun. I also believe small arms modernization is an area very suitable for outreach to the commercial sector for an "off the shelf" or easily adaptable solution for a new weapon. The Army should also look at what its allies are using to see if their systems can be used/adapted for the soldiers' needs. If confirmed, I intend to pay close attention to the Army's small arms modernization plans to ensure these programs are within cost, schedule, and performance objectives.

Question. Personal protective equipment modernization (PPE)

Answer. My assessment is that the Army continues to provide exceptional Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). Protecting our soldiers against a wide range of bullets, grenades, improvised explosive devices, and blunt impact is a top priority. I understand that the Army is constantly working to reduce weight and improve performance of PPE. The Army's next generation PPE system is the modular and mission-tailorable Soldier Protection System (SPS), and that the SPS offers better performance, reduced weight, better fit, and increased mobility for all soldiers, male and female.

It is my understanding that the Army's PPE modernization through the SPS program is meeting its objectives.

Question. AN/TPQ-53 Counter Fire RADAR

Answer. I understand the AN/TPQ-53 Counter Fire Radar detects, classifies, tracks, and locates the points of origin of projectiles fired from mortar, artillery, and rocket systems, and provides counter-battery target acquisition capabilities for all types of military operations. The system has both 90- and 360-degree capability and is the replacement for the Army's legacy fleet of AN/TPQ-36 and AN/TPQ-37 Firefinder Radars.

The AN/TPQ-53 has proven itself in combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I am aware the Army is assessing the AN/TPQ-53's ability to identify and track unmanned aerial systems, with the goal of tracking rocket, artillery, mortar targets and unmanned aerial systems simultaneously.

I understand the AN/TPQ-53 Counter Fire Radar program is meeting its objectives.

ARMY-RELATED DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE

Question. What is your understanding and assessment of the systems and processes for identifying, evaluating, and managing risk in the Army's organic and commercial defense industrial base?

Answer. It is vitally important that the Nation have a diverse, vibrant, innovative, resilient, and competitive defense industrial base. Our warfighters across the Defense Department rely on this base to provide the weapons, equipment, and systems they need to deploy, fight, and win across the full spectrum of conflict.

It is my understanding that the Department currently has appropriate systems and processes for identifying, evaluating, and managing risk in the Army's organic and commercial defense industrial base. However, these systems must continue to evolve to ensure we keep pace with the ever-changing global environment, technologies, and the private sector, among other things.

It is also my understanding that the Army continually identifies, evaluates, and manages risk in the organic (Army-owned) and commercial components of the Army Industrial Base. In the organic component, the Army assesses critical capabilities, minimum sustaining workloads, and other attributes of its facilities to ensure these facilities can meet requirements during mobilizations, national defense contingencies, and other emergencies. As part of managing organic risk, I understand the Army continues to work with the commercial sector to establish partnerships to reduce costs and preserve critical manufacturing and technological capabilities at Army facilities.

I also understand the Army works closely with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy office and other federal agencies to identify fragile and critical suppliers; assess financial, operational, geopolitical, and socio-economic risks; and take actions to mitigate risk. Each year, the Army synchronizes its commercial assessments based on expertise from both within and external to the Army to ensure assessments support optimal operational readiness of all Army weapons systems.

If confirmed, I will work to strengthen the Army's processes to identify, assess, and mitigate risk in the defense industrial base while ensuring compliance with the law.

Question. What is the health of the supply chain needed for the Army's industrial base? What key supply chains are in jeopardy?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army's supply chain that supports the defense industrial base is generally healthy and responsive. From my personal experience in the private sector, however, I am aware of how the lack of sustained, predictable, year-over-year funding can put severe strain on the supply chain. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army and Department of Defense leaders on the health and vibrancy of the supply chain.

Question. Should Army acquisition leaders consider impacts on the industrial base when addressing requirements for recapitalization or modernization of major end items such as tanks, tactical wheeled vehicles, or key repair parts?

Answer. Yes. The industrial base is vital to the Nation's security. As such, I believe the Army should continue to carefully consider impacts on the industrial base when addressing all requirements for both recapitalization and modernization.

Question. If confirmed, what changes, if any, would you pursue in systems and processes to improve identification, monitoring, assessment, and timely actions to ensure that risk in the Army-relevant sectors of the defense industrial base is adequately managed in order to develop, produce, and sustain technically superior, reliable, and affordable weapons systems?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders to review the systems and processes the Service uses to identify, monitor, assess, and mitigate supply chain risk in the Army Industrial Base, and to identify more effective ways to ensure a capable and ready supply chain. It is my understanding that the Army already works with the relevant DOD offices, other military services, federal agencies, and industry partners to identify, evaluate, and mitigate supply chain risk in the Army Industrial Base. If confirmed, I will support the Army's efforts, in concert with its partners, to procure superior, reliable, and affordable weapons systems and equipment to meet the needs of our soldiers.

ARMY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Question. What is your understanding and assessment of the role that Army science and technology programs have played and will play in developing capabilities for current and future Army systems?

Answer. I believe Army Science and Technology (S&T) programs are critical to maintain current Army readiness and modernize for the future. Technology, and those capabilities enabled by technology, are critical to our soldiers. It is my view that the Army S&T Enterprise should be focused on enabling soldiers to dominate the battlefield, across the full spectrum of conflict, today and in the future.

Army S&T is a critical future investment, developing new capabilities with game-changing potential, evaluating technology and system vulnerabilities, and addressing affordability, sustainability, reliability, and manufacturability issues throughout the system design process. The Army S&T Enterprise should continue to align with and enable the needs of the soldier today and for the Army of the future. If confirmed, I will work closely with senior Army leaders to ensure this alignment through a disciplined process that is focused on improving soldier capabilities.

Question. Given the budget, how will you ensure that Army science and technology programs will successfully transition to operational warfighting capabilities?

Answer. I believe the key to ensuring that Army science and technology programs successfully transition to operational warfighting capabilities is stable and predictable funding, solid alignment with the modernization strategy, and accountable leadership. The Army must also improve its business practices; reduce unnecessary costs; eliminate bureaucratic policies and procedures; delay, reshape, and/or right-size organizations; and take other actions that free up resources that can be invested in other priorities, such as Army science and technology.

If confirmed, I will review and work with the Army's senior leaders on the Service's modernization investment strategy. Such strategies include planning, programming, and budgeting for acquisition Programs of Record (PoRs) across the full spectrum of Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy. I understand Army S&T researchers assess these PoRs throughout their life cycles, and inform the research and development community of opportunities for technology insertions into ongoing PoRs.

Further, I understand Transition Agreements are critical mechanisms utilized to transition knowledge and technology products effectively and efficiently, ensuring collaboration and synergy between the S&T Enterprise and Materiel Developers. If confirmed, I will work with the Army's senior leaders to ensure S&T programs are aligned to priority capability gaps and soldier needs.

Question. If confirmed, what metrics would you use to judge the value and the investment level in Army science and technology programs?

Answer. If confirmed, I will verify that the Army's science and technology efforts align to soldier needs and priority capability gaps. I will ensure the development of metrics that measure the effectiveness of the Army's investments—paying close attention to schedule, cost, suitability, adaptability, and performance—and will further ensure those investments are driving a desired, measureable, and useable technological edge over potential adversaries.

ARMY LABORATORIES AND RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND ENGINEERING CENTERS (RDEC)

Question. What role should Army laboratories play in supporting current operations and in developing new capabilities to support Army missions?

Answer. I believe that Army laboratories should work diligently and collaboratively to deliver technology-enabled solutions for current conflicts and develop technologies to prepare the Army for multiple futures by enhancing the Army's ability to prevent, shape, and win decisively on the battlefield. If confirmed, I will look closely at the role the laboratories play in this regard, and look for opportunities to further enhance their alignment, deliverables, and cost effectiveness.

Question. If confirmed, how will you ensure that the Army laboratories and research and development centers have a high quality workforce, laboratory infrastructure, resources, and management, so that they can continue to support deployed forces and develop next generation capabilities?

Answer. It is my view that innovation is critical to the Army's future, so it must be adequately resourced and focused. If confirmed, I will work to better understand the specific issues and challenges facing the Army labs and the entire Science and Technology workforce. I want to ensure they have the necessary tools, personnel, and facilities available to provide world-class support to the soldier. This would include, for example, reviewing civilian personnel policies to address professional development and advancement opportunities.

Question. Do you support the full utilization of authorities established by Congress under the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration program that is currently being run in many Army RDECs?

Answer. If confirmed, I will support the full utilization of authorities established by Congress under the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration Program. I understand these authorities enable the Army to compete with the private sector to attract, recruit, train, and retain a top tier STEM workforce.

Question. Do you believe that all RDECs in the Army's Research, Development, and Engineering Command (RDECOM) need enhanced personnel authorities in order to attract and retain the finest technical workforce? Would you support expansion of the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration authorities to all of RDECOM's laboratories and engineering centers?

Answer. It is my understanding that all Army laboratories and RDECs are already designated as Science and Technology Reinvention Labs (STRs), providing them with all the authorities included as part of the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration project. I further understand that the Army STRs include the RDECOM laboratories and engineering centers, the Corps of Engineers laboratories, the Medical Command laboratories, the Army Research Institute, and the Space and Missile Defense Technical Center. It is my understanding that the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration authorities provide laboratory directors important tools to shape their workforce and remain competitive with the private sector. If confirmed I will work with the S&T Enterprise and Congress to ensure these authorities are properly utilized and to seek new authorities where necessary to further enable the Army's ability to attract and retain a top tier workforce.

Question. Do you believe that the Army's laboratories and engineering centers should have a separate, dynamic personnel system, uniquely tailored to support laboratory directors' requirements to attract and retain the highest quality scientific and engineering talent?

Answer. If confirmed, I will take a close look at this issue to better understand the current system, and the potential impacts of moving to a different system. I understand the Army labs and RDECs have the necessary authorities, under the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration project, to grant laboratory directors the ability to attract, recruit, and retain the highest quality scientific and engineering personnel by providing hiring flexibilities, rapid on-boarding, and flexible compensation options. If confirmed, I will continue to work with the S&T Enterprise to ensure we are able to attract and retain the highest quality workforce.

Question. How will you assess the quality of Army laboratory infrastructure and the adequacy of investments being made in new military construction and sustainment of that infrastructure?

Answer. My understanding is that Army laboratory facilities have an average age of more than 50 years. Given my experiences in the private sector, I appreciate that to continue developing cutting-edge technology that supports the soldier—and continue to recruit and retain the most talented personnel—the Army needs to have modern buildings, equipment, and other resources. If confirmed, I will study the challenges facing our Science and Technology infrastructure and look at various options to ensure the Army makes the investments necessary to modernize its laboratory infrastructure in support of Army research and development.

Question. Are you concerned about the current or future supply of experts in defense critical disciplines, particularly personnel with appropriate security clearances, to hold positions in defense laboratories?

Answer. I am concerned generally about the number of students pursuing Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) degrees nationally, and the competition that occurs within and between the private and public sectors for that limited pool of talent once they graduate. This is a very competitive and dynamic personnel issue that Army leaders need to pay close attention to if the Service is going to attract top tier talent. Making this issue even more difficult is the challenge of getting secu-

city clearances for these personnel in a timely manner. These are challenges I have seen in my private sector experience that directly impact the defense industry.

If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the Army can compete with the private sector to attract and retain the highest quality personnel for a variety of STEM fields, including critical areas such as materials science, biotechnology, and cyber. Further, I will be committed to working with Congress to ensure the Army has all necessary authorities to access a high quality and cleared workforce.

ARMY TEST AND EVALUATION (T&E) EFFORTS

Question. If confirmed, how will you ensure that the Army's T&E infrastructure is robust enough to ensure that new systems and technologies are tested to verify their combat effectiveness and suitability?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure funding for the Army's T&E infrastructure is adequate to support Army and other Service acquisition program testing requirements—both today and in the future. This will require both sustainment funding for the capabilities we currently have and investment in new capabilities in order to be prepared to test new weapon systems as they are developed. I believe that soldiers deserve the best weapon systems available, and that T&E is the method the Army uses to determine if a weapon system is effective, suitable, and survivable. If confirmed, I will ensure T&E is adequately funded and capable to accomplish this critical mission.

Question. What metrics will you use to assess the quality of the Army's T&E infrastructure?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ask the Army's T&E leaders to show me the quantitative and qualitative metrics they use to measure the state of the T&E infrastructure, which includes both test installations and test equipment. I would expect to see that the Army's T&E managers are listening to their customers and to their employees in areas such as customer satisfaction, adequacy of tests, appropriateness of tests, causes of test delays, and cost of testing, for example. I will also review how test managers address known capability gaps in advance of program testing needs, and what role they play in the requirement setting process. If confirmed, I will also assess how the Army is investing in test capability modernization to keep pace with the requirements of new weapon systems, and the overall role that T&E plays in the Army acquisition system.

Question. If confirmed, how would you ensure that weapon systems and other technologies that are fielded by the Army are adequately operationally tested?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders and the Army's operational test communities to ensure all Army weapons, systems, platforms, and other technologies are operationally tested in ways that replicate realistic combat conditions against current and future threats; operational testing also requires that systems be tested using commodity specific soldiers. Additionally, these technologies must be assessed against the performance parameters they were designed to meet. Doing so means that the testing community participates in the Acquisition process up front and throughout, and that the Army addresses all operational test concerns early in the test planning process. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the Army invests in the operational testing mission, and is ready to conduct effective operational tests along these lines.

ARMY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Question. What major improvements would you like to see made in the Army's development and deployment of major information technology systems?

Answer. I believe the Army must improve its ability to modernize its IT systems, with the private sector serving as its benchmark with regard to speed, features, and quality, so that it is able to deploy, fight, and win along the full spectrum of conflict in a contested environment. The Army must be better postured to first anticipate, then rapidly leverage, industry-driven technological advances. For the Army to be successful, it requires a joint end-to-end network that is expeditionary, mobile, user-friendly, protected, and interoperable with Joint Forces down to the tactical level. If confirmed, I will work with DOD, the private sector, and senior Army leaders to study and address this issue.

Question. How will you encourage process and cultural change in organizations so that they maximize the benefits that new enterprise information technology systems can offer in terms of cost savings and efficiency?

Answer. I believe that in order for the Army to remain ahead of its current and future adversaries, process and culture change must occur. Based on my experience in the private sector, I believe the Army must partner with industry and agile adopters like the special operations community to leverage proven and available so-

lutions that avoid long delays and excessive cost. If confirmed, I will look to the private sector for innovative ways to improve existing IT Architecture, and work with senior Army leaders to utilize flexible contracting strategies to rapidly obtain, test and upgrade new capabilities.

Question. What is the relationship between Army efforts at implementing enterprise information technology programs and supporting computing services and infrastructure to support Army missions and efforts being undertaken by the Defense Information Systems Agency?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) plays an integral role in the Army's network, and assists the Army in driving and implementing many of the Defense Department's Cyber and Information Technology initiatives to improve operational effectiveness, security, and efficiency. This includes those initiatives that cut across other component services. As a result, the Army and DISA have a strong partnership. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders to provide the most effective, secure and efficient enterprise network available for our Warfighters, and to continue the strong partnership with DISA.

Question. Given the nature of information technology change and development, are traditional acquisition procedures effective?

Answer. No, I do not believe so. The traditional acquisition process has its place and value in the development of complex systems in direct support of the warfighter. However, it is probably not the best acquisition model for the technology sector given the rapid rate of change in private sector IT systems. As such, I understand the Army is working to improve policies and procedures to provide greater flexibility in meeting urgent IT needs. Additionally, the Army recognizes the greater flexibility that recent National Defense Authorization Acts have provided through the use of Other Transaction Authorities, for example, as another tool to help it keep pace with the rate of technological change. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders to leverage these tools and pursue even greater flexibility when it comes to acquiring IT systems.

INVESTMENT IN INFRASTRUCTURE

Question. Witnesses appearing before this Committee in the past have testified that the military services under-invest in both the maintenance and recapitalization of facilities and infrastructure compared to private industry standards. Decades of under-investment in Defense Department installations have led to substantial backlogs of facility maintenance activities, created substandard living and working conditions, and made it harder to take advantage of new technologies that could increase productivity. These challenges have been exacerbated by current budget pressures.

What is your assessment of Army infrastructure investment?

Answer. I believe the Army has under invested in infrastructure over the past 15 years. The Army has taken risk in infrastructure investment in order to balance resources between force structure, readiness, and modernization. Currently, the Army's infrastructure investment is not able to keep pace with normal facility degradation. As the Army restructures and fields new equipment to meet new demands, it must also invest in the infrastructure needed to preserve it.

Question. If confirmed, what actions, if any, would you propose to increase resources to reduce the backlog and improve Army facilities?

Answer. If confirmed, I would review and assess the facility backlog with the Army's senior leaders and determine its impact on readiness and soldiers. I would direct Army leaders to develop a focused program to address infrastructure deficiencies for the most mission critical facilities; prioritize those that most directly impact readiness; and allocate available funds accordingly.

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENTS

Question. The Department of Defense has repeatedly requested a Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round.

Do you believe another BRAC round is necessary? If so, why?

Answer. Yes. I support efforts to reduce and realign excess Army infrastructure. This is important to the Service's fiscal health in the long run. The savings seen in the out years could be reinvested in other priorities, such as modernization. Any efforts to reduce infrastructure, however, should be informed by the National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy, likely future budgets, as well as the ongoing challenges facing the Army when it comes to readiness and modernization.

Question. If confirmed and if Congress were to authorize another BRAC round, how would you go about setting priorities for infrastructure reduction and consolidation within the Department of the Army?

Answer. I understand that if Congress were to authorize another BRAC round, the authorization would also likely establish the process and criteria for the Department to follow. If confirmed, I would work with Army and DOD leaders, subject matter experts, and others as appropriate to ensure the Army's BRAC priorities are consistent with the National Defense Strategy and National Military Strategy, comply with the law enacted by Congress, and enhance the Army's ability to execute its title 10 responsibilities.

Question. If confirmed and if Congress were to authorize another BRAC round, what is your understanding of the responsibilities of the Army in working with local communities with respect to property disposal?

Answer. If confirmed, I would ensure that the Army works closely with local communities impacted by BRAC decisions. The Army would need to work especially close with potential property transferees who have the resources and knowledge to swiftly put surplus BRAC property back into productive use.

It has been noted repeatedly that the 2005 BRAC round resulted in major and unanticipated implementation costs and saved far less money than originally estimated.

Question. What is your understanding of why such cost growth and lower realized savings have occurred?

Answer. It is my understanding that during the last BRAC round, a couple key factors that contributed to cost growth and lower realized savings were that the Army was undergoing a transformation to Brigade Combat Teams, and the Army was re-stationing overseas forces back to the U.S. These actions drove the need to construct new facilities, which in turn presented new costs. Further, I understand that savings from closing sites overseas were not counted as BRAC 2005 savings, even though they were quite substantial.

Question. How do you believe such issues could be addressed in a future BRAC round?

Answer. BRAC rounds should support the National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy, the Army's strategic/force posture, and the Service's ability to fulfill its title 10 requirements. Any future BRAC round should be all-encompassing with regard to costs and savings, and produce a solid return on investment. Ideas such as placing a time limit for assessing and realizing any net savings should be considered. If confirmed, I look forward to working with this committee on how the Army can accomplish its mission and realize cost savings by reducing excess infrastructure.

RELIGIOUS GUIDELINES

Question. In your view, do Department of the Army policies concerning religious accommodation in the military appropriately accommodate the free exercise of religion and other beliefs, including individual expressions of belief, without impinging on those who have different beliefs, including no religious belief?

Answer. Based on my current understanding, I believe Army policies support the religious rights of soldiers, including their right to abstain from religious practice. This was my experience as well during my 21 years in uniform. The Army's policy for religious accommodation incorporates the tenets of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in order to apply the appropriate legal standard in granting religious accommodations. The Army is a standards-based organization and any person who meets these standards is eligible to serve regardless of their religious beliefs or lack thereof.

Question. Under current law and policy, are individual expressions of belief accommodated so long as they do not impact good order and discipline?

Answer. Yes. I understand that individual expressions are being appropriately accommodated. The Army has taken several steps in the last year to streamline and routinize the process for soldiers to request religious accommodation, and for commanders with the appropriate authority to grant those accommodations. Commanders are obligated to consider every religious accommodation request individually and holistically. This consideration includes impacts on health and safety, unit cohesion, individual and unit readiness, and good order and discipline.

Question. In your view, do existing policies and practices regarding public prayers offered by Army chaplains in a variety of formal and informal settings strike the proper balance between a chaplain's ability to pray in accordance with his or her religious beliefs and the rights of other service members with different beliefs, including no religious belief?

Answer. I understand the Army does not tell chaplains or soldiers how, when, or whether to pray. The Chaplain Corps ensures the free exercise of religion by developing leaders and educating chaplains to perform or provide religious support to sol-

diers in a diverse and pluralistic environment. I further understand that Army chaplains are trained to conduct all religious support, to include prayers, with integrity and sensitivity—each chaplain being faithful to his or her own religious tradition—and, within that tradition, being as broad and inclusive as possible based on the audience. The Army believes this is an effective approach, where freedom and respect go hand in hand. Soldiers are free to exercise their individual religious faith (or not) and to bow in prayer (or not), with each respecting the others' freedom of religion and public expression. This was my experience during my time in uniform.

Question. What is your assessment of measures taken at the U.S. Military Academy to ensure religious tolerance and respect?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army's leadership at West Point is fully committed to protecting the constitutional rights of everyone at the Academy to freely practice their religious beliefs, and in promoting a climate of tolerance and respect for every persons' exercise of their religious beliefs.

DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES

Question. What is your understanding of the respective roles of the General Counsel and Judge Advocate General of the Army in providing the Secretary of the Army with legal advice?

Answer. It is my understanding that the General Counsel is the legal counsel to the Secretary of the Army and the chief legal officer of the Department of the Army. As such, the General Counsel is responsible for coordinating legal and policy advice to all members of Department. In addition, the General Counsel is responsible for determining the Department's position on any legal question or procedure.

Further, it is my understanding that The Judge Advocate General of the Army is the principal legal adviser to the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Army Staff and directs the members of The Judge Advocate General's Corps in the performance of their duties. It is also my understanding that The Judge Advocate General provides independent legal advice to the Secretary of the Army and members of the Army Secretariat in coordination with the General Counsel, and that The Judge Advocate General has primary responsibility for providing legal advice and services regarding the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the administration of military discipline.

Question. What are your views on the responsibility of The Judge Advocate General of the Army to provide independent legal advice to the Chief of Staff of the Army?

Answer. In my view, The Judge Advocate General's expertise and counsel should be available to both the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army. Further, no officer or employee of the Department of Defense should ever interfere with the ability of The Judge Advocate General to give independent legal advice to the Chief of Staff of the Army. If confirmed, I will fully support The Judge Advocate General providing independent legal advice to senior Army leaders. I know from my own military service that uniformed attorneys bring a unique perspective to the practice of law, and that they can be counted upon to provide the type of candid, insightful advice to senior leaders that is absolutely essential in today's complex strategic environment.

Question. What are your views on the responsibility of staff judge advocates within the Army to provide independent legal advice to military commanders throughout the Army establishment?

Answer. It is critical that staff judge advocates in the Army be able to provide independent legal advice to military commanders throughout the Service. As such, I fully support the statute that prohibits any officer or Department of Defense employee from interfering with the ability of judge advocates to give candid legal advice to commanders. This advice is critical to commanders and Army leaders who need to maintain accountability and ensure the good order and discipline of the force, all of which is vital to the Army accomplishing its mission.

SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Question. What is your assessment of the Army's sexual assault prevention and response program?

Answer. Sexual harassment and assault are detractors to readiness and erode the trust, unity, and esprit required for the Army and its soldiers to succeed. There can be no tolerance for this behavior; one incident is too many. As such, I believe senior Army leaders take this issue seriously and that the Service is working hard to prevent sexual harassment and assault.

However, more can and must be done. If confirmed, I will continue to resource efforts like the Special Victim Counsel program and the Sexual Harassment/Assault

Response and Prevention (SHARP) Resource Centers that provide consolidated or collocated services. I support the Army placing additional focus on prevention and assisting Commanders in creating healthy climates based on the dignity and respect of each member of the Army Team. I believe it is my duty, like that of all leaders, to exemplify the Army Ethic and set the right tone across the Total Army.

If confirmed, I will continue to make sexual harassment and assault prevention, and investigation and response, a top priority for soldiers and leaders at all levels.

Question. What is your view of the adequacy of the training and resources the Army has in place to prevent sexual assaults and to investigate and respond to allegations of sexual assault?

Answer. I understand the Army has placed a priority on ensuring that sufficient training and resources are available to leaders and units to prevent sexual assault and harassment, and to investigate and respond to allegations of sexual assault and harassment. The Army enhanced its training program by including facilitated group discussions and incorporating sophisticated, interactive, avatar-based gaming technology.

I also understand the Army has a well-regarded sexual assault investigators course that has been used to train other Services' personnel, resulting in exceptional investigative capabilities within the Army and throughout the Department of Defense. The Army's Special Victim Prosecutors focus on sexual assault and family violence crimes. As I understand it, this allows the Army prosecution team to provide the best possible guidance to investigators and commanders.

If confirmed, I will ensure the Army's efforts to prevent sexual harassment and assault, and investigate and respond, are performing as required, and that these programs are sufficiently resourced and receiving ample support from the chain of command.

Question. What is your assessment of the Army's Special Victim Counsel Program?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Special Victim Counsel (SVC) Program provides a capability that the Army views as unique and very successful. SVCs provide legal representation to victims of sexual assault at forty-three Army installations and forward deployed locations worldwide. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about this program, ensuring it is performing as required, and providing it the necessary resources and leadership focus.

Question. What is your understanding of the adequacy of Army resources and programs to provide victims of sexual assault the medical, psychological, and legal help they need?

Answer. I understand the Army has a response system in place for soldiers, Department of the Army Civilians, and Family Members who are victims of sexual assault that includes Sexual Harassment/Assault Response and Prevention (SHARP) Resource Centers. These Centers provide consolidated or collocated medical, legal and outreach services. Further, I understand that through the Army's professional corps of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Victim Advocates, victims are advised of the availability of medical, psychological and legal assistance, including the assignment of a Special Victim Counsel. If confirmed, I look forward to learning more about these efforts, ensuring they are performing as required, and providing them the resources and command attention they demand.

Question. What is your assessment of the potential impact, if any, of proposals to remove the disposition authority from military commanders over violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, including sexual assaults?

Answer. Based on my time in the Army, and as a Commander, I am convinced that the Commander's role in the Uniform Code of Military Justice is critical to the success of the military justice system, and to Army units accomplishing their mission. In my view, the authority to discipline and to hold soldiers accountable is an essential and fundamental responsibility of Commanders, particularly given the unique nature of military service. Further, I am concerned that removing this authority would send the wrong message to Commanders that they are somehow less responsible for good order and discipline, and for setting the right example as leaders. Given all this, I would be reluctant to remove a Commander's disposition authority and potentially undermine the progress that has been made. Rather, we need to hold leaders accountable for their own actions, and for those of their soldiers.

Question. What is your assessment of the Army's protections against retaliation or reprisal for reporting sexual assault?

Answer. I understand the Army leadership has made it very clear that sexual harassment, sexual assault, and retaliation have no place in the Army. I couldn't agree more. This type of misconduct directly impacts readiness. Through Sergeant Major of the Army Dailey's initiative, "Not In My Squad," the focus on empowering

first-line soldiers and Civilians to lead the charge against sexual assault, sexual harassment, and retaliation by fostering positive unit climates and encouraging bystander intervention is spot on.

With this emphasis on leadership at all levels to prevent and respond to sexual assault and harassment, the Army is also tackling acts of retaliation and reprisal against those who report, intervene, or witness incidents of sexual harassment or sexual assault. Additionally, the Army has taken formal steps to criminalize retaliation through policy and regulations, and has implemented stringent investigation and reporting requirements. If confirmed, I will ensure the Army continues to address retaliation and assess its prevention and response processes in order to remove all barriers to reporting.

Question. What is your view on the role of the chain of command in changing the military culture in which these sexual assaults occur?

Answer. I believe the chain of command's role is at the center of changing the culture. The Army leadership understands the chain of command is the key to ensuring a professional climate of dignity and respect for all Army soldiers, civilians, and family members.

Every member of the Army team must be able to come forward with any concerns about their work, home, or social environments. The Sexual Harassment/Assault Response Program (SHARP) is a command program, and all members of the chain of command have a duty to enforce the program through the appropriate use of Army resources. Leaders at all levels have a fundamental duty to set the right tone and example when it comes to sexual assault and harassment, and to address violations of the SHARP program quickly and fairly.

CHILD ABUSE IN MILITARY FAMILIES

Question. Recent press reports indicate that the number of incidents of child abuse in military families has increased.

What is your understanding of the extent of this issue in the Army, and if confirmed, what actions will you take to address it?

Answer. I feel strongly that a single incident of child abuse is one too many. As a father, I find such incidents particularly troubling. As a former soldier, I know that child abuse is contrary to the Army's values, and the expectations we have of all service members. I understand that the Army recently took steps to improve reporting of child abuse and ensure adequate support is provided for all victims. If confirmed, I will work hard to ensure prevention programs are appropriately resourced, leaders are empowered to help prevent child abuse, victims are provided treatment and kept safe, and that offenders are held accountable.

ABUSIVE ONLINE CONDUCT

Question. This Committee has considered testimony on reports that certain members of Marines United, an unofficial Marine Corps Facebook group, were found to be posting degrading comments and sharing nude photos of female service members. Members of the group included a number of active-duty service members, former military members, and military retirees.

What is the current Department of the Army policy for use of social media by soldiers?

Answer. Army Regulation 600–20, Command Policy, prohibits the use of electronic devices and online media for bullying, hazing, retaliation, and any other form of misconduct. In 2015, the Army updated its existing online conduct policy, which was supplemented and reissued this year. Current policy allows Commanders to take punitive measures for abusive online conduct.

This updated guidance advises Army personnel that online misconduct, to include harassment, bullying, stalking, discrimination, and retaliation, or any activity that undermines dignity and respect, is inconsistent with Army Values and negatively impacts the command climate and readiness. Furthermore, the policy strongly encourages immediate reporting by victims of online misconduct, or from those who witness such conduct.

Question. In your view, is this policy adequate to address abuses such as what occurred in the Marines United incident?

Answer. While I believe that current law, regulations and policies are adequate to address online abuse, these need to be continually reviewed. Equally important, however, is that Army leaders understand the critical role they play in helping to prevent this abuse and enforcing professional standards. Without continued messaging and enforcement, online abuse can affect individual and unit readiness in harmful ways.

Question. If confirmed, what action would you take to ensure that members of the Army are not subjected to abusive online conduct?

Answer. I believe that leader engagement is key to eradicating this toxic behavior. Commanders and leaders at all levels must take responsibility for talking about this problem and enforcing this prohibition. If confirmed, I will work with Army leaders to continue to enforce standards and advance initiatives that promote adherence to Army values and professional conduct across the force.

Question. In your view, does the Army have sufficient legal authority to hold offenders accountable for such misconduct?

Answer. Yes. In my view, Commanders have sufficiently broad authority under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to address a range of online misconduct committed by service members.

Question. What legislative authorities, if any, do you believe are necessary to address this problem?

Answer. I believe Commanders have sufficient authority now to hold offenders accountable. However, if confirmed, I will assess the need for any additional authorities and consult with the Committee as appropriate.

BALANCE BETWEEN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES AND CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES

Question. The Army employs many contractors and civilian employees. In many cases, contractor employees work in the same offices, serve on the same projects and task forces, and perform many of the same functions as federal employees. Both contractors and civilians make up an integral part of the Defense Department's total workforce.

Do you believe that the current balance between civilian employees and contractor employees best serves the Army?

Answer. Civilian and contractor employees play important and distinct roles within the Army. I understand that the Army must strike an appropriate balance between the civilian and contractor workforce based on the constraints of law and policy, and with regard to the most cost effective and available source of labor to perform a particular function. However, contractors should not perform inherently governmental functions. If confirmed, I commit to conducting an assessment with Army senior leaders regarding the Army's compliance with law and policy to ensure the most appropriate and cost effective mix of civilian and contract employees in the Army.

Question. In your view, has the Department of the Army utilized contractors to perform basic functions in an appropriate manner?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army works hard to ensure that its use of contractors complies with statutes and regulatory authorities prohibiting contractor performance of inherently governmental functions through the Inventory of Contracts for Services and Review procedures. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders to ensure compliance with existing law and policy.

Question. To what extent is the Army relying on military personnel to perform duties that in your view would be best performed by civilian personnel or contractors?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army may be relying on military personnel to perform some duties that could be performed by civilian personnel or contractors. If confirmed, I would work to ensure that we preserve military personnel for combat roles and roles that directly contribute to the readiness of the force.

It is my understanding that current law and DOD policy provides that military personnel can perform non-military tasks only if military performance is more cost effective than civilian or contractor personnel. If confirmed, I will take a close look at the assessment and monitoring of the mix of military and civilian personnel performing "like" jobs or functions to ensure compliance with the law and DOD policies.

Question. Do you believe that the Army should undertake a comprehensive reappraisal of "inherently governmental functions" and other critical government functions, and how they are performed?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army already has a process that continuously evaluates contractor roles and functions in terms of inherently governmental functions, critical functions, and commercial activities to ensure compliance with law policy and regulation governing this issue. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders to ensure that the most appropriate and cost effective sources of labor are used to satisfy Army mission requirements.

Question. Are there non-monetary reasons why the Army would need or desire one type of manpower over the other? If so, provide relevant examples where of those reasons. Under what circumstances should cost be used as the primary factor?

Answer. I understand that there are non-monetary reasons that informed some prior manpower decisions. For example, the law prohibits contractors from performing inherently governmental functions; therefore, either military or civilian employees fill these roles. Additionally, force management levels in both Afghanistan and Iraq previously led to some contract solutions for functions such as aircraft maintenance, dining facilities, and other installation support. Having worked in the business sector, I understand the relevance of cost as a factor. And having served on active duty in a theater of conflict, I have had experience with contract employees. If confirmed, I will follow the law and policy while making decisions that contribute first and foremost to readiness, while also ensuring the most cost effective use of our resources.

Question. If confirmed, will you work to remove any artificial constraints placed on the size of the Army's civilian and contractor workforce, so that the Army can hire the number and type of employees most appropriate to accomplish its mission?

Answer. If confirmed, I will assess and work to remove any artificial constraints placed on the size of the Army's civilian and contractor workforce. I will also work with Congress and senior Army leaders to ensure the Army has not only the ability, but also continues to hire the right types of employees with the right talent and skills to effectively and efficiently accomplish its mission.

WOMEN IN COMBAT INTEGRATION

Question. In December 2015, Secretary Carter changed assignment policy for women in military service, opening all occupations and units to them, including ground combat units in the Army and Marine Corps. Since that time, female soldiers have graduated from Ranger School and both enlisted and officer female soldiers are being assigned to units for the first time that have previously been closed to them.

Are you satisfied that the decision to open Army combat arms units and positions to women was based on an adequate review of the analysis conducted by the military services?

Answer. I understand that the Army developed a scientific, evidence-based, legally sufficient, and well-structured process for gender integration into career fields that had previously been closed to female soldiers. The Army drew upon several studies to use the best practices for gender integration and validated standards for every career field to set conditions for integration. I look forward to learning more about this process and the various studies behind it. From a readiness standpoint, having served as an Infantry Officer in Airborne and Air Assault units, I know that being able to draw upon the entire pool of eligible recruits, across all career fields, makes the Army stronger and more agile for meeting mission requirements.

Question. Do you believe there is any reason to revisit this decision?

Answer. No, I understand the process of integrating women into combat arms MOSs is proceeding well. I believe that any soldier who can meet the physical, mental, and skill standards for their contracted career field, and who can help make the units in their career field more effective, deserves the opportunity to serve in that career field, regardless of gender.

Question. Do you believe that the occupational standards developed by the Army, especially those developed for the ground combat occupations, reflect "actual, regular, and recurring duties" of the occupation in question, as required by law?

Answer. I understand the Army used gender-neutral standards to validate occupational standards and tasks for every career field and specialty. To initially identify whether a recruit can meet the physical standards for their contracted occupational specialty, the Army developed an occupational physical assessment test (OPAT). Recruiters administer this test at all recruiting stations to ensure that recruits meet the minimum physical standards for their contracted specialty and are ready for basic training. I look forward to learning more about these standards and the associated OPAT to understand better how it is being applied to promote the success of recruits and the readiness of units.

Question. Tank crews, howitzer sections, infantry squads, engineer squads, mortar squads, and scout sections readiness require small unit stability after weapons qualification. These are the building blocks that affect battalion and brigade overall readiness. Given available data, women may have higher rates of injury. What is your view on the impact this decision would have on unit readiness?

Answer. It is my understanding that the higher rates of injury for women have had a negligible impact on unit readiness thus far. The Army is engaged, however, in integrated longitudinal studies that assess injury rates for all soldiers in career fields previously closed to female soldiers. The Army anticipates that the results

from these studies will help improve readiness and refine physical standards and assessments.

Currently, soldiers must be able to perform all tasks in their occupational specialty in order to graduate from training and subsequently work in that career field. The occupational physical assessment test (OPAT) given to recruits before they report to training is a means to mitigate attrition and injuries by ensuring that recruits are physically qualified for their contracted occupational specialty.

If confirmed, I look forward to reviewing the Army's ongoing study to more fully understand the variables that could impact injury rates in all soldiers, and the best options the Army can pursue for reducing injury rates for all soldiers.

MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION (MWR)

Question. If confirmed, what challenges do you foresee in sustaining Army MWR programs in the future fiscal environment?

Answer. I believe that a significant challenge is identifying and prioritizing those programs that are most important to soldiers and their families, and then ensuring they are properly resourced in a fiscally constrained environment. My family and I enjoyed the Army's MWR programs when we were on active duty. If confirmed, I intend to ensure the Army continues to make MWR a priority by providing quality, sustainable, soldier and family-focused MWR programs and services.

MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM REORGANIZATION

Question. Section 702 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017 transferred direct oversight and management of military hospitals and clinics from the military services to the Defense Health Agency (DHA). In March and again in June, this Committee received the Department of Defense's interim reports on section 702, which described the Department's intent to develop a component model to administer and manage military treatment facilities. Under this component model, the Department would establish service intermediary medical commands, and those commands would be subject to two separate lines of authority—the DHA and the Services.

Do you believe that a component model, with establishment of new intermediary medical commands under two separate lines of authority, would make the military health system flatter, more agile, and more efficient?

Answer. It is my understanding that the details of the future organizational structures of the DHA and Component Command are still being developed. The Army, though, believes the component model will afford opportunities to make the military health system more responsive, more agile, and more efficient.

Under the fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, the Services retain the responsibility for readiness while the DHA will assume responsibility for the administration of the military medical treatment facilities. The component construct establishes Service-led component commands as the integrating element for Service directed readiness requirements and DHA directed MTF administration requirements.

If confirmed, I will take a close look at this issue to ensure the military health system structure is as agile and efficient as possible to meet soldiers' needs.

Question. If confirmed, would you reevaluate the Department's decision to proceed with a component model to implement section 702?

Answer. If confirmed, I will fully evaluate the Department's decision to proceed with a component construct to ensure it will meet Army readiness requirements and the DHA requirements for the administration of military medical treatment facilities, to include budget; information technology; health care administration and management; administrative policy and procedure; military medical construction; and other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

Question. If confirmed, would you urge the Secretary of Defense to reevaluate the Department's decision to proceed with a component model to implement section 702?

Answer. If confirmed, I will first fully evaluate the Department's decision to proceed with a component construct to ensure it will meet Army readiness requirements and the DHA requirements for the administration of military medical treatment facilities. Based on that evaluation, I would make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense as appropriate to ensure the health and readiness of the force is maintained as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Question. If confirmed, would you ensure that the Army reduces its medical headquarters staffs and infrastructure (including both regional command staffs and infrastructure) to reflect the more limited scope and size of its health care missions?

Answer. If confirmed, I would ensure the Army fully evaluates and supports efforts to eliminate unnecessary staff, infrastructure, and activities carried out by the

DHA and the Services—to include both regional command staffs and infrastructure—while ensuring the Army is able to fulfill its command support and readiness requirements and functions.

Question. In your view, would a component model streamline the administration and management of military treatment facilities?

Answer. The Army believes the component model construct does streamline the administration and management of military medical treatment facilities because it aligns Service-led component commands and Service-led MTFs directly under the authority, direction, and control of the DHA responsible for the administration of the MTFs as it relates to budget; information technology; health care administration and management; administrative policy and procedure; military medical construction; and other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate.

If confirmed, I will take a close look at this issue to ensure the military health system structure streamlines the administration and management of military treatment facilities to meet soldiers' needs effectively and efficiently.

Question. In your view, would a component model achieve the Committee's goal to eliminate multiple inefficient layers of management and bureaucracy in the Department of Defense's medical operations?

Answer. It is the Army's view that the component model construct would achieve the Committee's goal to eliminate unwarranted duplicative activities carried out by elements of the DHA and the Military Departments, while ensuring the Army is able to fulfill its command support and readiness requirements and functions. If confirmed, I will study this issue more closely to ensure this model is appropriate, and that it eliminates inefficient layers of management and bureaucracy in DOD's medical operations.

Question. In your view, would a component model eliminate the current stove-piped medical command structures of the Services?

Answer. It is my understanding the component construct will establish the DHA with the authority, direction and control to function as the one single point of accountability responsible for the administration of all military medical treatment facilities as it relates to budget; information technology; health care administration and management; administrative policy and procedure; military medical construction; and other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate. Further, I understand that each of the Services' medical departments are established to meet Service-specific requirements using Total Army Analysis (or similar) methodology. If confirmed, I will take a close look at this issue to ensure stove pipes are eliminated in this construct.

Question. If confirmed, would you ensure a rapid and efficient transfer of the operations of the Army's military medical facilities to the DHA?

Answer. If confirmed, I would ensure an effective and efficient transfer of responsibilities for the administration of the military medical treatment facilities as it relates to budget; information technology; health care administration and management; administrative policy and procedure; military medical construction; and other matters the Secretary of Defense determines appropriate from the Army to the DHA in accordance with the timelines and milestones set by the Department of Defense.

FAMILY READINESS AND SUPPORT

Question. Soldiers and their families in both the active and reserve components have made, and continue to make, tremendous sacrifices in support of operational deployments. Senior military leaders have warned of concerns among military families as a result of the stress of deployments and the separations that go with them.

What do you consider to be the most important family readiness issues for soldiers, and their families, and, if confirmed, how would you ensure that family readiness needs are addressed and adequately resourced, especially in light of current fiscal constraints?

Answer. The stress of deployment(s)—before, during, and after—has a major impact on family readiness. I know this based on my personal deployment to the Gulf War in 1990 to 1991. I believe one important way to lessen this impact is by providing high quality family programs that reduce stress, assist families, and enhance readiness. Key programs include services for child care, financial readiness, and substance abuse and domestic violence prevention. Other important programs include Child and Youth Services, and Army Morale, Welfare, and Recreation programs.

If confirmed, I will work to ensure these and other family readiness programs are properly resourced and effective in supporting soldiers and their families.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

Question. The numbers of suicides in each of the Services continue to be of great concern to this Committee.

If confirmed, what role would you play in shaping suicide prevention programs and policies for the Department of the Army to prevent suicides and increase the resiliency of soldiers and their families?

Answer. The number of suicides in the Service greatly concerns me. One is too many. It is tragic that these great Americans who serve their Country so well would reach a point where they view suicide as their only option. I understand the Army is conducting an extensive analysis of all soldier suicide cases, while developing new data on dependent suicides, to build a more comprehensive understanding of suicides in the Total Army family. If confirmed, I am fully committed to continuing these reviews and supporting implementation of any recommendations that will reduce the suicide rate.

Suicides directly impact readiness across all our formations, in addition to the impact they have on the Army family. If confirmed, I will make this issue one of my top priorities and work closely with Army leaders at all levels to prevent suicides.

SUPPORT FOR WOUNDED, ILL, AND INJURED SOLDIERS

Question. Service members who are wounded or injured in combat operations deserve the highest priority from the Army and the U.S. Government for support services, healing and recuperation, rehabilitation, evaluation for return to duty, successful transition from active duty if required, and continuing support beyond retirement or discharge.

What is your assessment of the progress made by the Army to improve the care, management, and transition of seriously ill and injured soldiers?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army has made good progress in the care of seriously ill and injured soldiers over the last ten years or so thanks to the support of Congress and an intense focus by Army leadership. The Army improved facilities like the renowned burn unit in San Antonio, Texas, and reduced processing times in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System. There is always room for improvement, however, especially when it comes to the care of the Army's wounded, ill, and injured soldiers.

If confirmed, I am committed to ensuring the Army continues to improve the care, management and transition of seriously ill and injured soldiers because they deserve no less than the very best the Army has to offer.

Question. If confirmed, are there additional strategies and resources that you would pursue to increase the Army's support for wounded soldiers, and to monitor their progress in returning to duty or to civilian life?

Answer. Support for wounded soldiers and monitoring their return to duty or civilian life is a top priority. If confirmed, I will work to ensure the Army maintains—and continues to improve—the quality of the Warrior Care and Transition Program, and, has the ability to expand this program, as necessary.

A key to maintaining the quality of care is to ensure that soldiers can seamlessly transition through the Integrated Disability Evaluation System, as required. To do this, the Army must have sustained and collaborative relationships across the federal government with agencies such as the Department of Veterans Affairs, and with the private sector.

SENIOR MILITARY AND CIVILIAN ACCOUNTABILITY

Question. While representative of a small number of individuals in the Defense Department, reports of abuses of rank and authority by senior military and civilian leaders and failures to perform up to accepted standards are frequently received. Whistleblowers and victims of such abuses often report that they felt that no one would pay attention to or believe their complaints. Accusations of unduly lenient treatment of senior officers and senior officials against whom accusations have been substantiated are also frequently heard.

What are your views regarding the appropriate standard of accountability for senior civilian and military leaders of the Department of the Army?

Answer. All Department of the Army personnel, military and civilian, must be held to the same standard. Everyone should live by and demonstrate the Army values and professionalism that the Nation expects of its Army. With regard to the Army's senior leaders, I expect them to lead by example and set the highest personal standards for themselves in all that they say and do.

Any alleged failure to maintain established standards should and will be investigated without sacrificing the appropriate due process for the individuals involved.

If confirmed, I will insist that all military and civilian leaders face appropriate consequences if it is determined they failed to adhere to established legal, moral, and ethical standards, regardless of the grade or position of the individual.

Question. If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that senior leaders of the Army are held accountable for their actions and performance?

Answer. The Department of the Army, subject to the oversight of DOD, has established policies that govern the investigation of any allegation made against senior Army and Civilian leaders. If confirmed, I will fully support these policies and current investigative processes to ensure all allegations receive a thorough, impartial investigation without violating the due process rights of any of individual. For all substantiated allegations, within my authority, I will ensure the leader faces appropriate consequences for his or her conduct. If I determine the system, policy, or processes need adjustment to ensure we maintain the high standards expected and required of our senior leaders, I will work to bring about those changes.

MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

Question. The transformation of the Armed Forces has brought with it an increasing realization of the importance of efficient and forward thinking management of senior executives.

What is your vision for the management and development of the Army senior executive workforce, especially in the critically important areas of acquisition, financial management, and the scientific and technical fields?

Answer. Having worked with and/or led senior executives during previous assignments at the Pentagon on the Army Staff and OSD Staff, I recognize the important role they play in the Nation's security, and the critical skills, knowledge, and experiences they bring to those roles. As such, the Army must work to ensure its senior executives are properly managed and professionally developed if the Service is to achieve its goals.

I understand the Army has instituted an enterprise approach to Senior Executive Service (SES) management through establishment of an annual Talent and Succession Management process. This process is designed to optimally align executive positions with the most critical Army imperatives and priorities, to include acquisition, financial management, and the scientific and technical fields. As I understand it, the process directly links executive positions to overall Army needs; develops a broader, more agile executive bench; and addresses succession planning for the Army's SES positions.

The Army has also placed an increased emphasis on Executive Development by implementing the Army Senior Executive Education Program. This program is centrally funded and focused on reinforcing the general principles of strategic leadership; business transformation and enterprise; change leadership; ethics, culture and management; and Army transformation.

If confirmed, I will review these developmental tools, processes, and programs and work with Army senior executives to refine them as necessary to ensure the Army continues to develop SES personnel who can help manage and lead the Department, particularly in the areas of acquisition, financial management and science and technology.

Question. Do you believe that the Army has the number of senior executives it needs, with the proper skills to manage the Department into the future?

Based on my prior service in OSD and the Army Staff, it is my understanding that the Army distributes civilian senior leaders in a variety of positions to work in conjunction with senior officers to help lead and manage the Army. I further understand the Army implemented a process of continual review to align senior leader allocations to leadership needs and identify changes in requirements. If confirmed, I will review the number and distribution of senior executives in the Army, and make changes as necessary to ensure the Service is well-led and managed for the challenges it faces today and in the future.

OPERATIONAL ENERGY

Question. In his responses to the advance policy questions from this Committee, General Mattis talked about his time in Iraq, and how he called upon the Department of Defense to "unleash us from the tether of fuel." He stated that "units would be faced with unacceptable limitations because of their dependence on fuel" and resupply efforts "made us vulnerable in ways that were exploited by the enemy."

Do you believe this issue remains a challenge for the Department of Defense?

Answer. Yes. The dependency or "tether of fuel" remains a constraint and vulnerability as indicated by Secretary Mattis during his confirmation hearing. I saw this same challenge during my combat experience in the 1990 to 1991 Gulf War.

Question. If confirmed, what will you do to unleash the Army from the tether of fuel?

Answer. It is my understanding that the Army has been pursuing multiple efforts to dramatically change the current dynamic of fuel dependence. These initiatives include pursuing improvements to the energy efficiency of equipment, and the way that electric power is generated and distributed on the battlefield. The goal is to improve the operational capability of Army systems by/while reducing overall fuel requirements. While progress has been made in reducing the fuel tether, a great deal of work remains. If confirmed, I plan on continuing these efforts.

Question. If confirmed, what priorities would you establish for Defense investments in and deployment of operational energy technologies to increase the combat capabilities of warfighters, reduce logistical burdens, and enhance mission assurance on our installations?

Answer. I understand that developing combat capabilities in this regard requires a complex set of trade-offs that involve maximizing the lethality, mobility, and protection of soldiers. Operational energy considerations need to be assessed and integrated into combat capabilities development to reduce constraints, vulnerabilities, and fuel dependencies. If confirmed, I will work with senior Army leaders to identify the right requirements and set priorities so the Army invests in the capabilities required to deploy, fight, and win on future battlefields that optimize energy usage without compromising combat effectiveness.

ENERGY AND ACQUISITION

Question. How can our acquisition systems better incorporate the use of energy in military platforms?

Answer. It is my understanding the Army S&T enterprise has various research efforts devoted to this topic, including construction methodologies to improve energy efficiency, and advanced and hybrid power trains and fuel cell technologies for military vehicles. I have been informed that these efforts are designed to improve efficiency and make better use of energy both on the battlefield and for base operations to enhance capabilities and lessen the logistics tail. It is my understanding that the Army is fundamentally changing the culture and better managing the use of energy throughout its acquisition systems with these efforts. If confirmed, I will assess how the Army can better address the use of energy in military platforms.

ENERGY RESILIENCY IN THE FIGHT AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND SYRIA (ISIS)

Question. Back in July after a coup attempt, the Turkish government cut off power to Incirlik Air Base, which is the primary platform for launching coalition airstrikes in the fight against ISIS. For roughly a week, deployed units had to operate off backup generators, which is expensive and not the preferred method of operation given the demanding tempo of sorties against ISIS.

If confirmed, specifically how will you address and make energy resiliency and mission assurance a priority for the Department of the Army, to include acquiring and deploying sustainable and renewable energy assets to improve combat capability for deployed units on our military installations?

Answer. My understanding is the Army's Energy Security and Sustainability Strategy acknowledges that energy, water, and land resources are critical to Army mission accomplishment. If confirmed, I will work with the Army's senior leaders to ensure the proper focus on energy resiliency in both installation and deployed unit operations.

Question. To what extent, if any, are title 10 training exercises and wargames dealing with energy outages? If not, why?

Answer. The Army must be prepared to operate in austere environments of all types, with units at all echelons prepared to meet their own energy needs with efficient and resilient organic assets. I understand that the Army trains in scenarios across the full spectrum of conflict and in challenging environments with only the power sources units bring with them. If confirmed, I would continue to ensure the Army conducts exercises under realistic combat conditions, especially against near peer threats, where external power sources are likely unavailable.

Question. Do you support the J-4's enforcement of the energy supportability key performance parameter in the requirements process?

Answer. I understand that the Department's acquisition process should explore alternate and renewable energy sources that are reliable, cost effective, and can relieve the dependence of deployed forces on vulnerable fuel supply chains to better enable our primary mission to win in conflict. The purpose of such efforts should be to increase the readiness and reach of our forces; these considerations must be

made up front, as part of the requirements process. If confirmed, I will support efforts to make energy supportability a performance parameter.

Section 2805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017 gave the Department of Defense new authority to plan and fund military construction projects directly related to energy resiliency and mission assurance, and to help address and mitigate against incidents like Incirlik, not to mention secure micro-grids to help prevent cyber-attacks.

Question. If confirmed, will you commit to use section 2805 to support mission critical functions and address known energy vulnerabilities with projects that are resilient and renewable?

Answer. If confirmed, I will look into how the Army can use the new authorities provided to it under Section 2805 to support mission critical functions by planning and funding new construction projects related to energy resiliency and mission assurance. My aim would be to use Section 2805 authorities to the greatest degree possible to address known energy vulnerabilities and guarantee the Army's energy security.

ENVIRONMENT

Question. If confirmed, will you comply with environmental regulations, laws, and guidance from the Environmental Protection Agency?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure the Army complies with applicable environmental regulations, laws, and guidance from the Environmental Protection Agency and state regulatory authorities.

Question. If confirmed, will you make the same level of investment for the Defense Department's Environmental Research Programs?

Answer. If confirmed, I will seek to ensure the Army's investment in environmental research is maintained at appropriate levels to meet the Army's requirements.

Question. If confirmed, will you work with the Department of Interior and the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to find cooperative ways to ensure military readiness and protect the environment on and around U.S. military installations?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure the Army continues to work closely with the Department of Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to uphold our responsibilities as stewards of some of our Nation's most valuable natural resources, while maintaining sufficient land for training in order to meet readiness needs.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Question. In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Secretary of the Army?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings, and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate committees in a timely manner?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee, or to consult with this Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If confirmed, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?

Answer. Yes, I agree to provide appropriate responses to all Congressional oversight requests.

[Questions for the record with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAN SULLIVAN

ARMY RIGOROUS TRAINING STANDARDS AND CHALLENGES

1. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, “This Kind of War” by T.R. Fehrenbach details the devastating loss of American lives at the start of the Korean War due to a lack of readiness. Would you agree that we must continue to ensure our military training standards are hard and rigorous to reflect the realities of combat, and that this standard should not be lowered or influenced by politics?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I believe that readiness must be the Army’s top priority, and that all of its training must be to standard, incorporate the current operational environment, not be influenced by politics, and must be hard and rigorous to best prepare soldiers and the Army for combat.

2. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, as the situation with North Korea escalates, what are your specific plans to ensure that our Army forces are ready and able to swiftly and decisively defeat North Korea threats?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will work with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Congress to secure the requisite funding and resources needed for such a major contingency. If confirmed as the Secretary of the Army, it would be my responsibility to ensure the Army provides trained and ready forces capable of conducting a broad range of missions so that the President has an array of options available to him. In this regard, I would work closely with General Milley to ensure the Army continues planning and training for contingency operations, and conducting rigorous training at home stations and Combat Training Centers (CTCs) focused on the high end threat. I will also work with General Milley and other senior Army leaders to ensure our deploying forces are fully manned, that munitions stocks are sufficient, and that the Army’s equipment is well maintained and ready to deploy.

General Milley has made readiness his number one priority. The Army has made substantial progress in improving the readiness of its forces to respond to contingencies in trouble spots around the world, including Korea. However, for contingencies on a scale such as Korea, an effective response by the Army would involve Regular Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve units, requiring mobilization of the Total Force. Proper preparation for operations on this scale would also require additional resources.

ARMY END STRENGTH

3. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, the size of the Army has been decreasing while the People’s Republic of China (PRC) is surging through 2 decades of military modernization, a resurgent Russia is expanding fighter and bomber aviation and exporting advanced surface to air missile technology, and a belligerent North Korea is on the verge of producing a nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile ICBM that strike the continental United States. We are also still heavily engaged in a war against violent extremism in the Middle East, Syria, and across the globe. What do you think is the correct end strength for Army, and what is the timeline you would undertake this growth in?

Dr. ESPER. Given today’s strategic environment and our current national defense objectives, I believe the Total Army end strength must be increased. The Secretary of Defense’s ongoing strategic review will inform the Army’s assessment of the Total Army end strength required to accomplish its roles and missions in support of the new National Defense Strategy. This assessment will also help determine the capabilities, force structure, training, and other factors critical to winning across the full spectrum of conflict. Growing the force should be done quickly but responsibly, ensuring quality is maintained and soldiers are properly trained and integrated into skill sets and units across the Total Force.

SMALL UNIT SUPPORT VEHICLE ADVOCACY

4. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, Alaska’s Army National Guard, as well as several other National Guard units, rely on the Small Unit Support Vehicle (SUS-V) to maneuver in cold weather, austere environments. While the SUS-V is no longer a program of record, it is a necessity in order to maneuver and save lives during rescue operations in extreme Arctic environments. Can I get your commitment, if confirmed, to take a hard look creating a SUS-V support plan that will sustain the SUS-V until a replacement can be identified and procured?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, if confirmed, I will ensure the Army thoroughly evaluates development of a SUS-V support plan. I am fully committed to providing the Total Force with the equipment required for their missions.

5. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, in this year's Senate NDAA report language, I sponsored a provision that calls for a rapid acquisition strategy to replace the Small Unit Support Vehicle (SUS-V) with a Joint All-Terrain/All-Weather Support Vehicle (JAASV). Can I get your commitment to take a detailed look at rapidly procuring the JAASV, which is urgently needed to replace the increasingly difficult and costly to maintain SUS-V?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, if confirmed, you have my commitment to take a thorough look at procuring the Joint All-Terrain/All-Weather Support Vehicle (JAASV) and report back to Congress consistent with the NDAA.

SMALL BUSINESS CONTRACTING

6. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, in March 2015, DOD issued a report to Congress, the "Assessment of Justification and Approval Requirements Implemented under Section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Section 811)." The report found that in fiscal year 2014 no 8(a) sole-source contracts were awarded that required an 8(a) justification and approval (J&A). DOD stated it could not determine the cause for this decline. There have been numerous reports from 8(a) firms that the decline in awards is due to tougher J&A standards for and scrutiny on the firms themselves, not the sole-source contracts that could be awarded to these firms. If confirmed, how would you encourage the Army to work more effectively with Native community-owned contractors, particularly regarding 8(a) sole-source contracts?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will seek to ensure that the Army provides fair opportunities to all socio-economic programs, including Native community owned contractors, and will message the same as appropriate to the responsible Army offices. I believe that the intent of the written justification of 8(a) sole source awards over \$22 million was to ensure competition. The Army worked diligently to support all small business programs. Over the last two fiscal years, I understand that the Army exceeded its Small Business Administration small business goals, while in fiscal year 2016 exceeding its competition goals. If confirmed, I would continue to support these practices.

7. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, section 811 does not prohibit direct awards greater than \$22 million (adjusted from \$20 million due to inflation), it has encouraged greater—if not excessive—levels of approval for comparatively small contracts. This unnecessarily high level of approval then led to zero contract awards above \$22 million to 8(a) corporations, according to a 2014 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report. How would you encourage such awards above \$22 million, when appropriate, to Native community-owned contractors given the additional scrutiny experienced by these firms?

Dr. ESPER. I realize the importance of the Small Business Administration's 8(a) Business Development Program to small businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, including firms owned by Alaska Native Corporations and Indian tribes. If confirmed, I will ensure the Army works collaboratively with the U.S. Small Business Administration in support of the program. As an initial step, I will work with my Small Business Director and Army Acquisition Executive to ensure that our acquisition workforce understands that the \$22 million is not a cap, but simply a threshold that triggers a process to further ensure value.

8. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, do you agree that section 811, similar to the Competition in Contracting Act (CICA), allows for the approval of a justification for an 8(a) sole-source to be approved by someone other than the Head of Agency and can the Head of Agency have the legal ability to delegate the approval authority for an 8(a) justification?

Dr. ESPER. I will ensure that the Army acquisition professionals are knowledgeable of appropriate dollar thresholds for approving 8(a) sole sources. If confirmed as Secretary of the Army, I would be the Head of the Agency empowered to delegate Senior Procurement Executive (SPE) Authority. The SPE in turn can delegate and oversee Head of Contracting Activities who appoints Senior Contracting Officials that ensure compliance with all acquisition laws, regulations, and policies. This is the same procedure used to ensure compliance with the Competition in Contracting Act (CICA).

9. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, shouldn't the level of agency approval by the appropriate agency official be tied to the dollar value of the contracts, as is done under CICA?

Dr. ESPER. Based on my understanding, I do believe that appropriate oversight needs to take place in approving 8(a) sole source justifications. Senior Contracting Officials are approving 8(a) sole source justifications above \$22 million to \$93 million, similar to CICA. If the amount is over \$93 million, I understand that the Secretary of the Army is the approval authority for the sole source justifications.

10. Senator SULLIVAN. Dr. Esper, while section 811 does not require a "Head of Agency" approval for sole source contracts over \$22 million, DOD—to include the Air Force—has interpreted it to require that level of approval. In addition, current law establishes higher levels of approval commensurate with higher contract values. If confirmed and given the authority of the Secretary, do you commit to streamline the approval of contracts above the \$22 million threshold to below the "Head of Agency" level and to the approval levels that are already matched to the contract risk incurred by the Army? If so, will you also issue a memo to contracting officers within the Army informing them of your decision to establish that authority at levels that are appropriate to the size and risk of the contracts in question, consistent with what is already in law?

Dr. ESPER. Yes, if confirmed, I am committed to streamlining acquisition approvals, while remaining compliant with laws and regulations that are established higher than my authority.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAVID PERDUE

ARMY AND AIR ASSETS

11. Senator PERDUE. Dr. Esper, when the Key West Agreement was signed in 1948, and the Air Force was defined as a new Service, the Air Force was tasked with furnishing close combat and logistical air support to the Army. Right now, the Air Force is feeling the crunch fiscally as much as any of the other Services as they work to modernize a number of large platforms at once. They also have to think about new domains for which they have been tapped as the lead, like space. Other Air Force platforms are being put forth as bill-payers, like the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) platform, for which the Air Force is not the end user, but your Army troops on the ground are. If confirmed, what will you do to work with the other service secretaries to ensure that your troops are getting what they need in terms of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), air cover, and airborne battle management?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will work closely with senior Army leaders, my peers in the other Services, and OSD to ensure soldiers have the ISR, air support, and airborne battle management (BMC2) capabilities the Army needs to fight and win the Nation's wars. While the Army requires these capabilities to support Commanders on the ground in support of national objectives, the Army is capability-centric and platform agnostic. I will also work closely with Congress to ensure the Army has or is provided all of the air-based capabilities it needs.

ARMY AND CYBER

12. Senator PERDUE. Dr. Esper, my home state of Georgia has been a leader in cyber, especially in the Army. At Fort Gordon in Augusta, we have NSA [National Security Agency] Georgia, the Army Cyber Center of Excellence, and Army Cyber Command Headquarter is moving down in 2020. How do you plan to make Army Cyber a part of everything that the Army does?

Dr. ESPER. Cyber is a present and growing threat that must be continually assessed and countered. Cyber defense and offense needs to be thoroughly integrated in nearly all that the Army does. As such, if confirmed, I look to build on the momentum of moving Army Cyber Command to Fort Gordon and ensuring this command is part of everything the Army does through several means. This includes continuing to provide senior leader vision, direction, and guidance to the Army's entire cyber enterprise across its operational and institutional forces; ensuring the readiness of the Army's Cyber Mission Force across the Total Army—Active, National Guard, and Army Reserve; ensuring the completion of the Army Cyber Command's Headquarters and Cyber Center of Excellence facilities at Fort Gordon, Georgia; building effective partnerships with industry, the inter-agency, intelligence community, allies, and academia; and most importantly, ensuring the Army continues to assess, recruit, train, retain, and take care of a world-class cyber workforce.

13. Senator PERDUE. Dr. Esper, cyber truly needs to be integrated into everything we do. What ideas do you have regarding cyber workforce recruitment and retention?

Dr. ESPER. The Army must continue to actively pursue a number of initiatives to recruit and retain a world-class cyber workforce:

For recruiting, I understand the Army's decision to both build a cyber school at Fort Gordon and establish a dedicated Cyber Career Field remains among the most effective means to attract young men and women to the Army. The Army must also leverage Congressionally-authorized programs, such as direct commissioning, that enhances its ability to directly appoint qualified individuals as cyber branch officers; civilian direct hiring authority; and the implementation of a Civilian Cyber Excepted Service program to continue to improve the most important element of the Cyber workforce, its people.

Being well-trained and feeling well-employed is critical to the retention of any workforce, including the best military and civilian personnel. I support the professionalization and commitment to continual training of the Army's cyber force. While it will always be challenging for the Army to compete with the private sector when it comes to compensation, the continuance of select military incentive pays, enlistment bonuses, and bonus agreements for senior NCOs will assist in retention efforts. Continuing programs such as student loan repayments, recruiting, retention, and relocation bonuses and scholarship opportunities should also enhance the retention of important civilian personnel working within the cyber force.

AUDIT

14. Senator PERDUE. Dr. Esper, DOD is the only Federal agency that cannot present auditable financial statements showing where and how it spends its annual budget. It has also been deemed at high risk for waste, fraud, abuse, and management by the Comptroller General. Despite much effort and billions of dollars spent to fix these problems, they have remained for decades. If confirmed, what actions will you take or direct that will achieve a better outcome than past actions and initiatives for financial auditability of the Army?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will hold military and civilian leaders at all levels accountable for achieving audit success. I am dedicated to supporting the Army's efforts to create a sustainable, auditable environment and further instilling a culture of financial transparency and accountability. Doing so is critical to better resource management and increased efficiency. Success in the Army's endeavor to achieve an unmodified audit opinion will require continued commitment to progressive improvements. The considerable progress towards an audit ready posture has enabled the Army to initiate the first full financial statement audits of their General and Working Capital Funds in Fiscal Year 2018.

If confirmed as Secretary of the Army, I will establish an environment in which military and civilian leaders at every level embrace audit and accountability initiatives in their daily routines. I intend to review the Army's audit progress on a regular basis, and provide the needed resources and leadership attention to promote a successful audit. I will expect leaders at all levels will regularly review the progress of their Commands as they implement corrective action plans to remediate findings from the independent public accountant. At the Department level, I will expect leaders to continue taking active roles in establishing policies, improving processes, and implementing system changes necessary to support the Army's efforts to achieve a clean opinion. Finally, I will enable the most senior leaders of the Army to ensure that human capital, information technology, and business processes facilitate the highest levels of reliability and integrity in the Army's financial reports.

M4 CARBINE RAILS

15. Senator PERDUE. Dr. Esper, the Senate Report to the fiscal year 2018 NDAA voiced concerns about the Committee's concern that the Army has not adopted a free-float rail system for the M4 Carbine and requests the Secretary of the Army to report back by December 1, 2017. If confirmed, will you review this program and reply back accordingly?

Dr. ESPER. I understand that the Army will provide Congress with a report on the M4 Carbine free-floated rail Soldier Enhancement Program initiative by December 1, 2017. If confirmed, and with sufficient time available, I look forward to reviewing this program and that report and replying back accordingly.

ARMY-NATIONAL GUARD/TOTAL FORCE

16. Senator PERDUE. Dr. Esper, Texas is the proud home of the largest National Guard and is currently overdriving to help the National Guard Bureau meet its end

strength, as they have been doing so for the past 10 years. When will this end strength be officially placed in Texas, along with the corresponding full-time manning, equipment and support personnel?

Dr. ESPER. I recognize and am grateful to the State of Texas for all the support it provides to ensure the readiness of the Total Army Force. It is my understanding that force structure authorizations allow States to recruit personnel, procure equipment, and receive full-time manning support. I further understand that the ARNG does not have additional force structure to allocate to Texas (or any other state) at this time. If confirmed, I would consider Texas as a top tier candidate to receive additional Force Structure and the accompanying End Strength authorization, provided DOD receives relief from the BCA; the Army receives an increase in force structure authorizations and sufficient appropriations to support that increase; and the Army's Total Force Policy supports such a decision.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR CLAIRE MCCASKILL

INTERAGENCY CBRNE TRAINING AT ARMY TRAINING FACILITIES

17. Senator MCCASKILL. Dr. Esper, during your testimony, you each acknowledged that the chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosives (CBRNE) threat posed by North Korea presents a serious concern to our national security, and that we are ill prepared to respond to a CBRNE attack or operate in a CBRNE environment. Would you agree that, given the nature of chemical and biological weapons, the threat posed by a CBRNE at home is just as dangerous as that posed to our forces overseas?

Dr. ESPER. CBRNE environments are complex and dangerous, but context specific. The threat posed to overseas forces is heightened as a consequence of proximity to the threat and the access malign actors have to deployed U.S. forces. That the overseas threat is contextually different and more proximate than that posed to the Homeland does not diminish the gravity of the threat to the Homeland.

18. Senator MCCASKILL. Dr. Esper, do you agree the Army's CBRNE enterprise is critical in keeping both servicemembers deployed overseas and civilians in the Homeland safe?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. Effective CBRNE response relies on how rapidly help arrives, what capabilities are immediately present at the scene, and how emergency responders adapt to the complexity of the incident. I understand the Army CBRNE enterprise is primarily a Homeland defense mission. Through a mix of Regular Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard forces, the Army can assist with chemical and biological detection, identification, and decontamination; medical assistance for mass casualty events; and support for domestic law enforcement.

I further understand that training for domestic CBRNE incidents enhances the Army's ability to accomplish their wartime mission. These well-trained CBRNE forces can effectively respond to and mitigate threats to our forces, installations, national partners, and civilian populations in the event of a CBRNE event overseas.

19. Senator MCCASKILL. Dr. Esper, do you agree that it is in the Army's best interest to ensure the highest degree of interoperability between Military Services and other Federal agencies?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. Interoperability is a key task for the Army to operate as a part of the joint force, and it is certainly in the Army's best interest to find ways to enhance joint interoperability. I also agree that the Army must work closely with the interagency, as well as with multinational partners, to understand, prepare for, and counter national security threats both abroad and in defense of the Homeland.

20. Senator MCCASKILL. Dr. Esper, do you agree with other military CBRNE leaders who have said combined training leads to effective response by building "a common understanding of each interagency partner's mission requirements and capabilities"?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I believe that training with other agencies facilitates an improved common understanding of requirements and capabilities, as does the exchange of information and ideas and other coordination in areas of mutual interest. Execution of such training must maximize efficiency and enhance service readiness consistent with the Army's Title 10 responsibilities to provide trained and ready military forces to the joint force.

21. Senator McCASKILL. Dr. Esper, can I get your commitment today that you will work with your counterparts across the Federal Government, to secure the resources need to support interagency CBRNE training conducted by the Army?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. If confirmed, you have my commitment that the Army will continue to review and assess opportunities to train with other Services and agencies in order to increase readiness and gain efficiencies, while ensuring the Army sustains its capabilities.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN

EQUIPMENT PROCUREMENT

22. Senator SHAHEEN. Dr. Esper, the Committee is aware that the Army awarded a contract earlier this year to procure the Advanced Combat Helmet Generation II (ACH Gen II). Procurement of the 24 percent lighter ACH Gen II is a step in the right direction to reduce the weight of critical personal protective equipment (PPE). Although this initial step is positive, it has come to my attention that the Army has yet to begin placing orders for the ACH Gen II against the contract awarded in March 2017. The Army indicated that industry plans for production of 10,000 to 12,000 helmets per month, resulting in significant investment in preparation to manufacture these helmets. The Army has yet to meet this commitment or provide detailed information as to when orders for production will begin. This is necessary to not only sustain the health and safety of our soldiers but to ensure that we maintain an ongoing and healthy industrial base. If confirmed, can you provide a timeline and short-term update on the Army's plan to procure the ACH Gen II helmet? Please be specific as to when orders are planned to begin, planned order requirements per month, and the long-term plan for the ACH Gen II program.

Dr. ESPER. I believe the Army continues to provide the best personal protective equipment (PPE) to protect soldiers while constantly working to reduce weight and improve performance. The Advanced Combat Helmet Generation (ACH Gen) II is example of that effort. It is my understanding that the ACH Gen II will begin First Article Testing in November 2017 to ensure it meets the Army's strict protective requirements. I also understand that the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), which maintains a stock of helmets to support funded requisitions from Army sustainment organizations and supply units, is expected to place an order for approximately 14,000 of the ACH Gen II helmets, pending successful First Article Testing and production approval; this is anticipated in March 2018. It is my understanding that the DLA cannot establish or guarantee monthly order quantities, but that future orders should go a long way to supporting a healthy industrial base.

NATIONAL GUARD READINESS AND CARE COORDINATION

23. Senator SHAHEEN. Dr. Esper, New Hampshire currently ranks 51 out of 54 in terms of the poor condition of its facilities and armories with many of these structures being more than a half-century-old. What is your view on adequately resourcing the National Guard Readiness Center Transformation Master Plan (RCTMP)?

Dr. ESPER. As a former Guardsman, I believe adequately resourcing the Army National Guard's (ARNG) Readiness Center Transformation Master Plan (RCTMP) is a readiness priority and critical to maintaining the National Guard as an Operational Reserve force. I understand that the Army National Guard has a plan to fund improvements to various Readiness Centers from fiscal year 2015 to 2023, and I agree this should be a priority.

24. Senator SHAHEEN. Dr. Esper, the New Hampshire National Guard employs a unique program called the Care Coordination program. This program provides support to guardsmen and their families throughout the deployment cycle with mental health issues, suicide prevention, employment services, and educational assistance to name a few. Please give me your perspective on the importance of programs like this and the need to ensure that our servicemembers and their families have resources available before, during and after overseas deployments.

Dr. ESPER. Programs like the New Hampshire National Guard's Care Coordination Program are essential to the overall well-being of soldiers and families, and the readiness of the Force. With our increased reliance on the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, it is especially critical that programs, such as the Care Coordination Program in New Hampshire, continue to function alongside traditional federal programs. New Hampshire has demonstrated a best practice that should be sustained, promoted, and shared throughout the force. With on-going Congressional

support, I understand the Army has been able to devote significant resources toward supporting these programs to help mitigate the stressors that some of its soldiers and families face during their military service.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND

TRANSGENDER SERVICEMEMBERS

25. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, what is your position on separating someone solely because of their gender identity?

Dr. ESPER. While I understand the Secretary of Defense is currently working with a panel of experts to develop a policy on the service of transgender soldiers, I believe that individuals who meet the requirements and standard for service, and who are able to make the force more lethal and effective, should not be separated solely because of their gender identity. If confirmed, I will provide my recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and work with the Secretary of Defense to help develop a policy that enhances readiness and is standards-based.

26. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, under what circumstances do you think someone who is honorably serving and meeting the same standards as other servicemembers should be separated solely based on their identity?

Dr. ESPER. I believe service in the Army is based on standards. Provided the soldier meets the Army entry/service standards and requirements, and can make the force more lethal and effective, I believe they should be allowed to serve and not be separated based solely on their gender identity.

27. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, Secretary of Defense James Mattis has said his panel will look at the issue of transgender accessions. Will you approach Secretary Mattis' review of transgender accession with an open mind and do you foresee any issues?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. If confirmed I will be open-minded in my approach to all issues, including transgender accessions, and provide the Secretary of Defense my best advice for transgender policy. At this time, I do not foresee any issues based solely on gender identity.

28. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, if confirmed, how will you safeguard the interests of openly serving transgender men and women as members of the Army?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I would work closely with senior leaders, military and civilian, to continually emphasize the importance of treating all soldiers with dignity and respect, maintaining military standards, and ensuring all soldiers meet those standards. Further, I will hold leaders accountable for taking this approach to their duties.

29. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, if confirmed, will you commit to meeting with openly transgender servicemembers to learn about their experiences within your first month on the job and before the panel has completed its analysis?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed I will meet with transgender soldiers, medical providers, and commanders as early as possible during my tenure to gain insights into their experiences, understand their medical needs, and better inform policy decisions.

COMBAT INTEGRATION

30. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, I have been pleased by the Army's progress in opening all occupational specialties to women. Will you support the continued efforts of General Mark A. Milley, USA, Chief of Staff of the Army, to open all Army roles to women?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I believe that any soldier who can meet the physical, mental, and other standards for their desired career field, and who can make the Army more lethal and effective, deserves the opportunity to serve in that specialty, regardless of gender.

31. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, how can the Army continue to recruit young women to combat arms roles?

Dr. ESPER. As explained to me, the propensity for female recruits to enlist in career fields previously closed to them far exceeds initial expectations; the Army's expectations in this regard were based on other nations' experiences with gender integration. If confirmed, I would meet with appropriate Army Senior Leaders to review how the Army can better recruit and retain quality female soldiers. Further, the

Army must continually evaluate and improve its marketing strategy to more effectively reach all eligible youth (male and female) across the country, and those who influence them.

MILITARY JUSTICE

32. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, both this year and last year, Senator Ernst and I put into the National Defense Authorization Act a military justice pilot to create litigation specialists in each Service. Do you believe that we should have Army lawyers that specialize in litigation and serve almost exclusively in trial assignments?

Dr. ESPER. It is my understanding that Army lawyers, both military and civilian, develop expertise in a wide variety of practice areas. Judge Advocates play an integral role in maintaining good order and discipline through the prosecution of criminal misconduct. The Army currently uses an Additional Skill Identifier to identify, track and develop Judge Advocates with military justice experience with the goal of developing senior judge advocates with extensive litigation experience. The Army believes it should be allowed to assign Judge Advocates where needed, based on mission requirements. Requiring Judge Advocates to serve almost exclusively in trial assignments may limit the ability to provide comprehensive legal support to the Army, particularly as it executes its mission in forward-deployed locations. That said, given that the Army has other occupations where service members specialize, I intend to keep an open mind to any proposals that can enhance the readiness and effectiveness of the force.

NEW YORK MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

33. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, the Army's military and civilian personnel assigned to Fort Drum, New York have proven themselves invaluable to our Nation's efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Drum is unique because of its airfield, which makes it easier for the 10th Mountain to deploy quickly. As the Army reassesses its funding priorities in the face of budget constraints and fiscal uncertainty, are you committed to keeping Fort Drum as home of the 10th Mountain Division?

Dr. ESPER. It is my understanding that there are currently no plans to relocate the 10th Mountain Division. While I generally support efforts to reduce and realign excess Army infrastructure, especially in light of budget uncertainty, if confirmed I will ensure these efforts are informed by strategy, Department of Defense guidance, law, and the Army's ability to fulfill its Title 10 responsibilities.

34. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, will you commit to visiting Fort Drum if you are confirmed?

Dr. ESPER. Yes.

ARMY CYBER

35. Senator GILLIBRAND. Dr. Esper, the New York and New Jersey National Guards have been awarded a joint Cyber Protection Team (CPT), but because the Army did not include the Guard's teams in its contribution to the Cyber Mission Force, the Guard teams are in a state of limbo—they are supporting Cyber Command, but they do not officially have a mission and are at the end of the line for funding and training. I have been pushing for these teams to be included in the Cyber Mission Force. I believe that we should view Army Guard CPTs as a national asset given the incredible talent offered by these citizen-soldiers, many of whom work in the private sector as information technology and computer science innovators. Do I have your commitment that you will look into the issue of the role of the Army Guard Cyber Protection Teams?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will be committed to oversee the effective build, readiness, and missioning of the Army's Total Force of Cyber Protection Teams—Active, National Guard, and Army Reserve. I understand that the Army National Guard teams from New York and New Jersey are scheduled to be at an Initial Operating Capability (IOC) by fiscal year 2021 and to reach Full Operating Capability by fiscal year 2022. If confirmed, you have my commitment to look into the role of the Army Guard Cyber Protection Teams.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD BLUMENTHAL
 NATIONAL URBAN SECURITY AND TECHNOLOGIES LABORATORY
 DIVERSITY OF THE FORCE

36. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Dr. Esper, do you agree that our military and our country are made stronger with the ability to draw on all individuals that are able to meet the rigorous requirements that our Armed Forces demand?

Dr. ESPER. I do. I understand the Army has made great progress at ensuring a key qualification for joining the Army and a specific branch is based on whether an individual can achieve the physical standard in their given specialty, not their gender. I further understand that studies preceding gender integration provided the impetus for military occupation specialties to clearly define the qualifications required in each career field, which ensures that readiness is grounded in objective, performance-based measures. I welcome any individual who is willing to serve, who meets the standards of service regardless of race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation, and who can make the force more lethal and effective. And I fully agree that diversity makes the Army stronger.

IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM

37. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Dr. Esper, if confirmed, will you continue to support Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP) and commit to ensuring it remains the Army's top aviation modernization program?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. If confirmed I will fully support the Improved Turbine Engine Program as one of the top modernization efforts for the aviation leg of our combined arms team. The ITEP engine is designed to buy back aircraft performance and ground commander payloads that have eroded over many years of aircraft weight increase in our AH-64 Apache and UH-60 Blackhawk fleets. This increased performance provides added speed, range, and agility to ground maneuver commanders, while using less fuel and increasing survivability for the aircrews. It is extremely important that we increase these capabilities in the legacy helicopter fleets and simultaneously bridge to future vertical lift.

38. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Dr. Esper, will you work to boost investments in research and development (R&D) across the Army?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I will work to increase the Army's investments in research and development (R&D). The Army requires increased Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation (RDT&E) funding to facilitate the transition of technology from S&T to programs of record, prototyping new capabilities and providing the analytical support and architecture for requirements. All of this is critical to the Army's current and future readiness.

BLACK HAWK

39. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Dr. Esper, the Black Hawk continues to be the backbone of Army aviation and its modernization strategy is incredibly important given the wear and tear on the fleet over the last 15 years. Will you commit to supporting a robust Black Hawk modernization program as Secretary of the Army?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I understand the UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter has been a workhorse for our ground maneuver forces over the last four decades in both maneuver warfare and counter-insurgency. I support the Army's goal of divesting A and L models from all components, and fully digitizing its largest fleet of aircraft.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MAZIE K. HIRONO

ROLE OF MODERNIZATION

40. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, in your advance policy question responses you identified readiness and modernization as two of your top priorities. As we work to try to finalize the NDAA for fiscal year 2018, what is your opinion on the relationship between readiness, the size of the force, and modernization and how should the Army prioritize across these areas?

Dr. ESPER. The Army fights in formations; formations consist of well-trained soldiers and equipment. For the Army, choosing between readiness, modernization or end strength is not an all or nothing option. While readiness must be our top priority right now, all three legs must be balanced appropriately. The Army cannot have more end strength than it has money to train, and it cannot have more units than it can equip. All three must be resourced as a package to form combat ready

formations. As near-term readiness improves, more resources can be devoted to modernizing the Army's weapons and equipment.

ASIA PACIFIC

41. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific is essential to U.S. national security. It is important for the United States to project strength and reassure our allies of our commitment to the region, particularly in light of the actions of North Korea. Can you discuss the role of Pacific Pathways in the Army's actions in the Pacific?

Dr. ESPER. I agree. I understand Pacific Pathways supports Pacific Command's security cooperation requirements by building Allied capacity and confidence throughout the Indo-Asia Region, while also building U.S. Army readiness for participating units critical to our ability to respond should a crisis or contingency arise. I further understand that tangible benefits of Pacific Pathways include sustained readiness of Army forces, increased confidence of our Allied partners, and improved access in the region and regional familiarization. These benefits directly contribute to increased readiness throughout the Pacific Theater at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels. The sum of these activities results in greater resilience among our regional Allies and Partners and improved deterrence against regional competitors and adversaries.

42. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, what additional assets does the Army envision directing to the Asia-Pacific area of operations?

Dr. ESPER. I understand Combatant Commanders continue to demand increased U.S. Army capabilities, including in the Indo-Pacific region. As an example, the Army recently announced the stationing of an engineer battalion headquarters that would improve engineering capability and capacity in Korea. In addition, the Army stationed a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) battery in Korea early this year to improve its ability to defend against ballistic missiles in the region. As tensions increase in the Indo-Pacific area of operations, the need for Army forces to respond to contingency requirements in the region and elsewhere may increase the importance of additional armored and long range fires capabilities, for example. If confirmed, I will continue to monitor the need for additional Army assets, as necessary, for the Indo-Pacific.

43. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, do you foresee any changes in the roles of the Guard and Reserve components in future Asia-Pacific missions?

Dr. ESPER. I understand that, for decades, the U.S. Army has always responded as a Total Force. Today, the Guard and Reserve components are fully integrated with U.S. Army Pacific (USARPAC) and U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) missions throughout the Indo-Pacific Region. They are integral in support of the USPACOM Security Cooperation Plan, including participation in Pacific Pathways, supporting State Sponsorship Programs with key countries in the region, and rotating through the USARPAC exercise program.

As someone who served in the Regular Army, Guard and Reserve components, I understand the Total Army force provides the necessary warfighting capabilities for future missions. At this time, I am not aware of any needed changes in the Guard and Reserve components in the region. I understand the Army would need to relook the requirements if Guard and Reserve readiness and roles in the Pacific were to be changed.

ENERGY SECURITY

44. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, U.S. energy security is a vital component to our national security. The need to reduce energy consumption, use clean alternative energy sources, and increase U.S. security is closely tied to our overall national security and an important goal for all our branches of the military. How do you plan to prioritize its long-term energy needs?

Dr. ESPER. My understanding is the Army's Energy Security and Sustainability Strategy acknowledges that energy security is critical to Army mission accomplishment. If confirmed, I will work with the Army's senior leaders to ensure the proper focus is placed in the operational and installation community. Priorities include reducing energy consumption while extending range, enhancing endurance, increasing flexibility, and resilience, and considering clean alternative fuel sources.

45. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, what efforts do you think would increase energy security in the Army?

Dr. ESPER. As outlined in the Army's Energy and Sustainability Strategy, it is my understanding that the Army is enhancing mission effectiveness through a range of power and energy initiatives. Reduction of operational energy requirements in military operations reduces soldier risk and vulnerability while improving combat effectiveness. On the battlefield, I am aware of actions underway to improve the lethality of weapon systems through energy efficiency, the way that electric power is generated and distributed, and by reducing the overall fuel requirements. At Army installations, it is my understanding that the Installation Energy and Water Security Policy sets a requirement to secure critical missions by providing the necessary energy and water for a minimum of 14 days. While progress has been made, a great deal of work remains. If confirmed, I plan on continuing these efforts and will ensure new approaches and technologies from industry partners are considered.

TRAINING AREAS

46. Senator HIRONO. Dr. Esper, training is an integral part of maintaining the capabilities and readiness of our force. As DOD continues to focus on the Asia-Pacific and the importance of forward based troops such as those assigned to Hawaii bases, it is imperative that our servicemembers have the opportunity to continue to train and hone their skills. Pohakuloa Training Area (PTA) is a great asset to all of the Services. The Army has been working to improve the facility and increase capabilities. What additional ways can the Army expand training opportunities for our forces stationed on Hawaii, including additional capacity at PTA and the Jungle Training School at Schofield Barracks?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will work with General Milley and other senior Army leaders to ensure Pohakuloa Training Area (PTA), the Jungle Training School, and all of the Army's training areas, ranges and schools are operating and being used efficiently and to the maximum extent relevant to the operational environment and emerging threats.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ANGUS S. KING, JR.

ENERGY RESILIENCY AND SECURITY

47. Senator KING. Dr. Esper, the Fiscal Year 2018 NDAA supports energy resiliency and security for military installations. I believe as part of this objective it is critical that the Army pursue the use of biomass when evaluating energy alternatives. Biomass energy is a source of local, affordable, reliable, cost-effective, clean, and secure energy that could help the Army with its power generation needs. What are your views on the importance of energy resiliency?

Dr. ESPER. I support the Department of Defense's view that we must strive to modernize our installation infrastructure, increase utility and energy conservation, enhance energy demand reduction, and otherwise improve energy resilience and efficiency. If confirmed, I will ensure our efforts are focused on warfighter readiness by ensuring energy supplies are secure and resilient. All energy supplies and sources, to include locally-supplied biomass, should be evaluated and considered for their ability to contribute to improved energy resilience for Army critical missions.

48. Senator KING. Dr. Esper, how will the Army make sure that biomass energy receives fair consideration for energy resiliency projects?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I will ensure that the Army continues to evaluate energy resilience projects for solutions that, first and foremost, effectively support the Army's ability to enhance warfighter readiness, project power, and support global operations. In so doing, I will ensure that Army energy resilience projects fairly evaluate all practical forms of energy for heat and electric power production, to include biomass where it makes operational, technical, and economic sense to do so.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ELIZABETH WARREN

CAREER MANAGEMENT

49. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) is nearly 40 years old and one of the key features of DOPMA is the up or out promotion system. Do you support any changes to that system, particularly for occupational specialties such as cyber?

Dr. ESPER. If confirmed, I support the review of all policies to ensure they will provide our Nation with the Army that it needs and deserves. I believe attracting and retaining the best talent in the Total Army will require increased flexibility in

areas such as promotions, assignments, and transitions between components. This is especially true in certain emerging high-demand skills like cyber. In short, I believe DOPMA needs to be reviewed and modernized. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the other Services toward this end, while continuing efforts to improve flexibility in the personnel system in the meantime.

50. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, would you be in favor of creating separate career tracks for technical military occupational specialties?

Dr. ESPER. I understand the Army already has separate career tracks for a number of specialties, many of which are largely technical. These career tracks for warrant officers do not include the traditional command and operational assignments required for continued upward mobility. I expect separate career tracks will continue to evolve with mission requirements, with cyber being a good example. As such, if confirmed, I am open to a continuing assessment of other skills and specialties that would benefit from a more technically oriented and separate career path.

ETHICS RECUSAL

51. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, in testimony you would not commit to going beyond the minimum requirement by recusing yourself from particular matters regarding Raytheon for the duration of your time in office. You said, "What I'd like to do is, if confirmed, is come back to you, maybe in a couple of years and see if there's an issue and maybe revisit the issue with you at that time." If confirmed, what factors would you consider in 2 years when weighing the decision to extend your recusal?

Dr. ESPER. The Army cannot afford to suffer from poor performance by contractors, nor does Congress or the public have patience for such shortcomings. Army acquisition must be improved, and I have committed to take a deep and personal interest in this issue, if confirmed, to ensure our soldiers have the weapons and equipment they need, when they need them, to fight and win on the modern battlefield. Therefore, while I am absolutely committed to not only meeting—and in some cases exceeding—federal ethics regulations to ensure I avoid any conflicts of interest, I am equally committed to ensuring I can meet my obligations to hold all Army contractors, including Raytheon, accountable.

Office of Government Ethics (OGE) regulations require that all employees recuse themselves for one year from participation in a particular matter in which their former employer is or represents a party to the matter. Pursuant to the President's Ethics Pledge, if confirmed, my recusal period will be doubled to two years. Additionally, I have personally agreed to further raise the bar by not seeking a waiver of the two year recusal period. I am committed to upholding the integrity and impartiality of the Department of the Army and if confirmed, I will continue to work closely with Army ethics officials to avoid any conflicts of interest or impartiality concerns for the duration of my appointment. All of this well exceeds OGE requirements that have been in place through multiple administrations.

My principal concern is that further extending/expanding my recusal may unnecessarily limit my ability, if confirmed, to personally and directly engage Raytheon leaders and hold them accountable for any failures or shortcomings that may arise in the future. My experience in the business world has been that the personal and direct engagement of a Service Secretary with the senior leaders of a defense contractor regarding a troubled program conveys the seriousness of the matter, and can be the best way to achieve a program turnaround that ultimately benefits the soldier and the taxpayer. Accordingly, if confirmed, the primary factors I would consider in two years concerning any extension of my recusal period would include: whether there is any likelihood that the public would question my impartiality at that point in time; whether my ability to participate in such matters in the long term is in the Army's and taxpayer's best interests; and conversely, whether and to what extent my inability to participate in such matters over the long term might negatively impact the Army's and taxpayer's interests. As such, I believe a review at the two-year mark rightly places the interests of the soldiers and the Army first, while balancing the expectations of Congress and the taxpayers regarding contractor performance and the ethical obligations of government officials, and after consulting DOD ethics officials, I understand they consider this to be more than a sufficient approach.

52. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, if confirmed, what do you expect to have materially changed in 2 years?

Dr. ESPER. The Army is operating in a highly dynamic environment, making the ability for leaders to engage and react to the unforeseen critical. Whether it is supporting peacekeeping or military operations, fielding or reacting to new technological advancements or capabilities, or addressing evolving performance issues under existing programs, consistent with the considerations outlined above, my primary concern is that all Army contractors, including Raytheon, are performing as expected and required, and can meet mission requirements. It is the very unpredictability of whether and when, if confirmed, my engagement as Secretary of the Army may be critical that makes it prudent to defer consideration of further extensions to my recusal and ensure that all of the relevant facts and circumstances existing at that time can be taken into account. As such, I believe a review at the two-year mark places the interests of the soldiers and the Army first in this dynamic environment, while balancing the expectations of Congress and the taxpayers regarding contractor performance and the ethical obligations of government officials. Additionally, my understanding is that the DOD ethics officials consider an additional extension, outside of the regulatory and Executive Order timeframes, to be unnecessary.

53. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, do the terms of your recusal include decisions where Raytheon is not the prime contractor but is instead a subcontractor?

Dr. ESPER. Under the terms of my Ethics Agreement, I will have varying degrees of recusals that will change over time as I become further removed from my employment with Raytheon. Until I divest of my financial interests in Raytheon, which will occur within the first 90 days, I am prohibited from participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that will have a direct and predictable effect on Raytheon's financial interests. Additionally, until such time as my deferred compensation is paid in full, I will be prohibited from participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that would have a direct, predictable, and substantial effect on the ability and willingness of Raytheon to meet their payment obligation. Both of these recusals would apply to particular matters where Raytheon is the subcontractor, if the matter meets the applicable direct and predictable effect standard.

Additionally, as set forth in my Ethics Agreement, OGE regulations require that all Executive Branch employees recuse themselves for one year from participation in a particular matter in which their former employer is or represents a party to the matter. Pursuant to the President's Ethics Pledge, if confirmed, my recusal period will be doubled to two years. And, since I have personally agreed to further raise the bar by not seeking a waiver of the two year recusal period, all of this well exceeds OGE requirements that have been in place through multiple administrations. Since a sub-contractor is not a party to the particular matter (e.g., the contract), these recusals would not apply to matters where Raytheon is not the prime contractor, unless Raytheon were serving as a representative for the prime contractor. This standard is wholly consistent with ethics standards in place through prior Administrations, and is designed to ensure senior government officials can adequately perform their jobs in the best interests of the soldiers and the taxpayers, consistent with the expectations of Congress, while maintaining the highest ethical standards. I am committed to upholding the integrity and impartiality of the Department of the Army and if confirmed, I will continue to work closely with Army ethics officials to avoid any conflicts of interest or impartiality concerns for the duration of my appointment.

54. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, do the terms of your recusal include decisions where Raytheon is not a contractor or subcontractor, but has a competing product and so could materially benefit from any decision you make?

Dr. ESPER. Under the terms of my Ethics Agreement, I will have varying degrees of recusals that will change over time as I become further removed from my employment with Raytheon. Until I divest of my financial interests in Raytheon, which will occur within the first 90 days, I am prohibited from participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that will have a direct and predictable effect on Raytheon's financial interests. Additionally, until such time as my deferred compensation is paid in full, I will be prohibited from participating personally and substantially in any particular matter that would have a direct, predictable, and substantial effect on the ability and willingness of Raytheon to meet their payment obligation. Both of these recusals would apply to particular matters where Raytheon is a competitor, if the matter meets the applicable direct and predictable effect standard.

Additionally, as set forth in my Ethics Agreement, OGE regulations require that all Executive Branch employees recuse themselves for one year from participation in a particular matter in which their former employer is or represents a party to

the matter. Pursuant to the President's Ethics Pledge, if confirmed, my recusal period will be doubled to two years. And, since I have personally agreed to further raise the bar by not seeking a waiver of the two year recusal period, all of this well exceeds OGE requirements that have been in place through multiple administrations. Where Raytheon is not a party to the particular matter (e.g., an awarded contract), the recusal would not apply. However, if the particular matter involves a procurement (e.g., a contract solicitation, a bid protest, etc.) where Raytheon is a competitor and thus a party, then the recusal would apply. This standard is wholly consistent with ethics standards in place through prior Administrations, and is designed to ensure senior government officials can adequately perform their jobs in the best interests of the soldiers and the taxpayers, consistent with the expectations of Congress, while maintaining the highest ethical standards. I am committed to upholding the integrity and impartiality of the Department of the Army and if confirmed, I will continue to work closely with Army ethics officials to avoid any conflicts of interest or impartiality concerns for the duration of my appointment.

55. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, in your nomination hearing, you testified in response to one of my questions that you personally lobbied on behalf of Raytheon regarding three Army programs during your time with the company. I followed up by asking whether you oversaw lobbying in other areas, to which you replied: "The lobbyists that reported ... the team that reported to me ... I oversaw all their activities across all Services, NDA, non-defense activities." When I asked whether that meant that you oversaw virtually everything that Raytheon lobbied on, you replied in the affirmative.

Given that as Vice President of Government Relations at Raytheon, you had at least some visibility into the entire array of government programs that Raytheon lobbied on, do you believe that, if confirmed as Army Secretary, it would be appropriate for you to recuse yourself from any matter in which the lobbyists you supervised were involved personally and substantially?

Dr. ESPER. The President's Ethics Pledge requires that, if confirmed, I recuse myself from participation in any particular matter (or any specific issue area where such particular matter falls) on which I lobbied within the two years prior to my appointment. Furthermore, I have personally raised the bar higher by agreeing not to seek a waiver of this recusal.

With regard to other Raytheon lobbyists, I did not lobby on any of the issues on which they lobbied (excepting, of course, those matters I identified in my confirmation hearing as being matters on which I personally lobbied). Additionally, I did not serve as the first line supervisor for those individual lobbyists. Rather, those individual lobbyists reported to a Director, who served as their immediate supervisor, which means I was twice removed from the details of their activities.

Taken in context with all of the requirements and recusals set forth in my Ethics Agreement, the requirements and recusals set forth in the President's Ethics Pledge, and my personal agreement not to seek waivers, I believe I have demonstrated my absolute commitment to ensuring the highest ethical standards. Furthermore, if confirmed, I will continue to work closely with Army ethics officials to avoid any conflicts of interest or impartiality concerns for the duration of my appointment. Additionally, as I have noted above, I am committed to ensuring that all Army contractors, including Raytheon, are held accountable and that if confirmed, I am able to fulfill my responsibilities as Secretary of the Army in that regard.

I believe that the existing robust ethical framework, together with my personal agreement not to seek waivers, strikes an appropriate balance that is in the best interests of the soldiers and the taxpayers, and is consistent with the expectations of Congress. With regard to lobbying activities, this will prohibit me from participating in matters on which I personally lobbied but will permit my engagement and accountability on those matters for which I had no personal involvement. If any matter arises in which the Committee is concerned about my engagement as Secretary, if confirmed, I commit to working openly and transparently to address any questions or concerns and to avoid any appearance of impropriety.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

56. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, I'm concerned that the Military Services are not prioritizing research, particularly basic research. If confirmed, will you commit to making basic research a priority?

Dr. ESPER. It is my understanding that the Army has recently undertaken a significant review of Science and Technology investments to ensure it is postured to deliver necessary technologies to enable its six modernization priorities. If confirmed, I am committed to effectively balancing the Army's investment in basic re-

search, applied research, and advanced technology developments to deliver foundational technologies in support of these modernization priorities to ensure the Army's current and future readiness.

GEOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY

57. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, more than half of our enlisted recruits come from just six States. Much of New England and part of the upper Midwest are underrepresented in the force and I am concerned that this reinforces the divide between civilians and our military. What are some of the things we could do to increase the geographic diversity of the force?

Dr. ESPER. I share your concern. If confirmed, I will review the Army's marketing strategy and community outreach by region to determine better methods of communicating with eligible youth, and those who will influence their decisions, about opportunities for service and a career in the U.S. Army.

58. Senator WARREN. Dr. Esper, do you think geographic diversity is important?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I believe geographic diversity improves and enhances the quality of talent brought into the Army. Recruiting people into the Army from every state and territory expands diversity of thought and experiences, and ensures the Service can attract the Nation's best and brightest, while also allowing the Army to be a truer reflection of our great Nation.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR GARY C. PETERS

HUMVEE ROLLOVER

59. Senator PETERS. Dr. Esper, I have been working with the Army to field brake and stability kits onto the new and existing High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) fleet for the Army, National Guard, and Army Reserve. HMMWV rollover accidents have resulted in injury or death for too many soldiers, as well as civilians when these accidents occur on public roadways. I have been told that the effort to field this technology to the HMMWV fleet will begin in fiscal year 2018. If you are confirmed, can you assure me that you will address the issue of HMMWV rollovers by working to field brake and stability kits to the HMMWV fleet?

Dr. ESPER. Yes. I understand that with prior congressional funding, the Army National Guard (ARNG) was able to modernize over 1,100 Up-Armored HMMWVs and purchase over 1,200 HMMWV Ambulances. If confirmed, I will monitor modernization efforts for these fleets to ensure they receive field brake and stability kits as planned.

STRYKER LETHALITY

60. Senator PETERS. Dr. Esper, I'm proud of having co-sponsored the amendment that supported the Army's requirement for up-gunning the Stryker combat vehicle with a 30mm cannon in response to an Operational Needs Statement from 2nd Cavalry Regiment. Within 15 months after the release of funds, the industrial base provided a prototype for the Army in a successful rapid acquisition program. The Stryker Lethality effort remains on track to field all the vehicles requested by summer 2018, on schedule and under budget. Following this success, the Army included a second set of Stryker Lethality vehicles on its Fiscal Year 2018 Unfunded Priorities List, and this committee authorized funding for them in the Fiscal Year 2018 NDAA. I think the need for this up-gunned capability for Stryker is crucial, both in Europe, and in Asia where we see an increasingly unstable threat from North Korea and rising tensions generally. Do you support the effort to enhance the lethality of Stryker vehicles?

Dr. ESPER. I support the Army's effort to enhance the lethality of the Stryker vehicle. It is my understanding that with the support you mentioned, the Army will deliver the first set of up-gunned Strykers to Europe within the next 90-days, three years from when they received the demand signal. That fielding, which makes the Strykers far more lethal, will continue in Germany and Poland for the 2d Cavalry Regiment (2SCR) throughout 2018. I appreciate the committee's support in the NDAA for the Army's request to fund the second set of up-gunned Strykers and, if confirmed, look forward to delivering them along a similar, rapid timeline.

[The nomination reference of Dr. Mark T. Esper follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 25, 2017.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Army, vice Eric K. Fanning.

[The biographical sketch of Dr. Mark T. Esper, which was transmitted to the Committee at the time the nomination was referred, follows:]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. MARK T. ESPER

Education:

- U.S. Military Academy
 - July 1982 to May 1986
 - BS, Engineering
- JFK School of Government, Harvard University
 - June 1994 to July 1995
 - MPA, National Security
- George Washington University
 - January 1997 to August 2008
 - Ph.D., Public Policy

*Employment Record*¹:

- U.S. Army
 - Rifle Platoon and TOW Platoon Leader, Rifle Company Executive Officer, Infantry Battalion Operations Officer (x2), Student (x3), Airborne Rifle Company Commander, Army Staff Officer
 - Fort Benning, GA; Fort Campbell, KY; Saudi Arabia; Vicenza, Italy; Boston, MA; Arlington, VA.
 - May 1986 to October 1996

Note: I continued my military service in the VA National Guard at Fort Belvoir, VA; the DC National Guard in Washington, DC; and the U.S. Army Reserves in Arlington, VA, from November 1996 until my retirement as a L TC/0-5 in July 2007.

- The Heritage Foundation
 - Chief of Staff
 - Washington, DC
 - July 1996 to December 1998
- Office of Sen Chuck Hagel
 - Legislative Director and Senior Policy Advisor
 - Washington, DC
 - January 1999 to January 2000
- Senate Government Affairs Committee/Office of Senator Fred Thompson
 - PSM/National Security Advisor
 - Washington, DC
 - January 2000 to July 2001
- Senate Foreign Relations Committee
 - PSM for National Security Affairs
 - Washington, DC
 - July 2001 to April 2002
- House Armed Services Committee
 - Policy Director
 - Washington, DC
 - April 2002 to November 2002
- Department of Defense, OSD Policy
 - Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Negotiations Policy)
 - Arlington, VA
 - November 2002 to May 2004

¹Most dates prior to July 2008 are estimates.

- Office of the Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist
 - National Security Advisor
 - Washington, DC
 - May 2004 to May 2006
- Aerospace Industries Association
 - Executive Vice President
 - Arlington, VA
 - May 2006 to July 2007
- Fred Thompson for President Campaign
 - National Policy Director and National Security Advisor
 - McLean, VA
 - July 2007 to February 2008
- Missouri State University, Department of Defense and Strategic Studies
 - Adjunct Professor (Part-time/Evenings)
 - Fairfax, VA
 - August 2006 to December 2010
- Performed multiple part-time jobs mostly simultaneously
 - Commissioner, United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission
 - Washington, DC
 - March 2007 to July 2008
 - President, Virtusci International LLC (Consulting firm I founded)
 - Burke, VA
 - March 2008 to July 2008
 - Senior Scholar, National Institute for Public Policy
 - Fairfax, VA
 - April 2008 to July 2008
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce
 - EVP for the Global IP Center, and, VP for Europe/Eurasia
 - Washington, DC
 - July 2008 to July 2010
- Raytheon Company
 - VP for Government Relations
 - Arlington, VA
 - July 2010 to Present

Honors and Awards:

- Military Awards
 - Legion of Merit, 2007
 - Bronze Star, 1991
 - Liberation of Kuwait Medal, 1991
 - Defense of Saudi Arabia, 1991
 - Combat Infantryman's Badge
 - Meritorious Service Medals (2)
 - Army Commendation Medals
 - Army Achievement Medals
 - Army Service Ribbon
- Federal Civilian Awards
 - Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service, 2004
- Other Awards
 - Laurel Highlands Senior High School Hall of Fame Inductee, 2013

[The Committee on Armed Services requires all individuals nominated from civilian life by the President to positions requiring the advice and consent of the Senate to complete a form that details the biographical, financial, and other information of the nominee. The form executed by Dr. Mark T. Esper in connection with his nomination follows:]

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ROOM SR-228

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6050

(202) 224-3871

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FORM

BIOGRAPHICAL AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION REQUESTED OF
NOMINEES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Complete all requested information. If more space is needed, use an additional sheet and cite the part of the form and the question number (i.e. A-9, B-4) to which the continuation of your answer applies. Unless otherwise required, an answer of yes, no, or not applicable is appropriate.

PART A—BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Biographical information furnished in this part of the form will be made available in Committee offices for public inspection prior to the hearing and will also be published in any hearing record as well as made available to the public.

1. **Name:** (Include any former names used.)

Mark T. Esper

2. **Position to which nominated:**

Secretary of the Army

3. **Date of nomination:**

July 25, 2017

4. **Address:** (List current place of residence and office addresses.)

[The nominee responded and the information is contained in the Committee's executive files.]

5. **Year and place of birth:**

1964, Uniontown, PA

6. **Marital status:** (Include full name of current spouse including any other names used, including maiden name.)

Married to Leah Lacy Esper since 1989. Spouse's Maiden Name was "Lacy"

7. **Names of children (if over age 18):**

- Luke T. Esper
- John R. Esper
- Kathryn L. Esper

8. **Education:** List names of secondary and higher education institutions attended, type of school (vocational, technical, trade school, college, university, military college, correspondence, distance, extension, and on-line) dates attended, degree received and date degree granted.

- U.S. Military Academy
 - July 1982 to May 1986
 - BS, Engineering
- JFK School of Government, Harvard University
 - June 1994 -July 1995
 - MPA, National Security
- U.S. Army Command & General Staff College
 - Completed via correspondence in 2001
- George Washington University
 - January 1997 to August 2008
 - Ph.D., Public Policy

9. **Employment record:** List all jobs held since college or in the last 10 years, whichever is less, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of employment. If the employment activity was military duty,

list separate employment activity periods to show each change of military duty station.

The following is my employment record for the last ten years. Some of the listed work dates are estimated.

- Aerospace Industries Association
 - Executive Vice President
 - Arlington, VA
 - May 2006 to July 2007
- Fred Thompson for President Campaign
 - National Policy Director and National Security Advisor
 - McLean, VA
 - July 2007 to February 2008
- Missouri State University, Department of Defense and Strategic Studies
 - Adjunct Professor (Part-time/Evenings)
 - Fairfax, VA
 - August 2006 to December 2010
- Performed multiple part-time jobs near simultaneously
 - Commissioner, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission
 - Washington, DC
 - March 2007 to December 2008
 - President, Virtusci International LLC (Consulting Firm I founded)
 - Burke, VA
 - March 2008 to July 2008
 - Senior Scholar, National Institute for Public Policy
 - Fairfax, VA
 - April 2008 to July 2008
- U.S. Chamber of Commerce
 - EVP for the Global IP Center, and later, VP for Europe/Eurasia
 - Washington, DC
 - July 2008 to July 2010
- Raytheon Company
 - VP for Government Relations
 - Arlington, VA
 - July 2010 to Present

10. **Government experience:** List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments, other than those listed above.

In addition to my service on the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, which is listed above, I was an appointed member of two separate State Department and Commerce Department Industry Trade Advisory Groups in 2007 given my position at AIA.

11. **Business relationships:** List all positions currently held as an officer, director, trustee, partner, proprietor, agent, representative, or consultant of any corporation, company, firm, partnership, or other business enterprise, educational or other institution.

Vice President, Government Relations, Raytheon

12. **Memberships:** List all memberships and offices currently held in professional, fraternal, scholarly, civic, business, charitable and other organizations.

- Member, Council on Foreign Relations
- Member, Veterans of Foreign Wars (and possibly the American Legion)
- Member, West Point Association of Graduates
- I may be a member of the Association of the U.S. Army (AUSA) as a result of attending their annual conference in Washington, D.C.
- Member, Nativity Catholic Church in Burke, VA.

13. **Political affiliations and activities:**

(a) If you have ever been a candidate for or have been elected or appointed to a political office, list the name of the office(s), whether you were elected/appointed/candidate, the year(s) the election was held or the appointment was made, and the term of office (if applicable).

N/A

(b) List all memberships and offices held in and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last 5 years.

N/A

(c) Itemize all individual political contributions of \$100 or more to any individual, campaign organization, political party, political action committee, or similar entity for the past 5 years. List each individual contribution and not the total amount contributed to the person or entity during the year.

- RA YPAC. I contributed annually to the Raytheon Political Action Committee (RA YPAC) over the past five years as the figures below show. These contributions were automatically deducted from my paycheck based on a fixed percent deduction. With an average of 26 pay periods each year, my approximate average contribution per pay period each year is listed in parentheses after the annualized amount. Additionally, I have been the Treasurer of RA YPAC since 2010.
 - 2012—\$1,341.52 (\$52)
 - 2013—\$1,091.07 (\$42)
 - 2014—\$1,619.77 (\$62)
 - 2015—\$1,683.63 (\$65)
 - 2016—\$1,736.34 (\$67)
 - 2017—\$748.49 (\$71)
- Richard Shelby via Shelby for U.S. Senate 2/8/2013 \$500
- McConnell Senate Committee 6/30/2014 \$500\$250
- John McCain via Sedona PAC 3/3/2015 \$250
- John McCain via Sedona PAC 3/6/2015 \$250
- Right to Rise PAC 3/6/2015 \$250
- Friends of Kelly Ayotte 10/15/2015 \$250
- Marco Rubio for President 11/24/2015 \$1,000

14. **Honors and Awards:** List all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, civilian service citations, military awards and decorations, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognition for outstanding service or achievements.

Military Awards

- Legion of Merit, 2007
- Bronze Star, 1991
- Liberation of Kuwait Medal, 1991
- Southwest Asia Service Medal, 1991
- Combat Infantryman's Badge, 1991
- Overseas Service Ribbon
- Meritorious Service Medals (2)
- Army Commendation Medals (2)
- Army Achievement Medals (5)
- Expert Infantryman's Badge
- National Defense Service Medal
- Army Service Ribbon
- Army Staff Identification Badge
- Qualifications: Airborne (Senior Parachutist), Ranger, Pathfinder, Air Assault, Jumpmaster

Federal Civilian Awards

- Department of Defense Medal for Distinguished Public Service, 2004

Other Awards

- Laurel Highlands Senior High School Hall of Fame Inductee, 2013

15. **Published writings:** List the titles, publishers, and dates of books, articles, reports, or other published materials which you have written including articles published on the internet.

- I wrote a monograph in 1991 at the Infantry Officers Advanced Course on the experiences of my Army unit in the Gulf War entitled "The Screaming Eagles of Desert Storm," which has subsequently become available online.
- I wrote a few (2-3) short public interest stories for my hometown newspaper, the Uniontown Morning Herald, in late 1991, recounting my personal experiences in the 1990-91 Gulf War.
- I wrote an Op-Ed about the war in Bosnia that was published in the Washington Times in early 1998.
- I completed my Ph.D. Dissertation titled "The Role of Congress in the Development of the United States' Strategic Nuclear Forces, 1947-68" in 2008. It was not published, but was archived through George Washington University.

- I am aware of at least three op-eds and articles dealing with intellectual property issues that were published under my name during my tenure as EVP of the Global IP Center at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce from 2008-10.

16. **Speeches:** Provide the Committee with two copies of any formal speeches you have delivered during the last 5 years of which you have copies and are on topics relevant to the position for which you have been nominated.

None

17. **Commitments regarding nomination, confirmation, and service:**

(a) If confirmed, will you adhere to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

Yes

(b) Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

No

(c) If confirmed, will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

Yes

(d) Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to Congressional requests?

Yes

(e) Will you promise to enforce or ensure whistleblower protections for all those witnesses?

Yes

(f) Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this Committee?

Yes

(g) Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted Committee, or to consult with the Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Yes

[The nominee responded to Parts B–F of the Committee questionnaire. The text of the questionnaire is set forth in the Appendix to this volume. The nominee’s answers to Parts B–F are contained in the Committee’s executive files.]

SIGNATURE AND DATE

I hereby state that I have read and signed the foregoing Statement on Biographical and Financial Information and that the information provided therein is, to the best of my knowledge, current, accurate, and complete.

MARK T. ESPER

This 27th day of July, 2017

[The nomination of Mark T. Esper was reported to the Senate by Chairman McCain on November 7, 2017, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on November 15, 2017.]

[Prepared questions submitted to Mr. Joseph D. Kernan by Chairman McCain prior to the hearing with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REFORMS

Question. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 included the most sweeping reforms since the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

Do you support these reforms?

Answer. I support the Committee in its effort to reform the organization and management of the Department of Defense (DOD). I firmly believe that continuously examining DOD policies and processes to find ways to best accomplish its missions is an enduring imperative. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the armed services, intelligence, and defense appropriations committees on implementation of these reforms as they relate to the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) and the defense intelligence enterprise.

Question. What other areas for defense reform do you believe might be appropriate for this Committee to address?

Answer. I believe there is opportunity for continued reform within the Department of Defense and, if confirmed, I would look carefully across the organization, management, and activities of the defense intelligence enterprise to determine where improvements could be made to support defense and national security challenges and priorities. If confirmed, I will engage and consult routinely with the Committees to conduct defense intelligence enterprise activities in more efficient and effective ways.

Question. Section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 required the Secretary of Defense to establish cross-functional teams to address critical objectives of the Department.

Do you agree that the Department must be able to integrate its diverse, functional capabilities well in order to successfully defend the nation from increasingly complex and dynamic security threats? Will you meet this requirement to the best of your abilities?

Answer. Yes, I strongly agree with the need to integrate these capabilities, and if confirmed, I am committed to proactively meeting this requirement to the best of my abilities. Today's diverse threats cross all domains and require a whole-of-government approach to developing comprehensive responses. The use of cross-functional teams leverages expertise across the DOD, including the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, the Military Departments/Services and the combat support agencies. Bringing talent together from across the Department, soliciting innovative thinking and delivering integrated solutions are crucial to improving DOD's ability to address threats to national security. As appropriate, I will as well advocate for cross-functional teams to include participants from other government agencies so that, collectively, we can better address national security challenges.

For example, I understand that the USD(I) has been tasked by the Deputy Secretary to oversee a cross-functional team focused on algorithmic warfare, and on leveraging technology to improve the processing, exploitation, and dissemination of full motion video collected from airborne platforms. That is a critical capability that would have been extraordinarily useful to me as a deployed special operations force commander and it remains so for our deployed military forces in harm's way.

Question. What is your understanding of the attributes and characteristics of effective cross-functional teams?

Answer. My belief, and I understand this is the practice for DOD's cross-functional teams, is the inclusion of subject matter experts from across the Department with technical expertise, appropriate knowledge of policy, strategy, and operations and the commitment to collaboratively tackle our most important national security challenges is an important imperative.

Question. What are your views on the potential focus areas and uses for future cross-functional teams?

Answer. I believe that we need to focus on and commit to drawing on cross-functional expertise from across the intelligence community. The ability of our joint force to integrate intelligence faster and more effectively than our adversaries will continue to drive U.S. competitive military advantage and better inform decision-making. Cross-government teams of this nature could be equally beneficial in bringing together solutions from across DOD and the Intelligence Community to address adversary threats. If confirmed, I will continue to support and promote participation in cross-functional teams.

DUTIES

Question. What is your understanding of the role, duties, and functions of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I))?

Answer. The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) is responsible for supporting the Secretary of Defense in discharging his intelligence and security responsibilities and authorities under Title 10 and Title 50 of the United States Code.

From DOD Directive 5143.01, I understand the responsibilities of the USD(I) to include: serving as the Principal Staff Assistant and intelligence advisor to the Secretary of Defense; exercising authority, direction, and control on behalf of the Secretary of Defense over the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency / Central Security Service, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Defense Security Service; establishing policy and priorities for, and providing oversight of, the defense intelligence enterprise; exercising oversight of personnel policy to ensure that intelligence organizations in the Department of Defense are staffed, organized, trained, and equipped to support the missions of the Department; ensuring that the DOD intelligence components that are also elements of the intelligence community are responsive to the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) in the execution of the DNI's authorities; ensuring that the combatant commanders, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the civilian leadership of the Department are provided with appropriate intelligence support; ensuring that counterintelligence activities in the Department are conducted and managed efficiently and effectively; ensuring that other sensitive activities which the Department conducts or supports are conducted and managed efficiently and effectively; overseeing the implementation of assigned DOD security policies and programs to ensure efficiency and effectiveness; serving as the Program Executive for the Military Intelligence Program, and ensuring that the Department provides the U.S. Congress with information sufficient to execute its oversight responsibilities. I believe an implied responsibility of USD(I), when appropriate, beneficial, and lawful, is to collaboratively support the intelligence-related needs for the whole-of-government mission to protect our nation's security.

Question. What recommendations, if any, do you have for changes in the duties and functions of the USD(I)?

Answer. At this time, I do not have specific recommendations for changes in the duties and functions of the USD(I). If confirmed, I will, as the Principle Staff Assistant and advisor to the Secretary of Defense and his Deputy, carry out those aforementioned duties and functions contained in DOD Directive 5143.01. I would coordinate widely across the Department of Defense and Intelligence Community, and inform the Committee of any recommendations.

Question. How do you view the relationship and division of responsibilities between the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (OUSD(I)) and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy?

Answer. Secretary Mattis has emphasized collaboration, partnerships, and reform of the Department. If confirmed, I would work closely and collaboratively with each of the Under Secretaries, their Principal Deputies, and other Department officials, recognizing the complementary perspectives each brings to the Department's mission. I believe that a close and continuing partnership between the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the USD(I) is essential to best align intelligence policies and capabilities with Policy objectives. Critically, and from my personal military career experience, I know that the key beneficiaries of this collaboration, strong relationship, and alignment between USD(P) and USD(I) are the warfighters, those in uniform that endeavor every day to support national security.

QUALIFICATIONS

Question. What background and experience, particularly in the area of intelligence matters, do you possess that qualify you to perform the duties of the USD(I)?

Answer. If confirmed, I believe I have the appropriate background and experience to effectively perform the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence.

Over the course of my 36 years in uniform, predominantly as a Naval Special Warfare/SEAL officer, I was a collector, consumer, and user of intelligence from a multitude of intelligence sources.

The bulk of my military career was spent serving with Special Operations and Special Warfare units participating in operations and exercises globally on many levels. I commanded platoons at Underwater Demolition Team 12, SEAL Delivery Vehicle Team One, and SEAL Team Five. I commanded SEAL Team Two and the Naval Special Warfare Development Group (NSWDG).

Commanding NSWDCG on 9/11, and subsequent Joint Task Forces through the initial operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, helped shape my knowledge of how special operators and other military combat forces depend on, and work effectively with, intelligence professionals.

The past 16 years of operations have brought intelligence and special operations professionals together in unique ways, with intelligence providing a battlefield advantage to both conventional and special operations forces and operators, and in return, providing intelligence officers the opportunity to validate and evolve their intelligence practices. This relationship is critical in how the United States will conduct conventional and irregular warfare operations in the 21st Century.

While serving in each of the geographic areas of responsibility for the Combatant Commands, on a Combatant Command staff, and deployed in support of named and contingency operations and exercises, I worked closely with intelligence professionals from the Joint Staff, Service components, Combat Support Agencies, the intelligence community, and law enforcement entities. Intelligence underpinned the planning and decision-making process of every operation. The fidelity of this intelligence directly correlated to mission success, mitigation of risk to our forces, and achievement of tactical to strategic objectives. The intelligence leveraged came not only from U.S. intelligence entities but from many ally and partner sources. I place a very high priority on the value of enduring collaboration and intelligence fusion.

While serving as the Deputy Commander of U.S. Southern Command, I observed how the Command's Joint Intelligence Operations Center and the Joint Interagency Task Force provided intelligence that drove defense, law enforcement and allied forces' activities to interdict illicit trafficking throughout the region. Additionally, I gained deep insights from my front row seat as the Senior Military Assistant to former Secretary of Defense, Robert M. Gates, where I viewed the collaborative decision processes with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Services and the Combatant Commands and OSD(I) efforts to coordinate intelligence community support to address defense intelligence needs.

Collectively, I believe these experiences both qualify me for, and would inform my efforts as, the OSD(I), if confirmed. I would be honored to serve with our nation's intelligence professionals.

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Question. What are your views on the state of the relationship between the OSD(I) and the Senate Armed Services Committee in particular, and with Congress in general?

Answer. I view the relationship between the OSD(I) and the Committee as indispensable to building a more capable and responsive intelligence enterprise to meet our nation's security needs. I believe that a close and collaborative relationship between DOD and Congress is an obligation and essential for both to perform their duties. My experience has been that the Department and DOD components have been responsive to the Committee. If confirmed, I would seek to routinely engage the Senate Armed Services Committee and other committees of jurisdiction to strengthen OSD(I)'s relationship with this Committee and Congress.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and the OSD(I)?

Answer. If confirmed as OSD(I), I would pursue an open, continuing, and forthright dialogue with Congress concerning issues vital to defense intelligence and national security. Furthermore, I would actively seek perspective, advice, and support from committees of jurisdiction; be forthcoming in explaining intelligence activities, programs, and budgets; seek to provide Congress with the information needed to carry out its Article I constitutional responsibilities; and be accountable to the Congress in carrying out my duties and responsibilities.

MAJOR CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES

Question. In your view, what are the major challenges confronting the OSD(I) and the Defense Intelligence Enterprise?

Answer. I believe the major challenges confronting OSD(I) and the defense intelligence enterprise include adapting to and providing timely awareness and insights into a diverse, complex and ever-changing array of security challenges. The broad scope and fast pace of global operations will very likely be conducted with a smaller force and in a constrained fiscal environment. Despite these constraints, the obligations and increasing demands on the intelligence enterprise to support policy, operations, acquisitions and decision-making will not wane, and our posture and capabilities must continue to support the full spectrum of security challenges. We must prevent strategic and military surprises. While accepting this responsibility, the

USD(I) must also address these challenges in an environment that requires better protection of our intelligence sources and methods, the networks on which we function, and from the full spectrum of threats—from traditional espionage to insider threats and unauthorized disclosures, whether ideologically-motivated or inadvertent.

Question. If confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges?

Answer. If confirmed, I would ensure that sufficient and available resources are devoted to the defense intelligence enterprise and pursue additional resources if there are critical shortfalls. I would seek to effectively implement the Secretary's priorities for the Department across the defense intelligence enterprise and ensure that comprehensive programs and policies are developed to support the execution of these priorities. The success of the defense intelligence enterprise depends on a workforce—a team of highly talented and experienced professionals with a wide range and depth of skill. If confirmed, I would pursue relentlessly those commercial technologies that show promise of rapidly advancing our intelligence superiority and advocate for initiatives. I would place a high priority on policies and programs that effectively recruit, train and retain the uniquely talented workforce required to advance the intelligence enterprises ability to mitigate, preempt, and respond to adversarial activities.

Question. How would you anticipate developing priorities for allocating your time and resources as the USD(I)?

Answer. If confirmed, I would align my priorities with those of the Secretary of Defense: to support increasing the lethality of the joint force, cultivating partnerships, and reforming the Department. I would seek to ensure that resources are allocated strategically to, and across, the defense intelligence enterprise in full support of military forces.

In developing intelligence-centric priorities in support of the Secretary's priorities, I would closely collaborate with the uniformed and civilian leaders to ensure optimal support to priority intelligence requirements of the combatant commanders and the operational and military forces that they task and lead. Additionally, I would place a high priority on developing and acquiring intelligence capabilities to maintain and advance our technological superiority; improve the tradecraft of personnel working in the defense intelligence enterprise; and protect our infrastructure and technologies from external and internal threats. Finally, I would allocate the necessary time to ensure the proper management and activities of the OUSD(I) staff focus on efficiency and effectiveness in support of Department modernization efforts.

Question. If confirmed, how would you balance the need to provide intelligence support to the warfighter with the need to provide intelligence support to policy makers?

Answer. My understanding and belief is that balancing these needs is one of the USD(I)'s primary responsibilities. If confirmed, I would work to ensure the defense intelligence enterprise continues to satisfy requirements for operationally-relevant intelligence that directly enables warfighter success, and I would work collaboratively across the Defense Department and with interagency partners to inform policy and military decision-making by our national leaders.

Question. If confirmed, how will you ensure that the geographic combatant commands are adequately assessing and prioritizing their intelligence needs?

Answer. The last position I held before retiring from the U.S. Navy was as the Deputy Commander of U.S. Southern Command. Assessing and prioritizing intelligence needs was one of the most critical roles I had in that position. If confirmed, and in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other Department and interagency partners that work with and support Combatant Commands, I would seek to strengthen integration and collaboration between the geographic and functional combatant commands and the elements of the intelligence community. The intelligence picture and assessments created by the intelligence enterprise inform commanders in their requirements and priority deliberations. An unwavering commitment to providing definitive intelligence and capabilities will help shape combatant commander assessments and priorities.

BUDGET

Question. What is your assessment of the impact of the budget caps required by the Budget Control Act on the capacity and capabilities of the Defense Intelligence Enterprise to meet requirements?

Answer. The impact has been significant on defense intelligence enterprise (DIE) readiness. I understand that the DIE has been inhibited by five consecutive years of one-year budget reductions to meet budget caps. This has stressed the ability of the DIE to optimally address warfighting requirements in South Asia and the Mid-

dle East and has a cascading negative impact in other regions. These constraints have forced tough choices on where to invest limited resources, such as between the competing requirements of intelligence support to counter-terrorism efforts and fortifying our intelligence capabilities against nations like Russia and China. The DIE has also experienced delays in system upgrades, facility maintenance and slowed the desired pace to address the emerging challenges presented by China's rapidly growing military and a resurgent Russia. I would expect that budget constraints will also limit investment in potentially enterprise-enabling technologies that could address complex intelligence needs. If confirmed, I will pay close attention to these areas and identify related issues and shortfalls.

TORTURE AND ENHANCED INTERROGATION TECHNIQUES

Question. Do you support the standards for detainee treatment specified in the revised Army Field Manual on Interrogations, FM 2-22.3, issued in September 2006, and in DOD Directive 2310.01E, the Department of Defense Detainee Program, dated August 19, 2014, and required by section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92)?

Answer. Yes. I fully support the standards on detainee treatment and intelligence interrogation laid out in the Army Field Manual, DOD policy, and the law. If confirmed, I will continue to support and enforce these standards and I would expect all DOD personnel to be held accountable for doing so.

MANAGEMENT OF THE DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE ENTERPRISE

Question. What is your understanding of the role of the OUSD(I) in overseeing and coordinating the efforts of the elements of the Defense Intelligence Enterprise?

Answer. I understand the USD(I) is responsible for supporting the Secretary of Defense, as his Principal Staff Assistant for assigned intelligence matters, in discharging his intelligence-related responsibilities and authorities under Title 10 and Title 50 of the United States Code. This includes exercising authority, direction, and control on behalf of the Secretary of Defense over the defense intelligence components of the Department of Defense and working closely with the Joint Staff, Combatant Commands, Service components and the ODNI to develop effective policy, plans, programs, and priorities.

Question. Are additional authorities, policy guidance, or resources necessary for effective oversight of the enterprise?

Answer. If confirmed, I would carefully assess the adequacy of the existing authorities, policies, and resources to determine what changes, if any, are needed for effective oversight of defense intelligence activities and to improve the performance of the enterprise. On behalf of the Secretary of Defense, I would work closely with the committees of jurisdiction to seek the support and resources necessary to execute effective oversight.

Question. Are there opportunities to improve coordination with the National Intelligence Community to improve intelligence support to the warfighter and, if so, where are the opportunities?

Answer. From my experience in uniform, I believe there are always opportunities to improve collaboration across the intelligence community to better support the warfighter. If I am confirmed, I would engage early and often with the combatant commanders to improve my understanding of their needs and I would frequently engage leaders within the national intelligence community to obtain support to meet those warfighter needs. I am particularly interested in improving the integration of national and defense intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities, and applying greater attention to faster, more agile and adaptive processing, exploitation, and dissemination of intelligence data to better support the warfighter and others that engage our adversaries at the tactical edge.

BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS

Question. The National Background Investigations Bureau at the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is currently charged with conducting background investigations (BIs) for the Department of Defense. However, its ownership of this process has led to a backlog of over 600,000 cases, which is increasing by more than 10,000 a month. This has led to unacceptable delays for Department personnel and programs as both are idled waiting for clearances. Secretary Mattis has indicated that he has made a decision in principle to transition from outsourcing BIs from OPM to having the Department of Defense conduct its own BIs. In addition, section 938 of S. 1519, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, mandates this transition.

Do you support this transition?

Answer. Yes. I fully support this effort. The unacceptable backlog of more than 700,000 cases has a significantly negative impact on DOD mission readiness. Appropriately cleared personnel, uniformed, civilian and contractor, are critical to the day-to-day operations of the Department as well as our future readiness and capabilities. Of concern, individuals cleared on an interim basis do not have access to the full scope of information they need to perform their duties, and, without a completed background investigation, the Department is accepting increased risk. The Department needs to address these issues and build a program that is effective in both avoiding backlogs and minimizing risks to our security. If confirmed, these issues will have my full attention.

One objection to the transfer of Defense Department BIs from OPM to the Department is that OPM would lose its “economy of scale” (as the Defense Department comprises the vast majority of OPM’s investigations workload) and there would be yet more duplication of personnel security overhead than already exists today. A counter-argument is that the small remaining investigations workload at OPM could also be transferred to the Defense Department, in much the same way that the Defense Security Service today manages the industrial security program for almost the entire Federal Government.

Question. What are your views on this issue?

Answer. My understanding is that the current OPM-led process is overwhelmed, and costs have spiraled in recent years. I would need a better understanding of the current program details and the concerns regarding economy of scale before I could provide my views. However, if confirmed, I would closely examine IT systems and the practices of OPM and DOD to conduct background investigations to ensure existing economies of scale are preserved and possibly improved. Additionally, I would ensure that any methods to reduce costs and develop improvements were shared, as appropriate, throughout the U.S. government.

ALLOCATION OF INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE (ISR) ASSETS THROUGH THE GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Question. This Committee has expressed concerns about the process and underlying analysis supporting the allocation of ISR assets to the combatant commands under the Global Force Management Process (GFMAP). While these GFMAP problems are numerous, the Committee has noted in particular that, since the events of September 11th, U.S. Central Command has received the overwhelming share of ISR assets, to the point where the Committee expressed doubt that “a rigorous analysis would consistently rank the lowest priorities of one or more combatant commands higher than the highest priorities of other combatant commands.”

What is your understanding and assessment of the adequacy of the process for allocating ISR capabilities under the GFMAP process?

Answer. The Global Force Management Process (GFMAP) was designed to allocate forces and capabilities across the Combatant Commands to best meet their prioritized requirements, including allocation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets. As the former Deputy Commander of U.S. Southern Command, I have personal experience competing with the U.S. Central Command and other Combatant Commands for limited ISR resources. While our troops fighting in active combat zones must always have priority for our resources, due consideration must be given to other security concerns. During my participation in the GFMAP process, I found that combatant commander requirements always exceeded the ISR assets available. If confirmed, I would closely coordinate with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support a process that achieves an appropriate balance in ISR allocation so we ensure that our global security responsibilities are best met.

Question. In your view, are modifications to the process warranted?

Answer. I am not aware currently of the exact distribution of ISR resources, but if confirmed, I would personally review current ISR allocations and participate, as appropriate, in the allocation process.

CYBER

Question. How do you perceive the challenges we face in cyberspace?

Answer. I believe that the cyberspace domain offers a multitude of benefits, but it also poses one of the greatest threats to our nation’s security. DOD, like our nation, faces a daily and growing threat in cyberspace. In recent years, malicious cyber activities conducted by our adversaries, both state and non-state actors, are increasingly complex, technologically advanced, disruptive, and persistent. DOD continues to face challenges in protecting and securing its networks, systems, infrastructure, and in developing its overall cyber capabilities. If confirmed, and in close collaboration with both the government and civilian sectors, as well as Congress. I would be

fully committed to addressing this challenge with both defensive and offensive measures.

Question. Briefly describe what policy objectives the Defense Department should be seeking to achieve in the cyber realm and the strategy you think is necessary to address these challenges.

Answer. The Secretary has discussed the need for both a whole-of-government effort regarding U.S. responses to malicious cyber activity and hardening our information networks and critical infrastructure, which I fully support. If confirmed, DOD's role in cyber will be one of my key focus areas, as the Department continues to support efforts to better assess the threat, bring technological and policy advancements to bear to deter our adversaries and protect our networks, support defensive and offensive cyber operations, fully develop the Cyber Mission Forces, and empower and resource U.S. Cyber Command.

Question. What role should the OUSD(I) play in addressing challenges in cyberspace?

Answer. I believe that OUSD(I)'s role is to facilitate an integrated perspective on cyberspace as it relates to intelligence. This includes providing the Secretary and our national security leadership a holistic look at the capabilities, operations, personnel, and resources across the defense intelligence enterprise needed to provide more effective and efficient intelligence support to DOD cyber operations. If confirmed, I would foster a close and continuing partnership between OUSD(I), OUSD Policy, the Joint Staff, U.S. Cyber Command, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Agency as we must collectively work to operate freely and safely in this domain.

Question. What is your understanding of the support that the OUSD(I) should provide to the Principal Cyber Advisor's cross-functional team under section 932 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014?

Answer. I understand that OUSD(I) supports the Principal Cyber Advisor cross-functional team through direct liaison and collaboration with the Director for Defense Intelligence that oversees defense technical collection and special programs. If confirmed, I will review the current level of support and identify any needed changes.

INFORMATION OPERATIONS

Question. The Russian government conducted an aggressive information operations campaign against the United States in 2016 in an attempt to influence the presidential election and undermine faith in America's democratic system and institutions. The Russian government has been conducting similar operations for a number of years, including in 2017, against U.S. allies in Europe. The Department of Defense, and the Federal Government as a whole, was ill-prepared to detect, defend against, and respond to these operations, which have been conducted primarily, but not exclusively, through cyberspace. Section 1042 of S. 1519, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a cross-functional task force to integrate across the Department's capabilities and organizations to respond to and conduct information operations and cyber-enabled information operations.

What are your views on the preparedness of the Department of Defense and the Federal Government as a whole to deter, defend against, and conduct integrated strategic information operations?

Answer. While I have been out of government for several years and have not been privy to the Department's progress in conducting information operations, I believe the ability of the Department of Defense and the Federal Government to understand, conduct, and deter strategic information operations falls short of what the nation needs. The 2016 Russian example is only one of many recent examples that highlight significant gaps in capability to counter strategic information operations and to develop an effective U.S. government-wide communications strategy. There is much work to do, including potential organizational reform and reallocation of resources. If confirmed, I would work closely with the other Primary Staff Assistants and the Joint Staff to understand how the intelligence community and defense intelligence enterprise can enhance operations in the information environment. This effort would include a review of OUSD(I)'s internal organizational structure. I understand that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff recently approved the introduction of a new, seventh Joint Function (information) that should serve as a springboard to better organize the entire Department to address strategic, operational, and tactical information operations.

Question. What is your assessment of section 1042?

Answer. If confirmed, I will commit to an extensive review of the potential implications of section 1042. If section 1042 is enacted into law, it may provide new opportunities to transform DOD information and cyber operations by prioritizing and integrating DOD efforts across the information environment. I would look forward to working closely and collaboratively with other stakeholders in the Department to ensure we have the requisite capabilities to operate effectively with speed and agility in the information environment and cyberspace domain. OUSD(I)'s internal organizational structure would also need to be examined to ensure that we are postured to meet the objectives of section 1042.

Question. What role would you foresee for the Defense intelligence components in supporting the task force proposed in section 1042?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure the defense intelligence enterprise is prepared to support the task force proposed in section 1042, if enacted into law. I foresee important roles for the defense intelligence components in supporting section 1042 objectives. Intelligence has always been a cornerstone of effective offensive and defensive operations in the information environment and thus a strong, impactful role for USD(I) to achieve the objectives outlined in section 1042 is appropriate. If the position of Defense Intelligence Officer for Information Operations and Cyber Operations was established in law, it may allow for substantial gains in effective, efficient, and proactive support for cyberspace operations, military deception, operations security, military information support operations, electronic warfare, and other indirect approaches that address the cognitive nature of war.

SPACE

Question. What do you perceive as the threats to our national security space satellites?

Answer. The United States, its allies, and partners rely on space capabilities for their security and prosperity. Losing access to our space capabilities would have severe consequences on the battlefield and our way of life here at home. Our adversaries recognize this dependency and have invested in a range of anti-satellite capabilities, from kinetic weapons to be employed against our satellites to non-kinetic cyber weapons that can disable our satellite ground stations and jam command, control, and communications links. Additionally, space has become increasingly congested, with the number of objects in orbit steadily growing, threatening our ability to operate safely.

Question. Briefly describe what policy objectives the Defense Department should be seeking to achieve and the strategy you think is necessary to address these threats.

Answer. If confirmed, I would support the Secretary and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in their articulation of the Department's space policy objectives. I believe that our defense intelligence enterprise must have the capabilities, personnel, and resources to adequately assess space threats and technology to better support the acquisition and operation of new space capabilities. Furthermore, I believe that OUSD(I) can work to better integrate intelligence with operations in protecting our space advantage, as well as increase the integration of space and airborne ISR in delivering intelligence advantage to our warfighters.

Question. Given that the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) would be required to respond operationally to active threats to reconnaissance satellites by adversaries in a conflict, should the Department consider designating the NRO as a combat support agency?

Answer. If confirmed, I would look into what changes may be warranted to our overall space enterprise based on the current and predicted threat environment.

RELATIONSHIP WITH RESPECT TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS AND LOW INTENSITY CONFLICT (ASD SOLIC)

Question. How are responsibilities for the oversight of the activities and programs of special operations forces delineated between the OUSD(I) and ASD SOLIC?

Answer. Since 9/11, U.S. special operations forces have successfully integrated operations and intelligence at every level of tactical and operational command. To the extent that these forces engage in intelligence, counterintelligence, security, sensitive activities, or other intelligence-related activities, the USD(I) and the ASD(SO/LIC) share responsibility for overseeing those activities. If confirmed, I will continue to build upon the active partnership between the USD(I) and ASD SO/LIC teams to ensure collaboration that strengthens the Department's oversight and effectiveness of special operations activities and programs.

Question. Are there any programs that are currently overseen by the OUSD(I) that would be more appropriately overseen by ASD SOLIC?

Answer. I am not aware of any currently. However, I would need to better understand the full range of program oversight. If confirmed, I would work closely with ASD SO/LIC and the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command to help ensure that supporting activities and programs are in place and overseen to support the Special Operations Command's effectiveness, and aligned to ASD SO/LIC's roles and responsibilities.

PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREATS

Question. The Secretary of Defense established the Department of Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) in 2014 to oversee the mitigation of insider threat risks to the Department and specific actions on insider threat cases. The Department faces technical, cultural, management, and organizational challenges in creating integrated, automated means to access data from, and make correlations across, the intelligence, counter-intelligence, law enforcement, physical security, cybersecurity, personnel security, and human resources organizations in all the military services, defense agencies, combatant commands, and Office of the Secretary of Defense, as well as the Department's contractor population. The USD(I) is the designated Department of Defense official accountable for managing and overseeing the Department's insider threat program.

How, if at all, should the Department change its data ownership and governance policies to allow for DITMAC to accomplish its mission?

Answer. It is vital that the Department, and USD(I), as the accountable manager for the program, develop appropriate tools and propose policies to collectively mitigate risk and address threats. I believe the Department should take an innovative, directive approach, seeking to implement promising data management technologies that develop an "all source," shared picture of the potential insider threats. The threat is too significant to not aggressively resolve those other aforementioned issues that are within the Department's ability and responsibility to resolve. If confirmed, I will closely examine the Department's insider threat mitigation program, identify any policy constraints, and work closely with leaders and staffs across the Defense Department to propose those data ownership and governance policies that are in the best interests of mitigating insider threats.

Question. Does the OUSD(I) have the authority and technical expertise necessary to guide the development of a comprehensive insider threat capability that integrates all sources of information for identifying insider threats using modern information technology?

Answer. I believe that the Department's insider threat program is still developing. I understand that the Department is using a phased approach to implement capabilities that will integrate the latest technologies available. The goal is for the program to be comprehensive by aggregating and analyzing available information vital to timely awareness and action in countering insider threats. If confirmed, I would pursue the expertise and technology to optimize this goal from any appropriate source and I will assess whether additional authorities or other resources would be needed for OUSD(I) to optimally address this threat.

Question. Is it advisable and appropriate, in your view, for the DITMAC to have access or be integrated into the Defense Department contractors' human resource, cybersecurity, physical security, and personnel security data systems, given that contractors were responsible for multiple recent insider threats?

Answer. I believe insider threat programs should address threats in a comprehensive and integrated way that ensures effective mitigation of threats regardless of their origin. If confirmed, I would evaluate fully the options to address any information-sharing challenges, including potential use of contractor data. I would propose the necessary integration and access protocols that best mitigate the insider threat while protecting sensitive data where appropriate.

PERSONNEL SECURITY TO SUPPORT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S INNOVATION STRATEGY

Question. The Department of Defense is pursuing a wide-ranging strategy to engage with commercial entities engaged in cutting-edge research and development, including through the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx). The Department's leadership recognizes that it needs new acquisition policies and practices to enable the Department to engage with this sector with the necessary speed, agility and flexibility. Two related obstacles are the time and difficulty involved in acquiring security clearances and the hurdles that non-traditional contractors face in getting access to data to test and demonstrate new information technology and software. The National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, for example, has concluded that it lacks the authority necessary to share even its unclassified imagery data with

companies and universities it hopes can develop dramatically improved exploitation capabilities through machine learning-based artificial intelligence algorithms.

What are your views on the importance of, and potential approaches for, the Defense Department's security apparatus adapting and tailoring its requirements and procedures to better support the Department's innovation agenda?

Answer. It is vital that DOD innovation efforts are secure and protected appropriately from all threats, just as it is vital for the Department to pursue those capabilities that will markedly enhance critically important capabilities. It is my understanding that a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 required the establishment of an Enhanced Security Program to Support the Department of Defense Innovation Initiative. If confirmed, I would work to ensure the effective implementation of this program at DOD innovation hubs, such as DIUx. In addition, I would aggressively support continued outreach to industry and seek the means to safely and rapidly bring data exploitation and emerging machine learning and artificial intelligence capabilities to bear on national security challenges.

U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND INTELLIGENCE OPERATIONS

Question. In your view, how are intelligence operations carried out by special operations personnel different from those carried out by others in the intelligence community?

Answer. In my experience, special operations missions require very precise and detailed intelligence to prepare the battlespace and ensure operations can be executed on short timelines and in high risk environments. This range of missions also requires access to agile and flexible intelligence-related infrastructure, tradecraft, and capabilities to meet operational requirements. Additionally, U.S. Special Operations Forces have trained and honed their skills to conduct meticulous site exploitations throughout the course of their operations. These have led to many follow-on successes against our adversaries. Sixteen years of close collaboration between the intelligence community and special operations forces has provided a critical battlefield advantage.

If confirmed, how would you ensure intelligence activities carried out by special operations forces are adequately coordinated with other activities carried out by those in the intelligence community?

Answer. I recognize the importance of fully coordinating special operations forces' intelligence activities with those of the intelligence community. While I believe this coordination and collaboration is closer than at any time in our nation's past, I would, if confirmed, continue efforts to improve coordination and deconfliction and promote the leveraging of each other's activities to meet intelligence needs from the tactical to the strategic levels.

NEED FOR INDEPENDENT INTELLIGENCE ANALYSIS

Question. If confirmed, how would you ensure that intelligence analysts within the Defense Department, including those who may be seconded to offices that are not part of the Defense intelligence structure, are independent and free of pressure from influence from their chain of command to reach a certain conclusion, including a conclusion that fits a particular policy preference?

Answer. I am firmly committed to the principle of analytic integrity for defense intelligence analysts. Through my career experience, I understand how important it is that the unvarnished truth, no matter how unwelcome, always makes its way from the field to the headquarters and national leaders. If confirmed, I would fully support policies and programs that ensure defense intelligence analysis is objective and free from the personal or political biases of individual analysts or managers. I am aware of and fully support actions taken by OUSD(I) in light of recent recommendations made by the DOD Inspector General to ensure analytic integrity, such as establishing an analytic ombudsman at each defense component that produces intelligence analysis and an analysis of alternatives to evaluate differing hypotheses when applicable.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Question. In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed for this position, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the USD(I)?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings, and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate committees in a timely manner?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee, or to consult with this Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If confirmed, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?

Answer. Yes.

[Questions for the record with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAN SULLIVAN

ARCTIC INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES GAP

1. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Kernan, the current DOD Arctic Strategy identifies significant shortfalls in U.S. domain awareness in the Arctic. Given Russia's continuing military buildup of the Arctic region, can you commit you will take a hard look at securing the capabilities you need to fill this critical intelligence gap?

Mr. KERNAN. I fully recognize Russia's continuing military buildup in the Arctic region and the threat that it poses. I understand that the Department has established processes by which it constantly assesses and readjusts resource allocation based on DOD priorities and changing world circumstances. If confirmed, one of my highest priorities will be to drive intelligence operations and activities to satisfy national security requirements and shape intelligence efforts to best support current operations and political-military decision-making. This will include ensuring current and future intelligence systems have the capability and capacity for Arctic domain awareness and operations.

READINESS CHALLENGES

2. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Kernan, what will you do to try to fill it?

Mr. KERNAN. One of the greatest challenges the Department faces in the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) domain is meeting expansive warfighter and domain awareness demands. I understand that the Department addresses this challenge through a continuous process of ISR asset allocation where it carefully balances defense priorities against risk. I intend to support ongoing efforts that seek opportunities to cultivate and enhance information sharing agreements with our allies, which can help bring partner capabilities to bear. I also intend to explore innovative ways of fielding multi-domain ISR capabilities to support the force of the future. If confirmed, I will assess our current intelligence capabilities, support priority-based allocations, and continue to seek ISR resources and capabilities to address Arctic and other global needs.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR CLAIRE MCCASKILL

KASPERSKY

3. Senator MCCASKILL. Mr. Kernan, what is your understanding and opinion of the nature of the concern as it relates to the relationship between the Russian Government and Kaspersky Labs products?

Mr. KERNAN. I understand and share the concerns expressed by the Federal Government about the ties between certain Kaspersky officials and Russian intelligence

and other Russian Government agencies. I am also concerned about requirements under Russian law that allow Russian intelligence agencies to request or compel assistance from Kaspersky, and to intercept communications transiting Russian networks. The risk that the Russian Government, whether acting on its own or in collaboration with Kaspersky, could capitalize on access provided by Kaspersky products to compromise United States Government information and information systems directly jeopardizes U.S. national security.

4. Senator MCCASKILL. Mr. Kernan, what is your level of awareness regarding the issues and concerns surrounding Kaspersky Labs products on DOD information systems, both classified and unclassified?

Mr. KERNAN. Is it my understanding that on September 13, 2017, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) issued Binding Operational Directive (BOD) 17-01 directing all departments and agencies to: identify any use or presence of Kaspersky products on their information systems; develop plans to remove and discontinue present and future use of the products; and, unless directed otherwise by DHS based on new information, begin to implement agency plans to discontinue use and remove the Kaspersky products from information systems. While the DHS BOD covers only civilian agencies and non-national security systems, it is my understanding that the Department is taking action consistent with the DHS BOD to determine if and where Kaspersky products are used on DOD unclassified and classified information systems and take appropriate actions to mitigate and remove any instances that are discovered.

5. Senator MCCASKILL. Mr. Kernan, do I have your commitment that, if confirmed, you will conduct a speedy review of the existence of, and the threat imposed by, Kaspersky products used by DOD contractors on unclassified networks?

Mr. KERNAN. I understand the importance of a speedy review of the threat posed by the existence of Kaspersky products on unclassified networks used by DOD contractors. If confirmed, you have my commitment to continue the review of DOD's networks to mitigate the threat posed by Kaspersky Labs and, in close coordination with the DOD Chief Information Officer and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to support any efforts to address risks posed by Kaspersky to DOD contractor unclassified networks.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

6. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Kernan, in recent months, we have seen the Trump administration attempt to politicize intelligence, notably to justify the President's refusal to certify the Iran nuclear deal. For example, after certifying the deal in July, the media reported that the President instructed staffers to make his case for de-certifying the deal in October. He reportedly told them that he wanted to be in a place to decertify Iran's compliance 90 days hence and that it was their job to put him there. This is not how intelligence gathering and analysis should work. We damage our ability to defend this country when we blind ourselves to intelligence that conflicts with our political motives and tailor our analysis to meet a political end. If confirmed, can I have your assurance that the information you provide to this Committee and to Congress will be unbiased, uncensored, and not politicized?

Mr. KERNAN. Yes. I am committed to a strong foundation of analytic tradecraft and objectivity that is vital to the production of all-source intelligence consistent with Intelligence Community standards. If confirmed, you have my commitment to provide this Committee and Congress with information that is unbiased, uncensored, and not politicized.

NORTH KOREA

7. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Kernan, while the North Korean nuclear threat is discussed widely in the media, the threat posed by North Korea's rapidly developing hacking and cyber heist capabilities has been far less publicized. Nevertheless, North Korean hackers are suspected of stealing U.S. and South Korean military plans, have been blamed for the May 2017 WannaCry ransomware attack, and accused of cyber heists from banks in Bangladesh and Taiwan. How would you assess the current North Korean cyber threat?

Mr. KERNAN. I view this as a very serious threat to our nation's security. As you described, North Korea has demonstrated the capability and willingness to conduct

damaging and destructive cyber effects in support of their policy objectives against the United States, South Korea, and other allies and partners.

8. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Kernan, do you feel we are adequately prepared to defend ourselves against North Korean cyber-attacks?

Mr. KERNAN. It is my understanding that the Department of Defense works closely with the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, the Intelligence Community, and our allies and partners in the Western Pacific to improve the security of our systems and respond appropriately to the destabilizing North Korean cyber activities. In addition, our alliance with the Republic of Korea continues to deepen and evolve, and includes expanding cooperation in the cyber domain.

I share the Department's view of the need to defend against North Korean cyber attacks and fully understand the need for actionable intelligence required to sustain a viable U.S. deterrence posture. Therefore, if confirmed, it is my intent to work closely with other elements of the Department, the Intelligence Community, and our allies and partners to provide intelligence warning and analysis, build cybersecurity capacity, share threat information, and conduct the exercises, education, and training necessary to inform and conduct directed defensive and offensive operations.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, RECONNAISSANCE

9. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Kernan, in your advance policy questions, you noted that "If confirmed, I would closely coordinate with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support a process that achieves an appropriate balance in ISR allocation so we ensure that our global security responsibilities are met." How will you work to address the shortfall?

Mr. KERNAN. From my time in uniform, I am aware that the Department has established approaches and processes by which it constantly assesses and readjusts resource allocation based on DOD priorities and changing global circumstances. If confirmed, I would ensure that USD(I) remains directly involved in the process run by the Joint Staff that results in the Secretary's allocation of resources to Combatant Commanders. If analysis indicates that senior-level attention is warranted to address significant reallocation needs, I will engage at my level with Combatant Commanders, defense intelligence leaders, and our foreign counterparts to help develop and improve methods to share information between the U.S. and its friends and allies. I intend to continue efforts to assist the Combatant Commanders by seeking innovative methods and resources to develop and field new capabilities where and when it makes good sense to meet the requirements of ongoing operations, the force of the future and collective national security needs. For example, I support DOD's efforts to deliver artificial intelligence-based algorithms to tactical Unmanned Aerial Systems, MQ-1/9, and MQ-9 Wide Area Motion Imagery processing and exploitation systems by the end of 2018.

10. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Kernan, ISR alone will not solve the root problem of rooting out terrorism and its sympathizers. How will you work with the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to address these issues?

Mr. KERNAN. In my view, DOD has a supporting role in a whole-of-government effort to address and counter terrorist-based radicalization. Effective counter-terrorism strategies should incorporate all elements of power and influence, and if confirmed, I will work with my counterparts within the Department and across other departments and agencies of the Federal Government in support of these efforts.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY ELECTION REPORT

11. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Kernan, in January the Office of the Director of National Intelligence's declassified report found Putin ordered a campaign to "undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process." Do you have any reason to question the Intelligence Community's conclusions?

Mr. KERNAN. No, I have no reason to question their conclusions.

12. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Kernan, if confirmed, will you commit to ensuring we are adequately deterring and preventing Russia from interfering in future elections?

Mr. KERNAN. If confirmed, I am committed to doing whatever I can to protect the integrity of the U.S. political system, including elections, from the influence of foreign powers with ill intent.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MAZIE K. HIRONO

CROSS FUNCTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

13. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Kernan, DOD's "third offset strategy" incorporates anti-access and area-denial, undersea warfare, cyber and electronic warfare, human machine teaming, guided munitions, the development of new operating concepts—many of which incorporate advanced intelligence and cross functional concepts. How to you plan to incorporate these concepts into the DOD's intelligence community?

Mr. KERNAN. If confirmed, I will advocate for the use of innovative concepts and technologies in the modernization of current and future intelligence capabilities. Using advances in decision-aiding technologies, such as advanced algorithms, artificial intelligence, and machine learning in our Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) systems, I believe we will be able to increase the speed of intelligence support to the warfighter through automated target recognition, processing, and dissemination. I also intend to continue support to the Department's cross-functional teams that provide expertise from across the DOD and the Intelligence Community to develop new intelligence technologies and processes for informed and timely actions by decision-makers and the Department of Defense.

14. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Kernan, what is your plan for recruiting and retaining uniformed and civilians who have these technical skillsets?

Mr. KERNAN. I recognize the importance of recruiting and retaining the best technical expertise our nation has to offer in support of our national security goals, but also understand the challenges of attracting and keeping talent who have significant opportunities available to them in the private sector. If confirmed, I will investigate the utility of attractive incentives in areas such as training, education, and compensation, as well as highlighting the unique work opportunities and authorities unavailable in the civilian sector. I will also examine the possibility of changes to the current talent management processes within the defense intelligence enterprise, which include developing non-traditional DOD career paths that afford equitable advancement, closed-loop detailing within highly skilled technical areas, and industry exchange and fellowship programs.

15. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Kernan, what, if any, changes in the organization of the Services/DOD do you think will enhance success?

Mr. KERNAN. I am committed to optimizing the organization of the Department to fully support the Secretary's priorities. If confirmed, I will be open to options that will enhance the ability of the Services and DOD as a whole to deliver the best intelligence to support policy, warfighter, and the acquisition communities. I will leverage all available information to inform my decisions and work with leadership of the Defense Intelligence Enterprise to identify and implement changes that enhance success in the most efficient and effective manner.

INFORMATION OPERATIONS

16. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Kernan, DOD defines "psychological operations" as planned operations to convey selected information to targeted foreign audiences to influence their emotions, motives, objective reasoning, and ultimately the behavior of foreign governments, organizations, groups, and individuals. Russia's involvement in the recent U.S. presidential election fits squarely in this definition. What is your plan for preventing these types of information operations from occurring in the future?

Mr. KERNAN. If confirmed, I am committed to working with my counterparts within the Department and across other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to utilize the full suite of tools and capabilities to counter corrosive foreign narratives, including strategic communication, public diplomacy, public affairs, and robust partner engagement.

17. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Kernan, how can DOD work with industry, particularly social media groups, in the future on these issues?

Mr. KERNAN. I believe forming strategic relationships with industry partners is an essential component to a whole-of-government effort aimed at countering terrorist messages and recruitment. I recognize both the importance and the challenges

of some public/private partnerships and wielding those strategic relationships in support of this broader effort. I believe we must build these relationships with full consideration of our security concerns and our Nation's values.

[The nomination reference of Mr. Joseph D. Kernan follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 19, 2017.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Joseph Kernan, of Florida, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, vice Marcel John Lettre II.

[The biographical sketch of Mr. Joseph D. Kernan, which was transmitted to the Committee at the time the nomination was referred, follows:]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOSEPH D. KERNAN

Education:

- Rockledge High School
 - Rockledge FL
 - 1970 to 1973
- United States Naval Academy
 - 1973 to 1977
 - BS June 1973
- National Defense University
 - 1997 to 1998
 - MS June 1998

Employment Record:

- Senior Vice President for Corporate Development, SAP National Security Services
 - Rockville MD
 - September 2013 to Present
- Advisor, SwiftShips
 - October 2013 to December 2013
 - Morgan City LA
- Advisor, JLM Companies (Fairlead Integrated)
 - Portsmouth VA
 - April 2014 to Present
- Deputy Commander, US Southern Command
 - Miami FL
 - June 2011 to September 2013
- Senior Military Assistant to Secretary Defense, Pentagon
 - June 2009 to May 2011
- Commander, US Fourth Fleet
 - Jacksonville FL
 - May 2008 to May 2009
- Deputy Commander & Commander, Naval Special Warfare Command
 - Coronado CA
 - October 2006 to August 2008

Honors and Awards:

- Military Awards
 - Defense Distinguished Service Medal (2)
 - Distinguished Service Medal (2)
 - Defense Superior Service Medal (3)
 - Legion of Merit (2)

- Bronze Star (3)
- Defense Meritorious Service Medal (1)
- Meritorious Service Medal (2) and Presidential Unit Citation

[The Committee on Armed Services requires all individuals nominated from civilian life by the President to positions requiring the advice and consent of the Senate to complete a form that details the biographical, financial, and other information of the nominee. The form executed by Mr. Joseph D. Kernan in connection with his nomination follows:]

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ROOM SR-228

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6050

(202) 224-3871

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FORM

BIOGRAPHICAL AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION REQUESTED OF
NOMINEES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Complete all requested information. If more space is needed, use an additional sheet and cite the part of the form and the question number (i.e. A-9, B-4) to which the continuation of your answer applies. Unless otherwise required, an answer of yes, no, or not applicable is appropriate.

PART A—BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Biographical information furnished in this part of the form will be made available in Committee offices for public inspection prior to the hearing and will also be published in any hearing record as well as made available to the public.

1. **Name:** (Include any former names used.)

Mr. Joseph D. Kernan

2. **Position to which nominated:**

Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence)

3. **Date of nomination:**

July 19, 2017

4. **Address:** (List current place of residence and office addresses.)

[The nominee responded and the information is contained in the Committee's executive files.]

5. **Year and place of birth:**

1955, Travis AFB CA

6. **Marital status:** (Include full name of current spouse including any other names used, including maiden name.)

Janet M Kernan (Williams)

7. **Names of children (if over age 18):**

Sean Joseph Kernan
Shannon Marie Mader

8. **Education:** List names of secondary and higher education institutions attended, type of school (vocational, technical, trade school, college, university, military college, correspondence, distance, extension, and on-line) dates attended, degree received and date degree granted.

- Rockledge High School
- Rockledge FL

- 1970 to 1973
- United States Naval Academy
 - 1973 to 1977
 - BS June 1977
- National Defense University
 - 1997 to 1998
 - MS June 1998

9. **Employment record:** List all jobs held since college or in the last 10 years, whichever is less, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of employment. If the employment activity was military duty, list separate employment activity periods to show each change of military duty station.

- Senior Vice President for Corporate Development, SAP National Security Services
 - Rockville MD
 - September 2013 to Present
- Advisor, SwiftShips
 - October 2013 to December 2013
 - Morgan City LA
- Advisor, JLM Companies (Fairlead Integrated)
 - Portsmouth VA
 - April 2014 to Present
- Deputy Commander, US Southern Command
 - Miami FL
 - June 2011 to September 2013
- Senior Military Assistant to Secretary Defense
 - Pentagon
 - June 2009 to May 2011
- Commander, US Fourth Fleet
 - Jacksonville FL
 - May 2008 to May 2009
- Deputy Commander & Commander, Naval Special Warfare Command,
 - Coronado CA
 - October 2006 to August 2008

10. **Government experience:** List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments, other than those listed above.

None

11. **Business relationships:** List all positions currently held as an officer, director, trustee, partner, proprietor, agent, representative, or consultant of any corporation, company, firm, partnership, or other business enterprise, educational or other institution.

Board Director, SAP National Security Services

Advisor, JLM Companies: Fairlead Integrated

12. **Memberships:** List all memberships and offices currently held in professional, fraternal, scholarly, civic, business, charitable and other organizations.

- Board Director, The Mission Continues
- Board Director, The National Navy SEAL Museum
- Member, UDT/SEAL Association
- Chairman, NS2 Serves

13. **Political affiliations and activities:**

(a) If you have ever been a candidate for or have been elected or appointed to a political office, list the name of the office(s), whether you were elected/appointed/candidate, the year(s) the election was held or the appointment was made, and the term of office (if applicable).

N/A

(b) List all memberships and offices held in and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last 5 years.

N/A

(c) Itemize all individual political contributions of \$100 or more to any individual, campaign organization, political party, political action committee, or similar entity for the past 5 years. List each individual contribution and not the total amount contributed to the person or entity during the year.

N/A

14. **Honors and Awards:** List all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, civilian service citations, military awards and decorations, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognition for outstanding service or achievements.

Military Awards:

- Defense Distinguished Service Medal (2)
- Distinguished Service Medal (2)
- Defense Superior Service Medal (3), Legion of Merit (2),
- Bronze Star (3)
- Defense Meritorious Service Medal (1)
- Meritorious Service Medal (2) and Presidential Unit Citation

15. **Published writings:** List the titles, publishers, and dates of books, articles, reports, or other published materials which you have written including articles published on the internet.

N/A

16. **Speeches:** Provide the Committee with two copies of any formal speeches you have delivered during the last 5 years of which you have copies and are on topics relevant to the position for which you have been nominated.

N/A

17. **Commitments regarding nomination, confirmation, and service:**

(a) If confirmed, will you adhere to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

Yes

(b) Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

No

(c) If confirmed, will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

Yes

(d) Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to Congressional requests?

Yes

(e) Will you promise to enforce or ensure whistleblower protections for all those witnesses?

Yes

(f) Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this Committee?

Yes

(g) Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted Committee, or to consult with the Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Yes

[The nominee responded to Parts B–F of the Committee questionnaire. The text of the questionnaire is set forth in the Appendix to this volume. The nominee’s answers to Parts B–F are contained in the Committee’s executive files.]

SIGNATURE AND DATE

I hereby state that I have read and signed the foregoing Statement on Biographical and Financial Information and that the information provided therein is, to the best of my knowledge, current, accurate, and complete.

JOSEPH D. KERNAN

This 25th day of July, 2017

[The nomination of Mr. Joseph D. Kernan was reported to the Senate by Chairman McCain on November 7, 2017, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on November 16, 2017.]

[Prepared questions submitted to Mr. Guy B. Roberts by Chairman McCain prior to the hearing with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REFORMS

Question. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 included the most sweeping reforms since the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

Do you support these reforms?

Answer. Yes.

Question. What other areas for defense reform do you believe might be appropriate for this Committee to address?

Answer. I do not have any specific recommendations at this time. If confirmed I would expect that in the process of implementing the FY 2017 NDAA reforms that we may identify additional changes that would be worth considering.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 also required that the Secretary of Defense establish cross-functional teams to address critical objectives of the Department.

Question. What are your views on the potential focus areas and uses for future cross-functional teams?

Answer. I do not have any specific recommendations at this time. If confirmed I would expect that in the process of implementing the FY 2017 NDAA reforms that we may identify focus areas and potential teaming opportunities.

DUTIES

Question. Section 138 of title 10, United States Code, provides that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs (ASD(NCB)) shall advise the Secretary of Defense on nuclear energy, nuclear weapons, and chemical and biological defense.

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the ASD(NCB)?

Answer. The ASD(NCB) is the principal advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense and the USD(AT&L) on nuclear energy, nuclear weapons, and chemical and biological defense.

The ASD(NCB) is the principal advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense and the USD(AT&L) for the nuclear matters and provides technical guidance to the Secretary of Defense regarding the nuclear stockpile. Nuclear Matters, under the (ASD(NCB) serves as the focal point for DOD activities and initiatives related to the dual missions of sustaining a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent and countering the threat from nuclear terrorism and nuclear proliferation.

QUALIFICATIONS

Question. What background and experience do you possess that qualify you for this position?

Answer. I have over thirty years of working arms control, anti-proliferation, deterrence and strategic stability issues. This includes:

Serving as a staff officer in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency working on the Conventional Forces in Europe and Open Skies Agreement;

While on active duty in the Marine Corps I served as an action officer on the Joint Staff with a portfolio that included the Chemical Weapons Convention, Biological

Weapons Convention, Certain Conventional Weapons Convention addressing landmines and incendiaries. I was on the U.S. delegations to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Review Conference, the Conference on Disarmament, and the International Atomic Energy Agency Board of Governor's meetings on the North Korean nuclear weapons program.

As the Department of the Navy's Associate Counsel for arms control agreements, I reviewed all naval programs for compliance with strategic arms controls agreements and provided legal advice with regard to the Polaris Sales Agreement with the UK. While serving as the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Negotiations Policy I was appointed Deputy Head of Delegation to the Biological Weapons Convention Review Conferences and I was a member of the Moscow Treaty negotiating team. I also participated in the creation and implementation of the Proliferation Security Initiative and the negotiation of UN Security Council Resolution 1540 which requires states to ensure their territory is not used for WMD purposes.

As NATO's Deputy Assistant Secretary General for WMD Policy and the Director for Nuclear Policy I was responsible for NATO's Countering WMD policy and initiatives. I also oversaw NATO's nuclear deterrence posture and was one of the drafters of NATO Deterrence and Defense Posture Review.

Finally, as a private consultant I have provided subject matter expertise on arms control, non-proliferation, international legal issues and strategies to combat terrorism to over 30 international domestic organizations and institutions.

MAJOR CHALLENGES AND PRIORITIES

Question. If confirmed, what broad priorities will you establish?

Answer. Maintaining a safe and secure nuclear deterrent capability, ensuring the destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile, decreasing the threat of proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and to keep WMD out of the hands of terrorists and other enemies by locking down, monitoring, and destroying weapons and weapons related materials.

Question. In your view, what are the major challenges that you would confront, if confirmed?

Answer. Working to synchronize the NCB priorities to support our Combatant Commands, International Partners and Interagency collaborators without duplication of effort.

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Question. What are your views on the state of the relationship between the Office of the ASD(NCB) and the Senate Armed Services Committee in particular, and with Congress in general?

Answer. Responsiveness to the SASC and to Congress writ large is essential so representatives can make informed legislative decisions on behalf of our Nation.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and the Office of the ASD(NCB)?

Answer. I will be available as needed to brief Congress and to discuss any Congressional concerns.

REORGANIZATION OF AT&L

Question. The Department of Defense plans to divide the duties of the Under Secretary of Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics, under which the ASD(NCB) falls, into two separate organizations as of February 2018. As directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, these will be the Under Secretary for Research and Engineering and the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Sustainment.

Will the Office of the ASD(NCB) be kept intact after the reorganization, and if so, under which Under Secretary will it fall?

Answer. The leadership of the Department is working on organization decisions and plans and I am not yet privy to or party to these conversations.

Question. What opportunities do you see for this office under the reorganization?

Answer. The NDAA presents an opportunity to further collaborate with our partners in Policy, Security Cooperation and CWMD to find efficiencies and build better synergistic relationships.

Question. If confirmed, how will you work to make sure that this office both takes advantage of advancements in research and innovation and keeps the modernization programs on schedule and within budget?

Answer. I will work collaboratively with all stakeholders to ensure that advances in research and innovation are effectively leveraged for safeguarding the warfighter and U.S. national security, while simultaneously relaying the acquisition needs to

ensure that such efforts are effectively targeted towards modernization programs. I look forward to additionally working with the other affected and interested agencies to ensure that cost, schedule, and performance goals pertaining to modernization programs are met.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS COUNCIL

Question. Section 179 of title 10, United States Code, designates the ASD(NCB) as the Staff Director of the Nuclear Weapons Council.

What is your understanding of this role?

Answer. The law directs that the DOD and the DOE/NNSA provide experts to serve as the NWC staff. Since the beginning of the NWC, the ASD(NCB) has performed the role of NWC executive secretary, in addition to the legally mandated staff director function. As executive secretary, the ASD(NCB) sets the agendas and facilitates the activities of the NWC. As staff director the ASD(NCB) also has oversight responsibilities for the NWC staff and the other subordinate organizations of the NWC.

If confirmed, what steps will you take to ensure that the Nuclear Weapons Council duties are effectively executed?

The Nuclear Weapons Council is the primary interface for coordinating nuclear weapons enterprise issues between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. Its top priority is to ensure the success of stockpile life extension and nuclear infrastructure modernization programs in the current fiscal environment; in particular, to advocate for the appropriate resource recommendations to ensure the safety, security, and effectiveness of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

As the staff director and executive secretary of the NWC, I understand the need to decisively address the issues facing our nuclear program managers and to control the cost of the weapon system and warhead development programs included within our program of record. I will work with the Nuclear Weapons Council, its subordinate bodies, and its individual members to oversee major nuclear acquisition programs, and ensure NWC annual reporting requirements are fulfilled in a timely manner.

Question. Are there any changes that you would recommend to the membership, organization, structure, or responsibilities of the Nuclear Weapons Council?

Answer. If confirmed, in support of the USD, I will review the operations of the Nuclear Weapons Council and make recommendations for appropriate changes and/or request any legislative language to ensure the NWC has the necessary authorities and responsibilities to maintain the nation's capability to develop, field, and ensure the safety, security, and effectiveness of our nuclear weapons.

Question. What do you see as the challenges that the Nuclear Weapons Council will face over the next four years, and what would you do to address these challenges, if confirmed?

Answer. The Departments of Defense and Energy each have ongoing efforts to modernize the nation's nuclear forces and weapons complex. If confirmed, I would work closely with the Nuclear Weapons Council, Air Force, Navy, and National Nuclear Security Administration, and other relevant OSD Components to ensure we successfully execute our planned modernization efforts and address emerging and future threats to deter adversaries and assure allies. In order to maintain a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent it is essential that we maintain the capability to conduct design and manufacturing of every element of that deterrent. Cost is always a consideration, but the foundational elements of remaining a nuclear weapons state cannot and should not be overlooked. Rebuilding infrastructure, some of which dates to the Manhattan Project Era, is an essential element of that, as is maintaining our intellectual capability.

In addition to ongoing efforts to modernize the nuclear enterprise, I am aware that the DOD is leading the on-going Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), which will have a significant impact on our nation's plans for the future of the nuclear enterprise. I have not yet been briefed on the details of the NPR process or content. However, I would assume, based on Secretary Mattis' open testimonies on the FY18 budget, that the Nuclear Posture Review will address this issue. As he stated, "We're looking at each leg of the triad and we're looking at each weapon inside each leg. What I'm looking for is a deterrent that will be most compelling and make certain these weapons are never used."

NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION

Question. Do you support and intend to advocate for the modernization of all legs of the triad of nuclear delivery vehicles?

Answer. Yes. I fully support both Departments' ongoing efforts to modernize the nation's nuclear forces and weapons complex. If confirmed, I would work closely with the Nuclear Weapons Council, Air Force, Navy, National Nuclear Security Administration, and other relevant OSD components to ensure we successfully execute our planned modernization efforts and address emerging and future threats to deter adversaries and assure allies.

Question. Do you support and intend to advocate for the funding, development, and fielding of the Long-Range Stand-Off Weapon?

Answer. I believe that the modernization of all elements of the triad are necessary. Our nation has maintained a nuclear cruise missile capability for decades, and I believe it continues to be an essential element of our deterrent capability and the Long Range Stand-Off is the logical successor for a timely modernization. I also believe that the ongoing Nuclear Posture Review will address this question more fully. That review will leave the ultimate determination to the Secretary of Defense and I will support the Secretary's position fully and completely.

Question. The Nuclear Weapons Council has laid out a schedule for modernization of the nuclear weapons stockpile over the next 20 years that involves life extension programs, major alterations, and interoperable warheads, in addition to maintenance of the existing stockpile systems.

Do you support and intend to advocate for all components of this program?

Answer. Yes. I fully support both Departments' ongoing efforts to modernize the nation's nuclear forces and nuclear weapons complex. If confirmed, I will work through the Nuclear Weapons Council, Air Force, Navy, NNSA, and other relevant OSD components to ensure we successfully execute the planned modernization efforts to deter 21st-century threats and reassure our allies.

In addition, although I have not been briefed on the on-going NPR, I am aware of the significant impact that such a review may have on the future of the nuclear enterprise, and I would expect to incorporate outcomes from this effort into the program of record for the nuclear enterprise.

Question. Do you agree that programs to modernize and replace critical infrastructure, such as the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement at Los Alamos and the Uranium Processing Facility at Y-12, are national security priorities that should be addressed in a timely manner?

Answer. Yes. It is my understanding that much of the Nation's critical nuclear infrastructure is at or beyond end of life, and no longer provides the reliability and flexibility that we need to sustain a modern nuclear deterrent. Congress has supported a significant, multi-year investment in the new Uranium Processing Facility at the Y-12 plant, and in recent NDAA's has expressed concern that the Nation needs to reestablish a plutonium pit production capability that supports the needs of the nation. If confirmed, I look forward to learning the details behind plans and programs to modernize and replace critical infrastructure, and how current and future infrastructure investments have been sequenced to address national security needs.

Question. Are the multiple components of the nuclear modernization plan appropriately sequenced and scoped in order to meet the operational needs of the commander of U.S. Strategic Command?

Answer. I am not familiar with the details of current U.S. Strategic Command operational plans and needs, and so cannot judge how well the current nuclear modernization plan is sequenced and scoped from that perspective. However, from experience in the military and elsewhere I know that the Commander of USSTRATCOM has significant input to budgeting decisions in the Department of Defense and in nuclear weapons decisions made by the Nuclear Weapons Council. If confirmed, I will work closely within the Department of Defense and with the Department of Energy to ensure that we sequence and scope nuclear modernization plans to support our 21st century nuclear deterrent.

Question. How do you intend to ensure the health of the specialized industrial base needed to produce certain components of the delivery systems currently being modernized?

Answer. The nuclear weapons enterprise within DOD is not unique in having concerns over the ability of the underlying industrial base to meet national needs. This is a much broader problem that affects a wide variety of acquisition programs in the Department of Defense. In my opinion, part of the answer is to provide clear demand signals and ensure that we try to appropriately sequence acquisitions over time, so that we don't ask our industrial partners to cycle between periods of high demand and inactivity. If confirmed, I will work with my colleagues in the DOD and DOE to see that we have aligned procurements of delivery platforms, warheads, and bombs in a way that can be met by the industrial base, and I will support the Un-

dersecretary of Defense for AT&L in her efforts to address this problem in a broader sense across the acquisition community.

NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS

Question. Section 171a of title 10, United States Code, outlines the responsibilities for the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System. The nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) system consists of more than 100 separate programs managed by the Navy, Air Force, or DISA. The system is aging and has suffered from inattention, yet is vitally important to ensuring the President has direct control over nuclear weapons and their use, during peacetime and in crisis.

What role do you see for the ASD(NCB) in oversight of the NC3 system?

Answer. The DOD Chief Information Officer has primary oversight of the NC3 system. If confirmed, I will work with CIO, Joint Staff, the Services, DISA, and other OSD Components to ensure that our NC3 system is assured and reliable at all phases of a crisis. In particular, I anticipate playing a role in oversight of the survivability of relevant NC3 systems in nuclear weapon environments.

Question. What actions will you take to ensure there is a long-term road-map and acquisition strategy to ensure the NC3 system meets requirements for the President?

Answer. As USSTRATCOM Commander General Hyten has emphasized, the nuclear deterrent is only as effective as the command and control that enables it to function, and many of those systems are facing obsolescence. If confirmed, I will support the Undersecretary for AT&L and the successor Under Secretary in emphasizing a strategic approach to modernizing NC3 systems across all programs. I believe that is the best way to meet our stringent nuclear command and control requirements within our budgetary constraints.

NAVY SHIPBUILDING

Question. In the 1970s and 1980s, the United States procured the current *Ohio*-class submarines within the Navy's shipbuilding (SCN) account. In 2015, Congress created a special fund, the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund for procurement of *Columbia*-class SSBNs, the replacements for the *Ohio*-class SSBNs.

Do you have a view on how the cost of *Columbia*-class SSBNs should be funded—solely from Navy resources, from a combination of Navy and other-than-Navy (e.g., OMB and other Defense) sources, or with a different approach? If so, please explain.

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with the DOD leadership and the US Navy to ensure that proper resourcing is provided for the *Columbia*-class SSBNs. This is a critical leg of our nation's nuclear deterrent. It is the nation's responsibility to provide the appropriate funds by any method deemed appropriate, regardless of the mechanism used.

NUCLEAR ENTERPRISE

Question. The nuclear enterprise functions through collaboration between the Navy, the Air Force, the Under Secretaries of Defense for Policy and for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the National Nuclear Security Administration headquarters, and the national laboratories and production sites.

Do you believe that the current system adequately connects military requirements to acquisitions and procurement to technical expertise and production?

Answer. The Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC) serves as the focal point for inter-agency analyses and decisions to maintain and manage the nuclear weapons stockpile. By law, the NWC is responsible for coordinating and approving activities of the Department of Energy for the study, development, and production of nuclear weapons. The NWC develops nuclear weapons stockpile options and the costs of such options and alternatives. I understand that the NWC reviews and approves requirements and ensures acquisition plans address those requirements. Through its subordinate committees, member agencies, and various annual review processes, the NWC has access to the technical expertise and insight into the production capabilities needed to support nuclear weapons procurement. If confirmed, as Staff Director to the NWC, I would endeavor to assure that the process works efficiently and effectively.

Question. Do you have any recommendations for improving the functions of the complex?

Answer. If confirmed, and consistent with whatever guidance comes from the Nuclear Posture Review Process, I will review the functions of the complex with my partner agencies to evaluate its performance and develop recommendations for improvement.

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

Question. Do you support the Stockpile Stewardship Program and have you reviewed the elements of this program as conducted by the National Nuclear Security Administration?

Answer. Yes, I support the program as I understand it. The National Nuclear Security Administration through this program ensures the Nation sustains a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent through the application of science, technology, engineering, and manufacturing. I am aware that this program enables maintaining the active stockpile, executing Life Extension Programs (LEPs) and performing Weapons Dismantlement without the need for underground nuclear testing. I am also aware that investment in a specialized science and engineering workforce with appropriate facilities and infrastructure are required for the program to be successful.

Question. In your view, are there any additional capabilities that the Stockpile Stewardship Program should develop?

Answer. Since 1995, there has been a requirement to conduct an annual stockpile assessment to evaluate the safety, performance, and reliability without nuclear explosive testing. This review is based on physics and engineering analyses, experiments, and computer simulations. These reviews drive changes into the NNSA Stockpile Stewardship program and new capabilities are planned appropriately. I am not familiar with the details of the assessments to date and the recommendations for new capabilities. If confirmed, I will review the results of the annual stockpile assessment with my partners and make appropriate recommendations on new capabilities.

Question. As materials and designs age, what is your opinion on whether the modeling and simulation will continue to suffice indefinitely in place of underground testing in ensuring the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile?

Answer. I am not familiar with the details of the reviews and assessment of the adequacies of the modeling and simulation capabilities. If confirmed, I will review the results of the annual stockpile assessment process with my partners and make appropriate recommendations on the adequacy of modeling and simulation capabilities to underpin the certification of the stockpile.

Question. If the technical conclusions and data from the Stockpile Stewardship Program could no longer confidently support the annual certification of the stockpile as safe, secure, and reliable, what would your recommendation be?

Answer. Since 1995, there has been a requirement to conduct an annual review of the stockpile to evaluate the safety, performance, and reliability without nuclear explosive testing. This review is based on physics and engineering analyses, experiments, and computer simulations. The Directors of the three DOE nuclear weapons laboratories—Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and Sandia National Laboratories (SNL)—are required to complete annual assessments of the safety, reliability, and performance of each weapon type in the nuclear weapons stockpile. In addition, the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command provides an assessment of the military effectiveness of the stockpile. These assessments also include a determination as to whether it is necessary to conduct an underground nuclear test to resolve any identified issues. The Secretaries of Energy and Defense are required to submit these reports unaltered to the President, along with any conclusions the Secretaries consider appropriate. If confirmed, I would review the results of the annual stockpile assessment results with my partners and make appropriate recommendations.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE MATTERS

Question. Section 138 of title 10, United States Code, states that the ASD(NCB) shall advise the Secretary of Defense on chemical and biological defense in addition to nuclear matters.

What is your understanding of your roles and responsibilities with respect to chemical and biological defense matters?

Answer. The ASD(NCB) is the principal advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense and the USD(AT&L) for activities that combat current and emerging WMD threats, including all matters related to Research, Development and Acquisition of chemical, biological, radiological defense. In this capacity, I will provide oversight for the development of acquisition policies, provide advice, and makes recommendations for chemical, biological, radiological, medical and non-medical defense as well as the safety and security of chemical and biological agents that are used to research medical countermeasure capabilities to protect the force.

Question. How do these roles and responsibilities relate to those of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction?

Answer. The DASD(CWMD) serves as the primary point of contact within the OUSD(P) for development and implementation of policies to counter WMD and ensures coordination for Homeland defense activities. The integration of DASD(CWMD) with the NBC components (NCB/NM, NCB/TRAC, NCB/CBD, and DTRA) are critical to the Department's efforts to counter WMD.

DASD(CWMD) provides DOD policy and guidance for the programs and activities of the DOD Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program in conjunction with NCB/TRAC and DTRA.

DASD(CWMD) develops, coordinates, and monitors implementation of DOD policies for arms control and nonproliferation of nuclear, radiological, chemical, biological, and advanced conventional weapons and missiles, and international technology transfers with NCB/TRAC and DTRA.

DASD(CWMD) oversees international countering WMD initiatives building U.S. and partner capacity in chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear defense capabilities and combating transnational threats in conjunction with all NCB components.

DASD(CWMD) is the Secretary of Defense representative for non-proliferation and arms control matters, including but not limited to those involving the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention, with the National Security Staff, the Department of State, and other departments, agencies, and inter-agency groups.

Question. What do you believe are the principal challenges in chemical and biological defense, and what would be your priorities for the Department of Defense's Chemical and Biological Defense Program?

Answer. The principal challenges are that the Threat is real and evolving, the Norms which have previously protected civilians and security forces are at risk, and technology advancements and ease of proliferation are lowering or eliminating barriers to those who wish to obtain WMD and increasing the capability of those who already have access to WMD.

To address these threats, the CBDP has three objectives; Prepare for Surprise, Advanced Early Warning, and Protect the Force:

Prepare for Surprise: Understanding of current CB threats and seize technical opportunities.

- Collaborate with the Intelligence Community to identify threats
- Characterize and forecast emerging, advanced, and non-traditional threats
- Maintain a robust, proactive technology watch

Advance Early Warning: Ensure early detection, information sharing and forecasts of impacts.

- Develop detection and diagnostic systems for forward/field use
- Build networked information systems that integrate CWMD and health sources
- Ensure processes are in place for effective sharing of critical information

Protect the Force: Develop and deploy effective materials, products, technologies, and medicines to minimize the effects of any CB agent.

- Invests in capabilities that are integrated into Warfighter CONOPs and training
- Develop flexible and broad-spectrum technologies—e.g., protective equipment, medical countermeasures, and decontamination—for diverse user communities
- Explore how capabilities can be combined to optimize outcomes

Interaction with Other Federal Agencies on Chemical and Biological Matters

The Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health and Human Services play important roles in planning and implementing U.S. policy and programs for protecting the United States against biological and chemical threats, including the development and stockpiling of vaccines and therapeutic products.

Question. If confirmed, how would you work with these agencies to ensure the effective coordination and collaboration of efforts to improve U.S. security against biological and chemical threats?

Answer. Coordination and collaboration with the other responsible agencies is not only critical to protecting the Homeland, but also to protecting the Warfighter. I strongly support the need for coordination and collaboration with DHS and DHHS to prevent duplicative efforts, increase efficiencies, and introduce cost-sharing measures in the development of medical countermeasures against biological and chemical threats. These interactions are formalized through the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise (PHEMCE).

CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION

Question. The United States is a party to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and, under the terms of the treaty, was obligated to destroy its chemical weapons stockpile by no later than the extended deadline of April 2012.

Do you agree that the Department of Defense and the U.S. Government should be in full compliance with the terms and obligations of the CWC and the Biological Warfare Convention, including the deadline for destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile under the CWC?

Answer. Yes, I agree that the Department of Defense and the U.S. Government should be in full compliance with the terms and obligations of the CWC and the Biological Warfare Convention. If confirmed, I will ensure all programs under my purview will remain in compliance with and meet the obligations of the Chemical Weapons Convention to destroy our chemical weapons stockpile in the most expeditious manner while ensuring the safety of the people and protecting the environment as well as the Biological Warfare Convention.

Question. If confirmed, will you work to ensure that the Department takes steps needed to minimize the time to complete destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile, without sacrificing safety or security?

Answer. If confirmed, I will ensure that the Department continues to evaluate options to accelerate the destruction schedules and complete destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile by the congressionally mandated destruction deadline of December 31, 2023.

Question. If confirmed, what actions would you take to ensure adequate funding is requested to permit the most expeditious destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile, consistent with the legal requirement to protect public health, safety, and the environment?

Answer. The destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile is a priority within the Department. I will work with the Comptroller and members of Congress to obtain the fiscal resources required to complete the destruction of the U.S. chemical weapons stockpile while protecting public health, safety, and the environment.

Question. Recently, there have been challenges at both major chemical demilitarization plants. The Pueblo Chemical Agent-Destruction Pilot Plant began destroying mustard agent back in September 2016, however, an unanticipated roof replacement and a hazardous waste spill halted operations. Additionally, the Blue Grass Army Depot has further schedule delays due to construction complications.

If confirmed, what management actions would you take to address these problems?

Answer. A new Program Executive Officer (PEO), Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) began in June 2017. The new PEO is evaluating initiatives to improve the management and performance of the program. If confirmed, I will review these initiatives with the PEO and determine appropriate management actions.

Question. Do you see the need for any changes in the structure, organization, or reporting relationships within the chemical demilitarization program?

Answer. If confirmed, I will review the program's organization and management structure as well as the reporting requirements and make changes as appropriate.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS (NUNN-LUGAR PROGRAMS)

Question. Do you support the Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs?

Answer. Yes, I support the Nunn-Lugar CTR program. CTR is DOD's primary program for helping other countries eliminate, secure, detect, and interdict the flow of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and related materials. This mission is critically important given the national security threats that we currently face relating to detecting WMD and WMD-related items that may fall outside state control, and securing especially dangerous pathogens, chemical precursors, and nuclear material.

If confirmed, I will support the DOD CTR Program and other relevant threat reduction programs by ensuring they are resourced and capable of fulfilling the mission to mitigate WMD-related risks.

Question. If confirmed, would you support joint research programs with foreign nations partnered with the United States in the areas of chemical or biological weapons defense?

Answer. Yes. In addition to chemical and biological defense research with more developed foreign partners such as the UK, Australia, and Singapore, the CTR program works with civilian and military counterparts in partner countries across the former Soviet Union, Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia to eliminate, secure or prevent proliferation of WMD. It accomplishes this mission in collaboration with international and non-governmental partners by developing locally appropriate, sus-

tainable programs. These joint research opportunities provide unique opportunities to advance key U.S. partnerships abroad, to protect the warfighter, as well as to safeguard the national security of the United States and its allies.

Question. What is your understanding as to your responsibilities with respect to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs?

Answer. Acquisition oversight of the CTR program is my primary responsibility. This includes monitoring cost, schedule, and performance, as well as approving engagement plans, validating requirements, and issuing tiered guidance to the program that informs its long-term planning activities and investments.

It is my understanding that my responsibilities, if confirmed, will include exercising authority, direction, and control over the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA). In this role I shall provide oversight of countering WMD efforts executed through DTRA's Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, with support from the office of the DASD(TRAC).

CONSEQUENCE MANAGEMENT OF CBRNE INCIDENTS

Question. The Department of Defense has a mission of providing support to civil authorities for consequence management of domestic chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or high-yield explosive (CBRNE) incidents, if directed by the President or the Secretary of Defense. Since 2002, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command have had responsibilities for planning and executing that mission.

If confirmed, how would you expect to work with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command on issues related to the Department's capabilities to provide support to civil authorities for CBRNE consequence management, as well their Homeland defense missions related to nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons or materials?

Answer. I would expect to continue to work with my Homeland Defense and NORTHCOM counterparts to address any issues and ensure that we are delivering the CBRN capabilities required to defend the Homeland.

DOD support to civil authorities is an important component of our mission, and I will continue to prioritize such support. The Defense Threat Reduction Agency, which is overseen by the ASD(NCB), already provides valuable assistance for CBRN events to CCMs, including USNORTHCOM, and to civil authorities. In addition, I would direct DTRA to continue to fully participate in USNORTHCOM exercises such as VIGILANT SHIELD, ARDENT SENTRY, and VIBRANT RESPONSE. I would also instruct DTRA to support USNORTHCOM joint task forces established during National Special Security Events.

Question. The Department of Homeland Security is the lead federal agency for planning, coordinating, and implementing consequence management of CBRNE incidents in the United States, in conjunction with the States and territories.

If confirmed, what relationship would you expect to have with the Department of Homeland Security and its component entities?

Answer. I understand that the Department has ongoing relationships to enhance efficiencies and would seek to strengthen those relationships.

If confirmed, I will continue our excellent relationship with the DHS on efforts of mutual concern to both of our organizations. For example, DTRA collaborates with DHS to develop technologies to address threats of mutual concern. These challenges include development of technologies for threat detection, hazard prediction, event modeling, and decision support.

Question. What do you believe is the appropriate role for the Department of Defense in providing support to civil authorities for CBRNE consequence management?

Answer. There are well established policies and procedures for DOD support to civilian authorities. DOD routinely exercises with civilian agencies through both NORTHCOM and National Guard exercises and deploys requested capabilities in support of high threat events, such as National Special Security Events.

I support the current laws and authorities which allow DOD to provide support to civil authorities in response to requests for assistance for domestic emergencies to include CBRNE incidents. For example, DTRA supports equipping and training the National Guard Civil Support Teams (CST). DTRA has developed a Mobile Field Kit for these CSTs which is a sensor integration and situational awareness tool to be used for nuclear and radiological detection.

Question. If confirmed, what role would you expect to have in regard to the oversight of Department of Defense capabilities related to consequence management of CBRNE incidents?

Answer. The CBRN defense equipment used in a response is primarily developed and fielded under the joint Chemical and Biological Defense Program. I don't envision any change to the current oversight responsibilities.

If confirmed, I will continue to exercise oversight activities of the DTRA consequence management programs and other collaborative efforts with NORTHCOM and DHS.

REPORTING CHAIN

Question. Section 138 of title 10, United States Code, states that the ASD(NCB) may communicate views on issues directly to the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense without obtaining the approval or concurrence of any other official within the Department.

What is your understanding of why this direct access is necessary?

Answer. The Department of Defense Military Liaison Committee coordinated military requirements with the Atomic Energy Commission. The committee functioned as the authorized channel of communication between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy on all atomic energy matters relating to the military applications of atomic weapons or atomic energy. The committee addressed matters of policy, programming, and commitment of funds to the military application of atomic energy.

In 1951, the Secretary of Defense moved the committee to the Pentagon and designated its chairman as the Deputy to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy Matters. In 1953, this position was re-designated as the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy.

Question. In 1996, Congress added the responsibilities of chemical and biological defense. Since then, Congress has maintained that the position was necessary to ensure appropriate senior-level policy oversight and implementation guidance within the Department.

What is your understanding of how this process has functioned in the past?

Answer. In my understanding, the ASD(NCB) has always had the required access to the Secretary of Defense on all issues under its purview.

Question. If confirmed, would you expect to have direct and timely access to the Secretary of Defense for matters pertaining to the safety, security, and reliability of nuclear weapons?

Answer. I am totally committed to maintaining a safe, secure and effective nuclear deterrent. If confirmed, I would expect to still maintain direct and timely access to the Secretary of Defense regarding safety, security, and reliability of nuclear weapons.

NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS

Question. If confirmed, would you commit to promptly notifying Congress of any significant issues in the safety, security, or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile?

Answer. If confirmed, once I have the facts, I will commit to prompt notification surrounding any significant issue in the safety, security, or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

NATIONAL SECURITY BUDGET REDUCTIONS/SEQUESTRATION

Question. The original discretionary caps imposed by the Budget Control Act (BCA) will be in effect for Fiscal Year 2018 through Fiscal Year 2021, unless there is an agreement to change the budget caps. Both Bipartisan Budget Agreements in 2013 and 2015 increased spending levels above the BCA caps and maintained parity between defense and non-defense funding.

In your assessment, what would be the impacts of continued implementation of the BCA discretionary caps through 2021 on the Department of Defense and national security, and specifically on nuclear modernization plans?

Answer. Budget realities, such as the BCA discretionary caps, have forced reductions in the scope, schedule margin, and management flexibility in recapitalization plans for the nuclear enterprise. Despite these challenges, the Department remains committed to strengthening and modernizing the nuclear Triad. The DOD continues to look for creative solutions to reduce costs, such as the incremental funding of the first *Columbia* submarine and the potential for greater commonality in Air Force and Navy ballistic missile systems. These issues continue to be addressed at each budget cycle through issue teams led by the DOD Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

Question. Do you believe that any future budget agreements must maintain parity between defense and non-defense funding?

Answer. If confirmed, my priorities will include supporting the secretary in obtaining the top-line defense budget, the necessary resources to rebuild the military, and participating in defense strategy and reform. If I am confirmed, I will work in close partnership with this committee to provide the appropriate justifications for the resources the department requests and in particular to ensure funding for our critical nuclear modernization program—a paramount national security priority.

Question. If confirmed, by what standards would you measure the adequacy of funding for the missions under your supervision?

Answer. The Department of Defense (DOD) is entering a period when multiple weapon delivery systems require significant modernization as they near end-of-life. The Department delayed several programs in previous years, thereby removing any schedule margin for recapitalizing these systems. Moreover, the internal and external reviews of the DOD nuclear enterprise conducted in 2014 brought additional focus on needed recapitalization and resulted in increased investments to ensure the long-term health of our nuclear forces.

Modernization and replacement programs will require increased investment over current levels for much of the next 15 years and will depend on sustained Congressional funding. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) must also be funded at an adequate level to maintain and extend the lifetime of the existing stockpile, while sustaining or modernizing its aging facilities and infrastructure. As a result, substantial funding will be required in the near future.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Question. In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress?

Answer. Responsiveness to the SASC and to Congress writ large is essential so representatives can make informed legislative decisions on behalf of our Nation.

Question. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated Members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the ASD(NCB)?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings, and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate committees in a timely manner?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee, or to consult with this Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If confirmed, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?

Answer. Yes.

[Questions for the record with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAN SULLIVAN

COUNTER-WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION MISSION

1. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Roberts, nuclear terrorism is one of the most dangerous threats to the United States. How will you work to support DOD, specifically the new U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) responsibility for the counter-weapons of mass destruction (WMD) synchronization mission, in efforts to improve capability and capacity for this vital mission?

Mr. ROBERTS. Working to ensure the Department has the capabilities and the capacity to counter weapons of mass destruction, especially for USSOCOM, will be a primary focus of my office, if confirmed. The recent mission changes that give USSOCOM additional authorities and responsibilities for counter-WMD activities

have provided an excellent opportunity for increased support to this critical mission set, and I will work within the department, with other departments and agencies, international partners, and with Congress to ensure resources are aligned to requirements, gaps are closed, and the United States is better prepared to counter WMD. I understand that the Department has made great strides, particularly at the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, in this area, and if confirmed, one of my first actions will be to meet with the USSOCOM commander, and other members of the CWMD community, to ensure our warfighters receive the support they need.

READINESS TO FIGHT IN A CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

2. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Roberts, how will you work to improve our servicemember's survivability and combat effectiveness in a chemical biological threat environment?

Mr. ROBERTS. If confirmed, I will continue the work within DOD and with our interagency partners to ensure our service members can not only survive, but are able to accomplish their mission in a chemical or biological environment. I will review our current efforts within DOD to ensure that they are addressing the highest priority requirements of our Services to accomplish their missions in a chemical and biological environment.

3. Senator SULLIVAN. Mr. Roberts, are DOD and Congress appropriately focused on this potential threat; what more do we need?

Mr. ROBERTS. My current assessment is that DOD and Congress are appropriately focused on the chemical and biological threat environment. If confirmed, I will review our efforts to ensure that the focus remains appropriate to ensure our warfighters can effectively accomplish their missions in a chemical or biological environment.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAVID PERDUE

NUCLEAR LABS HIRING CHALLENGE

4. Senator PERDUE. Mr. Roberts, earlier this year I had the honor to tour and meet with the great work force of U.S. Department of Energy Pantex Plant just northeast of Amarillo, Texas which is our Nation's primary facility for the final assembly, dismantlement and maintenance of nuclear weapons.

According to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report released this week, they "estimate it will cost at least \$1.2 trillion between 2017 and 2046 to introduce the mix of nuclear-armed submarines, bombers and missiles that are now under construction."

Nuclear labs are potentially facing a hiring challenge due to over half of their workforce being retirement eligible, 42 percent will be retirement eligible in 5 years specifically at Pantex. How do you plan to mitigate these challenges?

Mr. ROBERTS. The U.S. nuclear weapon research, development, and production complex, of which the Pantex Plant is a key component, reports to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which is part of the Department of Energy. The entire U.S. nuclear enterprise, including the DOD, NNSA, and their contractors, is facing the challenge of hiring the next generation of workers as the current workforce that sustained the United States, through the Cold War reach the end of their careers. The nuclear enterprise has been vigorously hiring the workforce for the 21st century and, if confirmed, I am dedicated to working with the NNSA, national laboratories, and production plants to continue to recruit and, more importantly, retain a talented workforce.

5. Senator PERDUE. Mr. Roberts, I understand it is crucial to our Nation's security to modernize our nuclear triad, but how do we find the balance of modernizing over the next 30 years while also having a plan to incentivize bright young Americans to pursue careers in the nuclear labs?

Mr. ROBERTS. The best and brightest young Americans are attracted by challenging and important work, and the sustainment and modernization of the U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent are among the most challenging and important in the nation. Each of our national nuclear laboratories faces unique challenges in the recruitment and retention of their work force, and will require aggressive, effective engagement by senior leadership. If confirmed, I will work closely with the national laboratories and the NNSA leadership to help recruit and retain the best and brightest to develop our next generation of nuclear forces.

6. Senator PERDUE. Mr. Roberts, what will you do to recruit and retain the most qualified professionals that are needed for such a technical and complex department?

Mr. ROBERTS. If confirmed, I will work with our national laboratories and the NNSA to reach out actively to our high schools and universities to promote science, technology, engineering and mathematics education. In addition, I will make sure we take advantage of the Department's hiring authorities to recruit the best and the brightest from around the country to revitalize our nuclear enterprise.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR CLAIRE McCASKILL

INTERAGENCY CBRNE TRAINING AT ARMY TRAINING FACILITIES

7. Senator McCASKILL. Mr. Roberts, during your testimony, you each acknowledged that the chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosives (CBRNE) threat posed by North Korea presents a serious concern to our national security, and that we are ill prepared to respond to a CBRNE attack or operate in a CBRNE environment. Would you agree that, given the nature of chemical and biological weapons, the threat posed by a CBRNE at home is just as dangerous as that posed to our forces overseas?

Mr. ROBERTS. I agree that a CBRNE attack is a dangerous threat to our national security, regardless whether it occurs overseas or at home.

8. Senator McCASKILL. Mr. Roberts, do I have your commitment to ensuring the coordination and collaboration between DOD, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) referenced in your advance policy questions will extend to the tactical level, where civilian first responders to a CBRNE event will be working shoulder to shoulder with military personnel?

Mr. ROBERTS. You have my commitment that, if confirmed, I will continue to collaborate and coordinate with DHS and HHS to avoid duplication of effort and develop and deliver capabilities that will enable our military and first responders to respond more effectively to a CBRNE event.

9. Senator McCASKILL. Mr. Roberts, will you commit to ensuring the military is properly resourced to provide the proper level of CBRNE response to ensure DOD is capable of effectively working with interagency partners?

Mr. ROBERTS. If confirmed, I do commit to ensuring that the military is properly resourced to respond effectively to a CBRNE event and that DOD is capable of working with interagency partners.

10. Senator McCASKILL. Mr. Roberts, what steps are necessary to ensure DOD and the Federal Government are capable of rapidly and effectively responding to a CBRNE event in the Homeland?

Mr. ROBERTS. DOD's CBRNE response enterprise is already organized and equipped to provide an effective and rapid response to a CBRNE event in the Homeland. In my view, DOD must, however, continue to ensure that it is properly resourced and maintain the effective training and response relationships with the other Federal, State, and local government organizations that have CBRNE responsibilities in the Homeland.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

11. Senator GILLIBRAND. Mr. Roberts, President Trump recently refused to certify that Iran is in compliance with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and called it "one of the worst and most one-sided transactions the United States has ever entered into". Nevertheless, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has stated repeatedly that Iran has been in regular compliance, and our allies have questioned our credibility in adhering to the agreements we've signed. As the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense on the formulation of nuclear defense policy, would you say the Iran nuclear deal—the JCPOA—increased or decreased the threat posed by Iran's nuclear capabilities?

Mr. ROBERTS. The JCPOA has the potential to decrease the threat posed by Iran's nuclear capabilities because it limits the production of weapons-usable nuclear material. If the compliance by Iran can be certified and verified appropriately, it could

delay the possibility of Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon. I am, however, troubled by perceived inadequacies of the verification provisions in the JCPOA. If confirmed, I will work closely with my colleagues in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the interagency, and with the monitoring organizations to understand fully the effectiveness of the JCPOA verification regimes and provide my best advice on the extent of Iranian compliance with the agreement.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

NATIONAL URBAN SECURITY AND TECHNOLOGIES LABORATORY

12. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Roberts, in your advance policy questions you state that coordination and collaboration with other Federal agencies “is not only critical to protecting the Homeland, but also to protecting the warfighter.” Do you agree that at a time of increasing instability, we must ensure first responders have the training, tools, and technologies needed to protect from nuclear, chemical, and biological attacks?

Mr. ROBERTS. I agree that we must ensure first responders have the training, tools, and technologies needed to protect against and recover from nuclear, chemical, or biological attacks.

13. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Roberts, if confirmed, you will be responsible for deterring nuclear, biological, and chemical attacks both at home and abroad. Do you agree that the National Urban Security and Technologies Laboratory (NUSTL) develops innovative training and technology for first responders to use in the instance of a nuclear or radiological attack on the Homeland and is a critical resource for your operations?

Mr. ROBERTS. I agree that first responders must have the necessary training and technological support to respond effectively to nuclear or radiological attacks. While I am not familiar with the work of this specific laboratory, if confirmed, I will ensure that DOD continues to work with DHS and its capabilities, like the NUSTL, to continue to deliver the training and technological support that our first responders require.

14. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Roberts, will you commit to working with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ensure critical programs for first responders, like NUSTL, are not only continued but fully supported?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am committed that, if confirmed, that I would continue DOD’s work with DHS to ensure our first responders receive the critical support they require from DHS’s laboratories, like the NUSTL.

SYRIA’S CHEMICAL WEAPONS

15. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Roberts, the UN Security Council has until November 16 to pass a resolution extending the Joint Investigative Mechanism’s mandate. Do you support its continuance to investigate chemical attacks in Syria?

Mr. ROBERTS. I support the continuance of the Joint Investigative Mechanism’s mandate to investigate the chemical attacks in Syria.

16. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Roberts, if it’s not renewed, what is the risk to our special operators in country, our partners, and the innocent civilians?

Mr. ROBERTS. The Joint Investigative Mechanism provides an international mechanism to enforce the tenets of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). Its continued work reaffirms that the use of chemical attacks are a violation of international norms. Any actions that undermine enforcement of the CWC could increase the risk of future chemical attack against our forces, our partners, or innocent civilians.

17. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Mr. Roberts, do you agree we must do more to pressure Russia and Iran to end their support for Assad’s murderous regime?

Mr. ROBERTS. I agree that we must continue to work with the international community to prevent further casualties from chemical attacks in Syria in violation of international law. That work must include pressing key nations, particularly Russia and Iran, based on their influential relationships with the Assad regime, to support UN efforts to resolve the country’s conflict and dictate the terms of any settlement.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MAZIE K. HIRONO

RESEARCH FOR DEFENDING AGAINST BIOLOGICAL ATTACKS

18. Senator HIRONO. Mr. Roberts, botulinum toxin is one of the most toxic poisons known. Botulinum toxin gained public attention after a vial of the bacteria was found by investigators in Iraq after the ouster of Saddam Hussein. The bacteria are easy to grow, and the toxin is relatively easy to produce in large quantities. This makes it a prime candidate for the bioterrorist's arsenal. The Department currently funds research to develop antitoxin drugs to counter the effects of the Botulinum toxin. Can you discuss the importance of these types of research programs as they impact the safety and security of our military and civilians and if confirmed, will you look into and provide me an update on the current state of the research and development of the antitoxins for Botulinum?

Mr. ROBERTS. Medical countermeasures for biological warfare agents, such as Botulinum toxin, are a key component of the DOD's integrated and layered defense against chemical, biological, and radiological hazards. If confirmed, I will review our research and development of antitoxins for Botulinum and provide you an update on the current state of that work.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MARTIN HEINRICH

PLUTONIUM SUSTAINMENT

19. Senator HEINRICH. Mr. Roberts, Los Alamos Lab has long been the Nation's designated center of excellence for plutonium research and is the only facility in the country capable of meeting the military's cost-and-schedule requirements for pit production. As we discussed when we met in my office, in response to section 3114 of the Fiscal Year 2013 NDAA, the Nuclear Weapons Council sent a letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee in July 2014 committing the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to begin the process of designing and building modular buildings [for pit production] at Los Alamos. If you are confirmed and the NNSA were to propose a deviation from the strategy the Nuclear Weapons Council endorsed in July 2014, can I have your commitment to recommend to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (AT&L) that the Pentagon's independent Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) office conduct an independent analysis of the assumptions and conclusions of the proposed alternative?

Mr. ROBERTS. A significant amount of work has already been done in exploring the ability to meet the military requirements for plutonium pit production. I understand that the Nuclear Weapons Council endorsed a strategy in 2014. The delays that have occurred subsequently are, as we discussed, concerning. If confirmed, I will seek to understand the changes in the program that have occurred since that time and will work closely with the Nuclear Weapons Council to ensure that there is a full, detailed, and independent analysis conducted by the appropriate body of all the assumptions and conclusion of the alternatives presented to the Nuclear Weapons Council.

[The nomination reference of Mr. Guy B. Roberts follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

AS IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 19, 2017.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Guy B. Roberts, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Andrew Charles Weber.

[The biographical sketch of Mr. Guy B. Roberts, which was transmitted to the Committee at the time the nomination was referred, follows:]

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF GUY B. ROBERTS

Education:

- Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island
 - 1994 to 1995
 - M.A. National Security and Strategic Studies, (with highest distinction).
- Georgetown University School of Law, Washington, DC
 - 1983 to 1985
 - LL.M International and Comparative Law.
- University of Southern California (London, England Program)
 - 1981-83
 - M.A. International Relations (with distinction)
- University of Denver, Denver, Colorado
 - 1972-75
 - Juris Doctor Law Degree
- Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona
 - 1968-72
 - B.A. Political Science (Magna cum laude)

Employment Record:

- United States Marine Corp.
 - Held a wide range of assignments in policy formulation, operations support, negotiations, management, litigation and policy/legal advisor before retiring with the rank of Colonel. Positions and responsibilities during this 25-year span included:
 - Legal counsel to four-star combatant commander (U.S. Southern Command)
 - Staff Judge Advocate to Commanding General, Second Marine Division
 - Joint Staff Action Officer responsible for arms control/nonproliferation issues
 - Staff Attorney, Headquarters, Marine Corps
 - Staff Judge Advocate to Commanding General, 9th Marine Brigade
 - Staff Attorney, Administrative Law, Navy Judge Advocate General
 - Staff Attorney, Naval Legal Service Office, London, England
 - Prosecutor and Defense Attorney, Camp Pendleton, California
 - Platoon and Company Commander, Camp Pendleton, California
 - November 1975 to January 2000
- Office of General Counsel, Department of the Navy
 - Associate Counsel (Arms Control/Non-proliferation)
 - January 2000 to May 2003
- Office of the Secretary of Defense for Policy, the Pentagon
 - Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense/Principal Director for Negotiations Policy
 - June 2003 to July 2005
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium
 - Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Weapons of Mass Destruction Policy and Director, Nuclear Policy
 - July 2005 to August 2011
- GBR Consultancy, Ashland, VA (Sole Proprietorship)
 - CEO, Subject Matter Expert (SME) and Senior National Security Consultant
 - September 2011 to Present
- University of Mary Washington and Virginia Commonwealth University
 - Adjunct Professor/Lecturer on terrorism, arms control, non-proliferation, international law
 - September 2012 to Present
- Computer Science Corporation (CSRA)
 - SME, Consultant/Casual Employee
 - September 2012 to Present

Honors and Awards:

- Military Awards
 - Defense Superior Service Medal
 - Legion of Merit

- Defense Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster (in lieu of second award)
- Meritorious Service Medal with Gold Star (in lieu of second award)
- Joint Service Achievement Medal
- Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal
- National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Star
- Federal Civilian Awards:
 - Exceptional Public Service Award, Department of Defense
 - Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Certificate of Appreciation
 - Annual Department of Navy Performance Awards, 2000-2003
- Academic Awards:
 - Stephen B. Luce Award for Academic Achievement (First in Class), Naval War College
 - General Linhard Award for Outstanding Research, Institute of National Security Studies, Air Force Academy

[The Committee on Armed Services requires all individuals nominated from civilian life by the President to positions requiring the advice and consent of the Senate to complete a form that details the biographical, financial, and other information of the nominee. The form executed by Mr. Guy B. Roberts in connection with his nomination follows:]

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ROOM SR-228

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6050

(202) 224-3871

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FORM

BIOGRAPHICAL AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION REQUESTED OF
NOMINEES

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Complete all requested information. If more space is needed, use an additional sheet and cite the part of the form and the question number (i.e. A-9, B-4) to which the continuation of your answer applies.

PART A—BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE NOMINEE: Biographical information furnished in this part of the form will be made available in Committee offices for public inspection prior to the hearing and will also be published in any hearing record as well as made available to the public.

1. **Name:** (Include any former names used.)

Guy Bradley Roberts (Former last name “West” and nickname “Lucky”)

2. **Position to which nominated:**

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense

3. **Date of nomination:**

July 19, 2017

4. **Address:** (List current place of residence and office addresses.)

[The nominee responded and the information is contained in the Committee’s executive files.]

5. **Year and place of birth:**

1950, Greeley, Colorado

6. **Marital status:** (Include full name of current spouse including any other names used, including maiden name.)

Married to Helene Wilhelmina Roberts (Maiden Name: Ceelen)

7. Names of children (if over age 18):

Matthew William Roberts
Alexander Guy Roberts

8. Education: List names of secondary and higher. education institutions attended, type of school (vocational, technical, trade school, college, university, military college, correspondence, distance, extension, and online) dates attended, degree received and date degree granted.

- Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island
 - Military College
 - 1994-95
 - M.A. National Security and Strategic Studies, (with highest distinction).
- Georgetown University School of Law, Washington, D.C.
 - Law School
 - 1983-85
 - LLM International and Comparative Law.
- University of Southern California (London, England Program)
 - Graduate College
 - 1981-83
 - M.A. International Relations (with distinction)
- University of Denver, Denver, Colorado
 - Law School
 - 1972-75
 - Juris Doctor Law Degree
- Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona
 - Four Year College
 - 1968-72
 - B.A. Political Science (Magna cum laude)

9. Employment record: List all jobs held since college or in the last 10 years, whichever is less, including the title or description of job, name of employer, location of work, and dates of employment. If the employment activity was military duty, list separate employment activity periods to show each change of military duty station.

- July 2005 to August 2011
 - Title: Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Weapons of Mass Destruction Policy and Director, Nuclear Policy,
 - Name of Employer: Assistant Secretary General (Gabor Iklody), Emerging Security Challenges Division, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO),
 - Location of Work: NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium.
 - Key NATO official responsible for developing policy and implementing NATO's comprehensive policy on preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
- August 2011 to Present
 - GBR Consultancy, Ashland, VA (Sole Proprietorship)
 - CEO, Subject Matter Expert (SME) and Senior National Security Consultant
 - September 2011 to Present
 - University of Mary Washington and Virginia Commonwealth University
 - Adjunct Professor/Lecturer on terrorism, arms control, non-proliferation, international law
 - September 2012 to Present
 - Computer Science Corporation (CSRA)
 - SME, Consultant/Casual Employee
 - September 2012 to Present

10. Government experience: List any advisory, consultative, honorary or other part-time service or positions with Federal, State, or local governments, other than those listed above.

None

11. Business relationships: List all positions currently held as an officer, director, trustee, partner, proprietor, agent, representative, or consultant of any corporation, company, firm, partnership, or other business enterprise, educational or other institution.

The following firms I have served or have made myself available to serve as a subject matter expert, consultant on national security or military issues, and advisor on nonproliferation, arms control, terrorism topics:

1. Institute for Defense Analysis (Provided expert advice on NATO issues for a study on NATO force posture) (I have not provided paid consulting services to IDA in the last two years.)
2. CSRA Corporation (Previously known as CSC or Computer Science Corporation) (Employed as a subject matter expert for presentations and training in support of Defense Threat Reduction Agency programs)
3. Cubic Corporation (Available as a subject matter expert for various proposals/projects.) (I have not provided paid consulting services to Cubic in the last two years.)
4. CSIS (designated a Senior Associate) (Participated in various dialogues/studies) (I have not provided paid consulting service to CSIS in the last two years.)
5. TOK (Tree of Knowledge, Inc.) Corporation (advice on how to do business with Department of Defense) (I have not provide paid consulting services to TOK in the last two years.)
6. Key Solutions Inc. (provided subject matter expertise on statement of work for U.S. Government project) (I have not provided paid consulting services to Key Solutions in the last two years.)
7. CACI Corporation (available as a subject matter expert) (I have not provided paid consulting services to CACI in the last two years.)

I will sever my working relationships with these entities prior to assuming a position with the Administration in the Department of Defense.

12. **Memberships:** List all memberships and offices currently held in professional, fraternal, scholarly, civic, business, charitable and other organizations.

- Licensed to practice law in Colorado, California, Arizona, U.S. District Court (10th Circuit), and before the Court of Military Appeals and the United States Supreme Court.
- Member: Colorado, California, Arizona bar associations (now inactive);
- Member: International Society for Military Law and Law of War; Hague Academy of International Law; International Institute of Strategic Studies (Inactive).
- Senior Associate, Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Chapter Vice President/Member, Richmond Chapter of Military Officers Association of America.

13. **Political affiliations and activities:**

- (a) If you have ever been a candidate for or have been elected or appointed to a political office, list the name of the office(s), whether you were elected/appointed/candidate, the year(s) the election was held or the appointment was made, and the term of office (if applicable).

None. I have never been a candidate for a political office.

- (b) List all memberships and offices held in and services rendered to all political parties or election committees during the last 5 years.

None

- (c) Itemize all individual political contributions of \$100 or more to any individual, campaign organization, political party, political action committee, or similar entity for the past 5 years. List each individual contribution and not the total amount contributed to the person or entity during the year.

None

14. **Honors and Awards:** List all scholarships, fellowships, honorary degrees, civilian service citations, military awards and decorations, honorary society memberships, and any other special recognition for outstanding service or achievements.

- Stephen B. Luce Award for Academic Achievement, Naval War College
- Exceptional Public Service Award, Department of Defense
- Defense Superior Service Medal
- Legion of Merit
- Defense Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster (in lieu of second award)
- Meritorious Service Medal with Gold Star (in lieu of second award)
- Joint Service Achievement Medal
- Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal

- National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Star
- Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Certificate of Appreciation
- General Linhard Award for Outstanding Research, Institute of National Security Studies
- Department of Navy Performance Awards, 2000-2003.

15. **Published writings:** List the titles, publishers, and dates of books, articles, reports, or other published materials which you have written including articles published on the internet.

- "The New Rules of War: The Case Against Ratification of Additional Protocol I," 26 Virginia Journal of International Law, fall 1985.
- "Covert Operations for Intelligence Gathering in Combatting Terrorism: The Moral Dilemma," in Fighting Back (Livingstone and Arnold, eds. 1986).
- "Self-help in Combatting State-Sponsored Terrorism: Self-Defense and Peace-time Reprisals," 19 Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law 243 (Spring 1987).
- "Treaty Violations in Afghanistan," in Afghanistan--The Great Game Revisited (Klass ed. 1987).
- "Judaic Sources of the Laws of War," Navy JAG Journal, 1988.
- "Enforcing the CFE Treaty: Ensuring Compliance Before it's too Late," Strategic Review, fall 1990.
- Co-Editor, National Security Law Documents, Carolina Academic Press, 1995, 2002.
- "An Elegant Irrelevance: The ABM Treaty in the New World Disorder," Strategic Review, spring 1995.
- "Five Minutes Past Midnight: The Clear and Present Danger of Nuclear Weapons Grade Fissile Materials," Institute for National Security Studies Occasional Paper #8, February 1996.
- "Nuclear Weapons-Grade Fissile Materials: The Most Serious Threat to US National Security Today?" Airpower Journal, Special Edition 1996
- "Reality Check: NATO's Ambitious Response to the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction," Airpower Journal, fall 1997
- Co-author, "International Cooperation and NATO's Counterproliferation Policy," in Countering the Proliferation and Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction (Hays, Jodoin, Van Tassel eds. 1998).
- "Caribbean Drug Challenges: Operations and the U.S. Southern Command," in Oceans Policy: New Institutions, Challenges and Opportunities (Nordquist and Moore eds. 1999)
- "The Counterproliferation Self-Help Paradigm: A Legal Regime for Enforcing the Norm Prohibiting the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction," Denver Journal of International Law and Policy, summer 1999
- "This Arms Control Dog Won't Hunt: The Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty and the Conference on Disarmament," Institute for International Security Studies Occasional Paper #36, January 2001.
- Co-author, "Building Democracies with Southern Command's Legal Engagement Strategy," Parameters, 2001
- "Cooperative Security Measures," in Arms Control: Cooperative Security in a Changing Environment (Larsen, ed. 2002)
- "Arms Control Without Arms Control: The Failure of the Biological Weapons Convention Protocol and a new Paradigm for Fighting the Threat of Biological Weapons," Institute for International Security Studies Occasional Paper #49, March 2003.
- "The UN Charter Paradigm on the Brink: The Legal and Policy Predicates for Use of Force Against Iraq," 42 Military Law and the Law of War Review 443, 2003.
- "Beyond Arms Control: New Initiatives to Meet New Threats," in Arms Control and Cooperative Security (Larsen and Wirtz, eds. 2009).
- "Hostis Humani Generis: The Threat of WMD Terrorism and How NATO is Facing the Ultimate Threat," Defence Against Terrorism Review, Vol. 2, No. 1, Spring 2009.
- "Effectiveness of Enforcement of Reduction Agreements: NATO's Role," Implications of Nuclear Disarmament for Global Security, Studies and Comments

11, R. Huber, K. Lange, D. McDonald (eds.), Hanns Seidel Foundation, 2010, p. 51.

- “The Threat Posed by Biological Terrorism,” Global Terrorism and International Cooperation Symposium Proceedings, 15-16 March 2010, Centre of Excellence Defence Against Terrorism, p. 113.
- “NATO and Preventing the Proliferation of WMDs,” Partnership for Peace Review, Vol. 2. No. 1, Spring 2011, p. 1
- “Role of Nuclear Weapons in NATO’s Deterrence and Defense Posture Review: Prospects for Change,” in Tactical Nuclear Weapons and NATO (Nichols, Stuart, McCausland, eds. 2012) p. 375.
- Co-editor, National Security Law and Policy, 3rd Edition, Caroline Academic Press, 2015.
- “Legal Options to WMD Disposition in a Conflicting Law and Policy Environment,” in Expanding Cooperative Threat Reduction in the Middle East and North Africa (Orde Kittrie, Arizona State University Press, August 2016) p. 109. Available at: <https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/#inbox/156b8e3b126bfc69?projector=1>.
- “America Must be Ready to Nuke First,” in The National Interest, August 3, 2016, available at: <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/america-must-be-ready-nuke-first-17233>.

16. **Speeches:** Provide the Committee with two copies of any formal speeches you have delivered during the last 5 years of which you have copies and are on topics relevant to the position for which you have been nominated.

Over the last 6 years I have been a guest speaker and/or panelist at numerous conferences, symposiums and other events. I usually speak from notes I prepare beforehand and then speak extemporaneously using my notes to refresh my memory. I don’t have any copies of formal speeches. I also teach my classes at Mary Washington and VCU using notes. I have spoken often on nuclear deterrence, arms control and non-proliferation issues but have no copies of those specific speeches I made on those topics at those events.

17. Commitments regarding nomination, confirmation, and service:

(a) If confirmed, will you adhere to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

Yes

(b) Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

No

(c) If confirmed, will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

Yes

(d) Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to Congressional requests?

Yes

(e) Will you promise to enforce or ensure whistleblower protections for all those witnesses?

Yes

(f) Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this Committee?

Yes

(g) Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted Committee, or to consult with the Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Yes

[The nominee responded to Parts B–F of the Committee questionnaire. The text of the questionnaire is set forth in the Appendix to

this volume. The nominee's answers to Parts B–F are contained in the Committee's executive files.]

SIGNATURE AND DATE

I hereby state that I have read and signed the foregoing Statement on Biographical and Financial Information and that the information provided therein is, to the best of my knowledge, current, accurate, and complete.

GUY B. ROBERTS

This 25th day of July, 2017

[The nomination of Mr. Guy B. Roberts was reported to the Senate by Chairman McCain on November 7, 2017, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on November 16, 2017.]

