

**H.R. 1735—FY16 NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION BILL**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING
THREATS AND CAPABILITIES**

SUMMARY OF BILL LANGUAGE.....	1
BILL LANGUAGE.....	13
DIRECTIVE REPORT LANGUAGE	64

SUMMARY OF BILL LANGUAGE

Table Of Contents

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE-WIDE, JOINT, AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 142—Strategy for Replacement of A/MH-6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird Aircraft to Meet Special Operations Requirements

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Extension of Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program

Section 212—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medical Countermeasures Program

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 221—Expansion of Education Partnerships to Support Technology Transfer and Transition

Section 222—Strategies for Engagement with Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions of Higher Education

Section 223—Plan for Advanced Weapons Technology War Games

Section 225—Briefing on Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION AND MILITARY FAMILY

READINESS MATTERS

Section 572—Extension of Authority to Conduct Family Support Programs for Immediate Family Members of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Special Operations Forces

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 848—Streamlining of Requirements Relating to Defense Business Systems

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Permanent Authority to Provide Rewards through Government Personnel of Allied Forces and Certain Other Modifications to Department of Defense Program to Provide Rewards

Section 1033—Repeal of Semiannual Reports on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for Combating Terrorism Program

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1054—Information-Related and Strategic Communications Capabilities Engagement Pilot Program

SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1082—Executive Agent for the Oversight and Management of Alternative Compensatory Control Measures

Section 1086—Department of Defense Strategy for Countering Unconventional Warfare

Section 1088—Congressional Notification and Briefing Requirement on Ordered Evacuations of United States Embassies and Consulates Involving the Use of United States Armed Forces

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1261—Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

Section 1263—Permanent Authority for NATO Special Operations Headquarters

Section 1264—Extension of Authorization to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction

Section 1266—Modification of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Extension of Date for Completion of Destruction of Existing Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Section 1621—Executive Agent for Open-Source Intelligence Tools

Section 1622—Waiver and Congressional Notification Requirements Related to Facilities for Intelligence Collection or for Special Operations Abroad

Section 1626—Clarification of Annual Briefing on the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Requirements of the Combatant Commands

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE-WIDE, JOINT, AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 142—Strategy for Replacement of A/MH-6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird Aircraft to Meet Special Operations Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for the replacement of the A/MH-6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird aircraft to meet requirements particular to special operations for future rotary-wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Extension of Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program

This section would amend section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by extending the authorization for the Department of Defense to execute activities for the Rapid Innovation Program through 2020.

Section 212—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medical Countermeasures Program

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of 50 percent of the funds made available for the Department of Defense Medical Countermeasures program within the Chemical-Biological Defense Program until the Secretary of Defense provides a report to the congressional defense committees that validates the requirements and conducts an independent cost-benefit analysis to justify funding and efficiencies. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a review of the certification to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits his report.

The committee is concerned that the Advanced Manufacturing and Development (ADM) program within the Medical Countermeasures Program has experienced a program delay of 16 months and an increase in cost of more than \$52.0 million. The committee expects the Department of Defense to conduct this review and assessment of the ADM program in order to determine the future of the

program, and whether continuing it in a fiscally constrained environment is in the best interests of the Department of Defense and the U.S. Government.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 221—Expansion of Education Partnerships to Support Technology Transfer and Transition

This section would modify the authority for education partnerships in section 2194 of title 10, United States Code, by allowing institutions that support technology transition or transfer activities, such as business schools or law schools with technology management programs, to participate.

The committee is aware that the current statute authorizing educational partnership agreements (EPA) limits the educational institutions that can participate to “local educational agency, colleges, universities, and any other nonprofit institutions that are dedicated to improving science, mathematics, and engineering education.” Historically, law schools and business schools that might have technology-focused concentration areas have been deemed ineligible to participate. By permitting defense laboratories to form an EPA with a business school, it would allow the laboratories to work with students who can examine technology for its commercial potential, provide for early market assessments, and evaluate market strengths and weaknesses. Likewise, by allowing law schools to participate in an EPA, the laboratory could work with law students on patent assessments and legal issues involving technology transfer. The committee also believes that these kinds of arrangements would create opportunities for business students to enhance their skills related to commercializing technology using real-world inventions, helping to ensure a future workforce skilled in entrepreneurship and the creation of high-tech companies. Law students would gain experience related to intellectual property development and protection that would also be valuable in business development.

Section 222—Strategies for Engagement with Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions of Higher Education

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to each develop a strategy for engagement with and support of the development of scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities with historically black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions, and to submit such strategies to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy that encompasses the strategies developed by the military departments and to submit this strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 223—Plan for Advanced Weapons Technology War Games

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a plan for integrating advanced technologies, such as directed energy weapons, hypersonic strike systems, and autonomous systems, into broader title 10 war games to improve socialization with the warfighter and the development and experimentation of various concepts for employment by the Armed Forces. The Secretary would be required to submit the plan to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee believes that there are a number of emerging advanced weapons systems, like directed energy, electromagnetic railguns, hypersonics, and autonomous systems, that have the potential for dramatically enhancing the military effectiveness of U.S. forces. The committee has been concerned in the past with the transition of some of these science and technology concepts into fielded systems, and recognizes that there are a number of factors that can inhibit this transition. The committee believes that a significant factor is the lack of experimentation, concept development and war gaming that can be helpful in ironing out the technology, refining operating concepts and gaining warfighter trust and confidence in untested systems. The committee is aware of numerous historical examples in which experimentation with new technologies in peacetime have paved the way for their adoption and effective use in wartime. The committee believes that increasing integration of these new, advanced technology weapons systems into existing exercises, either as tangible prototypes or as conceptual excursions, could be valuable in promoting the experimentation needed to lay the foundation for successful technology adoption by the warfighting community.

Section 225—Briefing on Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program

This section would require a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the U.S. Special Operations Command Shallow Water Combat Submersible prior to program acceptance of the first article delivery on the account of schedule delays and a reduction of final basis of issue from 14 to 10 platforms.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION AND MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Section 572—Extension of Authority to Conduct Family Support Programs for Immediate Family Members of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Special Operations Forces

This section would extend the family support program authority provided for immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces assigned to Special Operations Forces in section 554 of the the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) by 2 years, from 2016 to 2018.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 848—Streamlining of Requirements Relating to Defense Business Systems

This section would revise section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify responsibilities for the management of defense business systems. As a result, this section would repeal the current reporting requirement contained in section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, and insert a new annual reporting requirement through the year 2020 on the revised requirements of section 2222.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Permanent Authority to Provide Rewards through Government Personnel of Allied Forces and Certain Other Modifications to Department of Defense Program to Provide Rewards

This section would modify section 127b of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to make rewards to a person providing information or non-lethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against terrorism, or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation. The committee notes that this program has successfully contributed to U.S. counterterrorism objectives at the tactical, strategic, and national level. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to review and consider how this authority could also be used for transnational criminal organizations and activities that hold a terrorism nexus.

Section 1033—Repeal of Semiannual Reports on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for Combating Terrorism Program

This section would modify and streamline reporting requirements for budget information related to program for combating terrorism as required by section 229 of title 10, United States Code. This section would specifically eliminate subsection (d) of section 229, regarding semiannual reports on obligations and expenditures.

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1054—Information-Related and Strategic Communications Capabilities Engagement Pilot Program

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program to assess information-related and strategic communications capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the various combatant commanders, including urgent and emergent operational needs, and the operational and theater security cooperation plans of the Geographic and Functional Combatant Commanders.

The committee is concerned that the U.S. Government is losing the battle to operationalize information, which can shape the information environment and support its operational goals. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and Al Qaeda are using radical jihadist narratives to shape the battlefield, drive recruitment and support, and inspire imitators outside their main area of control. In the case of ISIL, it is able to use the narratives in ways that reinforce its battlefield successes.

In addition, the Russian Federation has reinvigorated its uses of narratives to create uncertainty, providing cover for its activities and helping to shape the battlefield. It deploys similar narratives to mobilize support in society at home and, where possible, in the local population of other countries.

The committee does not believe that the U.S. Government, including the Department of Defense, is effectively coordinating its efforts in ways that can fundamentally root out and eliminate the narratives that drive these movements. The committee believes that the lack of an overall strategy to support unity of effort is a major deficit to the U.S. Government's actions. The inability to be proactive in our information engagement, or to be responsive enough from a defensive perspective to operate on the timescales of our adversaries, are also flaws in how the Department of Defense and the U.S. Government approach this problem.

The committee believes that providing the authority for the Department to carry out the pilot program established in this section would provide the flexibility needed to try out different approaches, tailored to the operating environment and circumstances, to see more broadly which approaches work and which do not. The committee also believes that there is an important technology component that has not been well-utilized in the past, which will help the military sense, respond and plan for operations in the information environment in ways that traditional approaches do not provide.

SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1082—Executive Agent for the Oversight and Management of Alternative Compensatory Control Measures

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent for the oversight and management of alternative compensatory control measures. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the close of each of the fiscal years 2016 through 2020, on the oversight and management of alternative compensatory control measures.

Section 1086—Department of Defense Strategy for Countering Unconventional Warfare

This section would required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the President and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a strategy for the Department of Defense to counter unconventional warfare threats posed by adversarial state and non-state actors. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit the strategy to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee is concerned about the growing unconventional warfare capabilities and threats being posed most notably and recently by the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee notes that unconventional warfare is defined most accurately as those activities conducted to enable a resistance movement or insurgency to coerce, disrupt, or overthrow a government or occupying power by operating through or with an underground, auxiliary, or guerrilla force in a denied area. The committee also notes that most state-sponsors of unconventional warfare, such as Russia and Iran, have doctrinally linked conventional warfare, economic warfare, cyber warfare, information operations, intelligence operations, and other activities seamlessly in an effort to undermine U.S. national security objectives and the objectives of U.S. allies alike.

Section 1088—Congressional Notification and Briefing Requirement on Ordered Evacuations of United States Embassies and Consulates Involving the Use of United States Armed Forces

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to provide joint notification to the appropriate congressional committees as soon as practicable after the initiation of an evacuation operation of a U.S. embassy or consulate involving the use of U.S. Armed Forces. It would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to provide a joint briefing to the appropriate congressional committees within 15 days of an evacuation operation of a U.S. embassy or consulate involving the use of the Armed Forces.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1261—Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would authorize a 1-year extension to the Department of Defense to continue to develop, manage, and execute a Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery personnel recovery program for isolated Department of Defense, U.S. Government, and other designated personnel supporting U.S. national interests worldwide. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$25.0 million in funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance for such recovery program through fiscal year 2017.

Section 1263—Permanent Authority for NATO Special Operations Headquarters

This section would make permanent the authority for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Headquarters, as first authorized in section 1244(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84).

Section 1264—Extension of Authorization to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction

This section would extend the authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction from section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) from 2017 to 2020.

Section 1266—Modification of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would modify the reporting requirement within section 1208(f)(1) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), as most recently amended by section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84), from annual to biannual, and raise the authorized amount to \$100.0 million. Given the increased focus on this authority and additional authorization amount of \$100.0 million, the committee believes biannual reporting is required to ensure robust congressional oversight of this important authority.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Extension of Date for Completion of Destruction of Existing Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions

This section would modify section 1412(b)(3) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145) by extending the stockpile elimination deadline from December 31, 2017, to December 31, 2023.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Section 1621—Executive Agent for Open-Source Intelligence Tools

This section would amend chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official of the Department of Defense to act as an executive agent for open source intelligence tools.

Section 1622—Waiver and Congressional Notification Requirements Related to Facilities for Intelligence Collection or for Special Operations Abroad

This section would modify section 2682 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the requirement to accomplish maintenance and repair of a real property facility for an activity or agency of the Department of Defense (other than a military department) by or through a military department designated by the Secretary of Defense. Section 2682(c) provides the Secretary of Defense with the authority to waive this requirement if necessary to provide security for authorized intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad undertaken by the Department of Defense. This section would modify the waiver requirement to include a notification requirement for the Secretary of Defense to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees when waiver authority is used and to sunset the waiver authority on December 31, 2017.

Section 1626—Clarification of Annual Briefing on the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Requirements of the Combatant Commands

This section would modify section 1626 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) to include U.S. Special Operations Command within the annual briefing requirement by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

BILL LANGUAGE

1 **SEC. 142.[Log 60357] STRATEGY FOR REPLACEMENT OF A/**
2 **MH-6 MISSION ENHANCED LITTLE BIRD AIR-**
3 **CRAFT TO MEET SPECIAL OPERATIONS RE-**
4 **QUIREMENTS.**

5 (a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 90 days after the
6 date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense
7 shall submit to the congressional defense committees a
8 strategy for replacing A/MH–6 Mission Enhanced Little
9 Bird aircraft to meet the rotary-wing, light attack, recon-
10 naissance requirements particular to special operations.

11 (b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy under subsection (a)
12 shall include the following:

13 (1) An updated schedule and display of pro-
14 grammed A/MH–6 Block 3.0 modernization and up-
15 grades, showing usable life of the fleet, and the an-
16 ticipated service life extensions of all A/MH–6 plat-
17 forms.

18 (2) A description of current and future rotary-
19 wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements and
20 platforms particular to special operations, including
21 key performance parameters of future platforms.

22 (3) The feasibility of military department-com-
23 mon platforms satisfying future rotary-wing, light
24 attack, reconnaissance requirements particular to
25 special operations.

1 (4) The feasibility of commercially available
2 platforms satisfying future rotary-wing, light attack,
3 reconnaissance requirements particular to special op-
4 erations.

5 (5) The anticipated funding requirements for
6 the special operation forces major force program for
7 the development and procurement of an A/MH-6 re-
8 placement platform if military department-common
9 platforms described in paragraph (3) are not avail-
10 able or if commercially available platforms described
11 in paragraph (4) are leveraged.

12 (6) Any other matters the Secretary considers
13 appropriate.

1 **Subtitle B—Program Require-**
2 **ments, Restrictions, and Limita-**
3 **tions**

4 **SEC. 211.[Log 59993] EXTENSION OF DEFENSE RESEARCH**
5 **AND DEVELOPMENT RAPID INNOVATION**
6 **PROGRAM.**

7 Subsection (d) of section 1073 of the Ike Skeleton
8 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011
9 (10 U.S.C. 2359 note) is amended by striking “through
10 2015” and inserting “through 2020”.

1 **SEC. 212.[Log 59845] LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF**
2 **FUNDS FOR MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES**
3 **PROGRAM.**

4 (a) **LIMITATION.**—Of the funds authorized to be ap-
5 propriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fis-
6 cal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evalua-
7 tion, Defense-wide, for advanced development and manu-
8 facturing activities under the medical countermeasure pro-
9 gram, not more than 50 percent may be obligated or ex-
10 pended until 45 days after the date on which the Secretary
11 of Defense submits to the congressional defense commit-
12 tees the report under subsection (b).

13 (b) **REPORT.**—The Secretary shall submit to the con-
14 gressional defense committees a report on the advanced
15 development and manufacturing activities under the med-
16 ical countermeasure program that includes the following:

17 (1) An overall description of the program, in-
18 cluding validated Department of Defense require-
19 ments.

20 (2) Program goals, proposed metrics of per-
21 formance, and anticipated procurement and oper-
22 ations and maintenance costs during the period cov-
23 ered by the current future years defense program
24 under section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

25 (3) The results of any analysis of alternatives
26 and efficiency reviews conducted by the Secretary

1 that justifies the manufacturing and privately fi-
2 nanced construction of an advanced manufacturing
3 and development facility rather than using other
4 programs and facilities of the Federal Government
5 or industry facilities for advanced development and
6 manufacturing of medical countermeasures.

7 (4) An independent cost-benefit analysis that
8 justifies the manufacturing and privately financed
9 construction of an advanced manufacturing and de-
10 velopment facility described in paragraph (3).

11 (5) If no independent cost-benefit analysis
12 makes the justification described in paragraph (4),
13 an explanation for why such manufacturing and pri-
14 vately financed construction cannot be so justified.

15 (6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense
16 determines appropriate.

17 (c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later
18 than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary sub-
19 mits the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller Gen-
20 eral of the United States shall submit to the congressional
21 defense committees a review of such report.

1 **Subtitle C—Other Matters**

2 **SEC. 221.[Log 60719] EXPANSION OF EDUCATION PARTNER-**
3 **SHIPS TO SUPPORT TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER**
4 **AND TRANSITION.**

5 Section 2194(a) of title 10, United States Code, is
6 amended by inserting after “mathematics,” the following:
7 “technology transfer or transition,”.

1 **SEC. 222.[Log 59829] STRATEGIES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH**
2 **HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNI-**
3 **VERSITIES AND MINORITY-SERVING INSTITU-**
4 **TIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

5 (a) **MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.**—

6 (1) **STRATEGY.**—The Secretaries of the military
7 departments shall each develop a strategy for how to
8 engage with and support the development of sci-
9 entific, technical, engineering, and mathematics ca-
10 pabilities of covered educational institutions in car-
11 rying out section 2362 of title 10, United States
12 Code.

13 (2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each strategy under para-
14 graph (1) shall include the following:

15 (A) Goals and vision for maintaining a
16 credible and sustainable program relating to the
17 engagement and support under the strategy.

18 (B) Metrics to enhance scientific, technical,
19 engineering, and mathematics capabilities at
20 covered educational institutions, including with
21 respect to measuring progress towards increas-
22 ing the success of such institutions to compete
23 for broader research funding sources other than
24 set-aside funds.

1 (C) Promotion of mentoring opportunities
2 between covered educational institutions and
3 other research institutions.

4 (D) Regular assessment of activities that
5 are used to develop, maintain, and grow sci-
6 entific, technical, engineering, and mathematics
7 capabilities.

8 (E) Inclusion of faculty of covered edu-
9 cational institutions into program reviews, peer
10 reviews, and other similar activities.

11 (F) Targeting of undergraduate, graduate,
12 and postgraduate students at covered edu-
13 cational institutions for inclusion into research
14 or internship opportunities within the military
15 department.

16 (b) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary of
17 Defense shall develop and implement a strategy for how
18 to engage with and support the development of scientific,
19 technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities of
20 covered educational institutions pursuant to the strategies
21 developed under subsection (a).

22 (c) SUBMISSION.—

23 (1) MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—Not later than
24 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,
25 the Secretaries of the military departments shall

1 each submit to the congressional defense committees
2 the strategy developed by the Secretary under sub-
3 section (a)(1).

4 (2) OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.—Not later
5 than one year after the date of the enactment of this
6 Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the
7 congressional defense committees the strategy devel-
8 oped under subsection (b).

9 (d) COVERED INSTITUTION DEFINED.—In this sec-
10 tion, the term “covered educational institution” has the
11 meaning given that term in section 2362(e) of title 10,
12 United States Code.

1 **SEC. 223.[Log 59833] PLAN FOR ADVANCED WEAPONS TECH-**
2 **NOLOGY WAR GAMES.**

3 (a) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense, in
4 coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of
5 Staff, shall develop a plan for integrating advanced weap-
6 ons technologies into exercises carried out individually and
7 jointly by the military departments to improve the develop-
8 ment and experimentation of various concepts for employ-
9 ment by the Armed Forces.

10 (b) **ELEMENTS.**—The plan under subsection (a) shall
11 include the following:

12 (1) Identification of specific exercises to be car-
13 ried out individually or jointly by the military de-
14 partments under the plan.

15 (2) Identification of emerging advanced weap-
16 ons technologies based on joint and individual rec-
17 ommendations of the military departments, including
18 with respect to directed-energy weapons, hypersonic
19 strike systems, autonomous systems, or other tech-
20 nologies as determined by the Secretary.

21 (3) A schedule for integrating either prototype
22 capabilities or table-top exercises into relevant exer-
23 cises.

24 (4) A method for capturing lessons learned and
25 providing feedback both to the developers of the ad-

1 vanced weapons technology and the military depart-
2 ments.

3 (c) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 180 days after the
4 date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall sub-
5 mit to the congressional defense committees the plan
6 under subsection (a).

1 **SEC. 225.[Log 60354] BRIEFING ON SHALLOW WATER COM-**
2 **BAT SUBMERSIBLE PROGRAM.**

3 (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the first article de-
4 livery date of the shallow water combat submersible pro-
5 gram of the United States Special Operations Command,
6 the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional
7 defense committees a briefing on such program.

8 (b) ELEMENTS.—The briefing required under sub-
9 section (a) shall include the following elements:

10 (1) An updated acquisition strategy, schedule,
11 and costs for the shallow water combat submersible
12 program.

13 (2) Major milestones for the program during
14 the period beginning with the delivery of additional
15 articles and ending on the full operational capability
16 date.

17 (3) Performance of contractors and subcontractors
18 under the program.

19 (4) Integration with dry deck shelter and other
20 diving technologies.

21 (5) Any other element the Secretary or the
22 Commander of the United States Special Operations
23 Command determine appropriate.

1 **SEC. 572 [Log 59847]. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CON-**
2 **DUCT FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR IM-**
3 **MEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS OF MEMBERS OF**
4 **THE ARMED FORCES ASSIGNED TO SPECIAL**
5 **OPERATIONS FORCES.**

6 Section 554(f) of the National Defense Authorization
7 Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 10 U.S.C.
8 1785 note) is amended by striking “2016” and inserting
9 “2018”.

1 **SEC. 848 [Log 57909]. STREAMLINING OF REQUIREMENTS**
2 **RELATING TO DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.**

3 (a) IN GENERAL.—

4 (1) REVISION.—Section 2222 of title 10,
5 United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

6 “§ 2222. **Defense business systems: business process**
7 **reengineering; enterprise architecture;**
8 **management**

9 “(a) DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS GENERALLY.—
10 The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each covered
11 defense business system developed, deployed, and operated
12 by the Department of Defense—

13 “(1) supports efficient business processes that
14 have been reviewed, and as appropriate revised,
15 through business process reengineering;

16 “(2) is integrated into a comprehensive defense
17 business enterprise architecture; and

18 “(3) is managed in a manner that provides visi-
19 bility into, and traceability of, expenditures for the
20 system.

21 “(b) ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—

22 “(1) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE.—
23 The Secretary shall issue guidance to provide for the
24 coordination of, and decision making for, the plan-
25 ning, programming, and control of investments in
26 covered defense business systems.

1 “(2) SUPPORTING GUIDANCE.—The Secretary
2 shall direct the Deputy Chief Management Officer of
3 the Department of Defense, the Under Secretary of
4 Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics,
5 the Chief Information Officer, and the Chief Man-
6 agement Officer of each of the military departments
7 to issue and maintain supporting guidance, as ap-
8 propriate, for the guidance of the Secretary issued
9 under paragraph (1).

10 “(c) GUIDANCE ELEMENTS.—The guidance issued
11 under subsection (b)(1) shall include the following ele-
12 ments:

13 “(1) Policy to ensure that the business proc-
14 esses of the Department of Defense are continuously
15 reviewed and revised—

16 “(A) to implement the most streamlined
17 and efficient business processes practicable; and

18 “(B) to enable the use of commercial off-
19 the-shelf business systems with the fewest
20 changes necessary to accommodate require-
21 ments and interfaces that are unique to the De-
22 partment of Defense.

23 “(2) A process to establish requirements for
24 covered defense business systems.

1 “(3) Mechanisms for the planning and control
2 of investments in covered defense business systems,
3 including a process for the collection and review of
4 programming and budgeting information for covered
5 defense business systems.

6 “(4) Policy requiring the periodic review of cov-
7 ered defense business systems that have been fully
8 deployed, by portfolio, to ensure that investments in
9 such portfolios are appropriate.

10 “(d) DEFENSE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ARCHITEC-
11 TURE.—

12 “(1) BLUEPRINT.—The Secretary, working
13 through the Deputy Chief Management Officer of
14 the Department of Defense, shall develop and main-
15 tain a blueprint to guide the development of inte-
16 grated business processes within the Department of
17 Defense. Such blueprint shall be known as the ‘de-
18 fense business enterprise architecture’.

19 “(2) PURPOSE.—The defense business enter-
20 prise architecture shall be sufficiently defined to ef-
21 fectively guide implementation of interoperable de-
22 fense business system solutions and shall be con-
23 sistent with the policies and procedures established
24 by the Director of the Office of Management and
25 Budget.

1 “(3) ELEMENTS.—The defense business enter-
2 prise architecture shall—

3 “(A) include policies, procedures, business
4 data standards, business performance measures,
5 and business information requirements that
6 apply uniformly throughout the Department of
7 Defense; and

8 “(B) enable the Department of Defense
9 to—

10 “(i) comply with all applicable law, in-
11 cluding Federal accounting, financial man-
12 agement, and reporting requirements;

13 “(ii) routinely produce verifiable,
14 timely, accurate, and reliable business and
15 financial information for management pur-
16 poses; and

17 “(iii) integrate budget, accounting,
18 and program information and systems.

19 “(4) INTEGRATION INTO INFORMATION TECH-
20 NOLOGY ARCHITECTURE.—(A) The defense business
21 enterprise architecture shall be integrated into the
22 information technology enterprise architecture re-
23 quired under subparagraph (B).

24 “(B) The Chief Information Officer of the De-
25 partment of Defense shall develop an information

1 technology enterprise architecture. The architecture
2 shall describe a plan for improving the information
3 technology and computing infrastructure of the De-
4 partment of Defense, including for each of the major
5 business processes conducted by the Department of
6 Defense.

7 “(e) DEFENSE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—

8 “(1) REQUIREMENT FOR COUNCIL.—The Sec-
9 retary shall establish a Defense Business Council to
10 provide advice to the Secretary on developing the de-
11 fense business enterprise architecture, reengineering
12 the Department’s business processes, and require-
13 ments for defense business systems. The Council
14 shall be chaired by the Deputy Chief Management
15 Officer and the Chief Information Officer of the De-
16 partment of Defense.

17 “(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the
18 Council shall include the following:

19 “(A) The Chief Management Officers of
20 the military departments, or their designees.

21 “(B) The following officials of the Depart-
22 ment of Defense, or their designees:

23 “(i) The Under Secretary of Defense
24 for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics

1 with respect to acquisition, logistics, and
2 installations management processes.

3 “(ii) The Under Secretary of Defense
4 (Comptroller) with respect to financial
5 management and planning and budgeting
6 processes.

7 “(iii) The Under Secretary of Defense
8 for Personnel and Readiness with respect
9 to human resources management proc-
10 esses.

11 “(f) APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR DEVELOPMENT.—

12 “(1) INITIAL APPROVAL REQUIRED.—The Sec-
13 retary shall ensure that a covered defense business
14 system program cannot proceed into development
15 (or, if no development is required, into production or
16 fielding) unless the appropriate approval official (as
17 specified in paragraph (2)) approves the program by
18 determining that the covered defense business sys-
19 tem concerned—

20 “(A) supports a business process that has
21 been, or is being as a result of the acquisition
22 program, reengineered to be as streamlined and
23 efficient as practicable consistent with the guid-
24 ance issued pursuant to subsection (b), includ-
25 ing business process mapping;

1 “(B) is in compliance with the defense
2 business enterprise architecture developed pur-
3 suant to subsection (d) or will be in compliance
4 as a result of modifications planned;

5 “(C) has valid, achievable requirements;
6 and

7 “(D) is in compliance with the Depart-
8 ment’s auditability requirements.

9 “(2) APPROPRIATE OFFICIAL.—For purposes of
10 paragraph (1), the appropriate approval official with
11 respect to a covered defense business system is the
12 following:

13 “(A) In the case of a system of a military
14 department, the Chief Management Officer of
15 that military department.

16 “(B) In the case of a system of a Defense
17 Agency or Defense Field Activity or a system
18 that will support the business process of more
19 than one military department or Defense Agen-
20 cy or Defense Field Activity, the Deputy Chief
21 Management Officer of the Department of De-
22 fense.

23 “(C) In the case of any system, such offi-
24 cial other than the applicable official under sub-

1 paragraph (A) or (B) as the Secretary des-
2 ignates for such purpose.

3 “(3) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—For any fiscal
4 year in which funds are expended for development
5 pursuant to a covered defense business system pro-
6 gram, the Defense Business Council shall review the
7 system and certify (or decline to certify as the case
8 may be) that it continues to satisfy the requirements
9 of paragraph (1). If the Council determines that cer-
10 tification cannot be granted, the chairman of the
11 Council shall notify the appropriate approval official
12 and the acquisition Milestone Decision Authority for
13 the program and provide a recommendation for cor-
14 rective action.

15 “(4) OBLIGATION OF FUNDS IN VIOLATION OF
16 REQUIREMENTS.—The obligation of Department of
17 Defense funds for a covered defense business system
18 program that has not been certified in accordance
19 with paragraph (3) is a violation of section
20 1341(a)(1)(A) of title 31.

21 “(g) RESPONSIBILITY OF MILESTONE DECISION AU-
22 THORITY.—The Secretary shall ensure that, as part of the
23 defense acquisition system, the requirements of this sec-
24 tion are fully addressed by the Milestone Decision Author-

1 ity for a covered defense business system program as ac-
2 quisition process approvals are considered for such system.

3 “(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than March 15 of
4 each year from 2016 through 2020, the Secretary shall
5 submit to the congressional defense committees a report
6 on activities of the Department of Defense pursuant to
7 this section. Each report shall include the following:

8 “(1) A description of actions taken and planned
9 with respect to the guidance required by subsection
10 (b) and the defense business enterprise architecture
11 developed pursuant to subsection (d).

12 “(2) A description of actions taken and planned
13 for the reengineering of business processes by the
14 Defense Business Council established pursuant to
15 subsection (e).

16 “(3) A summary of covered defense business
17 system funding and covered defense business sys-
18 tems approved pursuant to subsection (f).

19 “(4) Identification of any covered defense busi-
20 ness system program that during the preceding fis-
21 cal year was reviewed and not approved pursuant to
22 subsection (f) and the reasons for the lack of ap-
23 proval.

24 “(5) Identification of any covered defense busi-
25 ness system program that during the preceding fis-

1 cal year failed to achieve initial operational capa-
2 bility within five years after the date the program
3 received Milestone B approval.

4 “(6) For any program identified under para-
5 graph (5), a description of the plan to address the
6 issues that caused the failure.

7 “(7) A discussion of specific improvements in
8 business operations and cost savings resulting from
9 successful covered defense business systems pro-
10 grams.

11 “(8) A copy of the most recent report of the
12 Chief Management Officer of each military depart-
13 ment on implementation of business transformation
14 initiatives by such military department in accordance
15 with section 908 of the Duncan Hunter National
16 Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009
17 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4569; 10 U.S.C.
18 2222 note).

19 “(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

20 “(1)(A) DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.—The
21 term ‘defense business system’ means an informa-
22 tion system that is operated by, for, or on behalf of
23 the Department of Defense, including any of the fol-
24 lowing:

25 “(i) A financial system.

1 “(ii) A financial data feeder system.

2 “(iii) A contracting system.

3 “(iv) A logistics system.

4 “(v) A planning and budgeting sys-
5 tem.

6 “(vi) An installations management
7 system.

8 “(vii) A human resources manage-
9 ment system.

10 “(viii) A training and readiness sys-
11 tem.

12 “(B) The term does not include—

13 “(i) a national security system; or

14 “(ii) an information system used ex-
15 clusively by and within the defense com-
16 missary system or the exchange system or
17 other instrumentality of the Department of
18 Defense conducted for the morale, welfare,
19 and recreation of members of the armed
20 forces using nonappropriated funds.

21 “(2) COVERED DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM.—

22 The term ‘covered defense business system’ means a
23 defense business system that is expected to have a
24 total amount of budget authority, over the period of
25 the current future-years defense program submitted

1 to Congress under section 221 of this title, in excess
2 of the threshold established for the use of special
3 simplified acquisition procedures pursuant to section
4 2304(g)(1)(B) of this title.

5 “(3) COVERED DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM
6 PROGRAM.—The term ‘covered defense business sys-
7 tem program’ means a defense acquisition program
8 to develop and field a covered defense business sys-
9 tem or an increment of a covered defense business
10 system.

11 “(4) ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE.—The term
12 ‘enterprise architecture’ has the meaning given that
13 term in section 3601(4) of title 44.

14 “(5) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term ‘infor-
15 mation system’ has the meaning given that term in
16 section 11101 of title 40.

17 “(6) NATIONAL SECURITY SYSTEM.—The term
18 ‘national security system’ has the meaning given
19 that term in section 3542(b)(2) of title 44.

20 “(7) MILESTONE DECISION AUTHORITY.—The
21 term ‘Milestone Decision Authority’, with respect to
22 a defense acquisition program, means the individual
23 within the Department of Defense designated with
24 the responsibility to grant milestone approvals for
25 that program.

1 “(8) BUSINESS PROCESS MAPPING.—The term
2 ‘business process mapping’ means a procedure in
3 which the steps in a business process are clarified
4 and documented in both written form and in a flow
5 chart.”.

6 (2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sec-
7 tions at the beginning of such chapter is amended
8 by adding at the end the following new item:

 “2222. Defense business systems: business process reengineering; enterprise ar-
 chitecture; management.”.

9 (b) DEADLINE FOR GUIDANCE.—The guidance re-
10 quired by subsection (b)(1) of section 2222 of title 10,
11 United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(1),
12 shall be issued not later than December 31, 2016.

13 (c) REPEAL.—Section 811 of the John Warner Na-
14 tional Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007
15 (Public Law 109–364; 10 U.S.C. 2222 note) is repealed.

1 **Subtitle D—Counterterrorism**

2 **SEC. 1031 [Log 60359]. PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO PRO-**
3 **VIDE REWARDS THROUGH GOVERNMENT**
4 **PERSONNEL OF ALLIED FORCES AND CER-**
5 **TAIN OTHER MODIFICATIONS TO DEPART-**
6 **MENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM TO PROVIDE**
7 **REWARDS.**

8 (a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 127b(c)(3) of title 10,
9 United States Code, is amended—

10 (1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subpara-

11 graphs (B) and (C)” and inserting “subparagraph

12 (B)”;

13 (2) by striking subparagraphs (C) and (D).

14 (b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—

15 (1) **SECTION HEADING.**—The section heading

16 for section 127b of title 10, United States Code, is

17 amended to read as follows:

18 **“§ 127b. Department of Defense rewards program”.**

19 (2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS.**—The table of sections

20 at the beginning of chapter 3 of such title is amend-

21 ed by striking the item relating to section 127b and

22 inserting the following new item:

“127b. Department of Defense rewards program.”.

1 **SEC. 1033 [Log 59838]. REPEAL OF SEMIANNUAL REPORTS**
2 **ON OBLIGATION AND EXPENDITURE OF**
3 **FUNDS FOR COMBATING TERRORISM PRO-**
4 **GRAM.**

5 Section 229 of title 10, United States Code, is
6 amended—

7 (1) by striking subsection (d); and

8 (2) by redesignating subsection (e) as sub-
9 section (d).

1 **SEC. 1054 [Log 59822]. INFORMATION-RELATED AND STRA-**
2 **TEGIC COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES EN-**
3 **GAGEMENT PILOT PROGRAM.**

4 (a) PILOT PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of
5 Defense may carry out a pilot program or multiple pilot
6 programs under which the Secretary assesses information-
7 related and strategic communications capabilities to sup-
8 port the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements
9 of the geographic and functional combatant commanders,
10 including the urgent and emergent operational needs and
11 the operational and theater security cooperation plans of
12 such combatant commanders, to further United States na-
13 tional security objectives and strategic communications re-
14 quirements.

15 (b) ELEMENTS.—Any pilot program carried out
16 under subsection (a) shall include each of the following
17 elements:

18 (1) Clearly defined goals and end-state objec-
19 tives for the pilot program, including the traceability
20 of such goals and objectives to the tactical, oper-
21 ational, or strategic requirements of the combatant
22 commanders.

23 (2) A process for measuring the performance
24 and effectiveness of the pilot program.

1 (3) A demonstration of a technology capability
2 or concept to support the tactical, operational, or
3 strategic needs of the combatant commanders.

4 (4) Supporting activities and coordinating ele-
5 ments with joint, interagency, intergovernmental,
6 and multinational partners.

7 (c) GOVERNANCE.—The Secretary shall create a gov-
8 ernance structure for executing any pilot program carried
9 out under subsection (a) that allows for centralized over-
10 sight and planning of the program with program execution
11 decentralized to the combatant commands. The Secretary
12 shall provide a written charter for such a governance
13 structure by not later than the date that is 30 days after
14 the date on which the Secretary decides to carry out such
15 a pilot program.

16 (d) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—By not later than 14
17 days after the date on which the Secretary decides to carry
18 out a pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary
19 shall submit to the congressional defense committees writ-
20 ten notice of the decision. Such notice shall include the
21 scope of activities, funding required, sponsoring combat-
22 ant commander, anticipated participants, and expected
23 duration of the pilot program.

1 (e) **TERMINATION.**—The authority to carry out a
2 pilot program under this section shall terminate on Sep-
3 tember 30, 2022.

1 **SEC. 1082 [Log 59948]. EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR THE OVER-**
2 **SIGHT AND MANAGEMENT OF ALTERNATIVE**
3 **COMPENSATORY CONTROL MEASURES.**

4 (a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—

5 (1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 21
6 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by add-
7 ing at the end of the following new section:

8 **“§ 430A. Executive agent for management and over-**
9 **sight of alternative compensatory control**
10 **measures**

11 “(a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—The Secretary of Defense
12 shall designate a senior official from among the personnel
13 of the Department of Defense to act as the Department
14 of Defense executive agent for the management and over-
15 sight of alternative compensatory control measures.

16 “(b) ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND AUTHORI-
17 TIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the roles,
18 responsibilities, and authorities of the executive agent des-
19 igned under subsection (a). Such roles, responsibilities,
20 and authorities shall include the development of an annual
21 management and oversight plan for Department-wide ac-
22 countability and reporting to the congressional defense
23 committees.”.

24 (2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sec-
25 tions at the beginning of such chapter is amended

1 by adding at the end of the items relating to such
2 subchapter the following new item:

“430A. Executive agent for management and oversight of alternative compensatory control measures.”.

3 (b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the close
4 of each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Secretary
5 of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense com-
6 mittees a report on the oversight and management of al-
7 ternative compensatory control measures. Each such re-
8 port shall include—

9 (1) the annual management and oversight plan
10 required under section 430A(b) of title 10, United
11 States Code, as added by subsection (a);

12 (2) a discussion of the scope and number of al-
13 ternative compensatory control measures in effect;
14 and

15 (3) any other matters the Secretary of Defense
16 determines appropriate.

1 **SEC. 1086 [Log 59842]. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STRAT-**
2 **EGY FOR COUNTERING UNCONVENTIONAL**
3 **WARFARE.**

4 (a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of De-
5 fense, in consultation with the President and the Chair-
6 man of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, shall develop a strategy
7 for the Department of Defense to counter unconventional
8 warfare threats posed by adversarial state and non-state
9 actors.

10 (b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under sub-
11 section (a) shall include each of the following:

12 (1) An articulation of the activities that con-
13 stitute unconventional warfare being waged upon the
14 United States and allies.

15 (2) A clarification of the roles and responsibil-
16 ities of the Department of Defense in providing indi-
17 cations and warning of, and protection against, acts
18 of unconventional warfare.

19 (3) The current status of authorities and com-
20 mand structures related to countering unconven-
21 tional warfare.

22 (4) An articulation of the goals and objectives
23 of the Department of Defense with respect to coun-
24 tering unconventional warfare threats.

25 (5) An articulation of related or required inter-
26 agency capabilities and whole-of-Government activi-

1 ties required by the Department of Defense to sup-
2 port a counter-unconventional warfare strategy.

3 (6) Recommendations for improving the
4 counter-unconventional warfare capabilities, authori-
5 ties, and command structures of the Department of
6 Defense.

7 (7) Recommendations for improving interagency
8 coordination and support mechanisms with respect
9 to countering unconventional warfare threats.

10 (8) Recommendations for the establishment of
11 joint doctrine to support counter-unconventional
12 warfare capabilities within the Department of De-
13 fense.

14 (9) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense
15 and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff deter-
16 mine necessary.

17 (c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180
18 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Sec-
19 retary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense
20 committees the strategy required by subsection (a). The
21 strategy shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may
22 include a classified annex.

23 (d) DEFINITION OF UNCONVENTIONAL WARFARE.—
24 In this section, the term “unconventional warfare” means
25 activities conducted to enable a resistance movement or

1 insurgency to coerce, disrupt, or overthrow a government
2 or occupying power by operating through or with an un-
3 derground, auxiliary, or guerrilla force in a denied area.

1 **SEC. 1088 [Log 60908]. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION AND**
2 **BRIEFING REQUIREMENT ON ORDERED**
3 **EVACUATIONS OF UNITED STATES EMBAS-**
4 **SIES AND CONSULATES INVOLVING THE USE**
5 **OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.**

6 (a) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary
7 of Defense and the Secretary of State shall provide joint
8 notification to the appropriate congressional committees
9 as soon as practicable after the initiation of an ordered
10 evacuation of a United States embassy or consulate involv-
11 ing the use of United States Armed Forces.

12 (b) BRIEFING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of De-
13 fense and the Secretary of State shall provide a joint brief-
14 ing to the appropriate congressional committees not later
15 than 15 days after the initiation of an ordered evacuation
16 of a United States embassy or consulate involving the use
17 of the United States Armed Forces.

18 (c) ELEMENTS.—Each notification under subsection
19 (a) and briefing under subsection (b) shall include the fol-
20 lowing:

21 (1) An overview of the ordered evacuation.

22 (2) The status of all personnel assigned to the
23 embassy or consulate, including United States citi-
24 zens and locally-employed staff.

25 (3) The status of the embassy or consulate, in-
26 cluding whether the embassy or consulate was se-

1 cured and all classified or otherwise sensitive mate-
2 rial destroyed upon departure.

3 (4) An overview of the manner and location
4 from which the Department of State will continue to
5 conduct the duties and responsibilities of the em-
6 bassy or consulate.

7 (5) A description of the disposition of United
8 States Government property and whether such prop-
9 erty was destroyed, disabled, abandoned or otherwise
10 left behind, or remains in the possession of United
11 States Government personnel.

12 (6) Any other matters the Secretary of Defense
13 and Secretary of State determine to be relevant.

14 (d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES
15 DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate con-
16 gressional committees” means—

17 (1) the congressional defense committees; and

18 (2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the
19 Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the
20 House of Representatives.

1 **Subtitle G—Other Matters**

2 **SEC. 1261. [LOG 59841] NON-CONVENTIONAL ASSISTED RE-**
3 **COVERY CAPABILITIES.**

4 (a) **EXTENSION.**—Subsection (h) of section 943 of
5 the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act
6 for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat.
7 4579), as most recently amended by section 1261 of the
8 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015
9 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3579), is further amend-
10 ed by striking “2016” and inserting “2017”.

11 (b) **REVISION TO ANNUAL LIMITATION ON FUNDS.**—
12 Subsection (a) of such section is amended—

13 (1) by striking “Upon” and inserting the fol-
14 lowing:

15 “(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon”;

16 (2) by striking “an amount” and all that fol-
17 lows through “may be” and inserting “amounts ap-
18 propriated or otherwise made available for the De-
19 partment of Defense for operation and maintenance
20 may be”; and

21 (3) by adding at the end the following new
22 paragraph:

23 “(2) **ANNUAL LIMIT.**—The total amount made
24 available for support of non-conventional assisted re-

1 covery activities under this subsection in any fiscal
2 year may not exceed \$25,000,000.”.

1 **SEC. 1263. [LOG 60360] PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR NATO**
2 **SPECIAL OPERATIONS HEADQUARTERS.**

3 Section 1244(a) of the National Defense Authoriza-
4 tion Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123
5 Stat. 2541), as most recently amended by section 1272
6 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year
7 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2023), is further
8 amended by striking “for each of fiscal years 2013, 2014,
9 and 2015 pursuant to section 301” and inserting “for any
10 fiscal year”.

1 **SEC. 1264. [LOG 60391] EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION TO**
2 **CONDUCT ACTIVITIES TO ENHANCE THE CA-**
3 **PABILITY OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO RE-**
4 **SPOND TO INCIDENTS INVOLVING WEAPONS**
5 **OF MASS DESTRUCTION.**

6 Section 1204(h) of the National Defense Authoriza-
7 tion Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127
8 Stat. 897; 10 U.S.C. 401 note) is amended by striking
9 “September 30, 2017” and inserting “September 30,
10 2020”.

1 **SEC. 1266. [LOG 59840] MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY FOR**
2 **SUPPORT OF SPECIAL OPERATIONS TO COM-**
3 **BAT TERRORISM.**

4 (a) **AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a) of section 1208 of
5 the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization
6 Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat.
7 2086), as most recently amended by section 1208(a) of
8 the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year
9 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3541), is further
10 amended by striking “\$75,000,000” and inserting
11 “\$100,000,000”.

12 (b) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Subsection (f)(1) of such sec-
13 tion 1208, as most recently amended by section 1202(c)
14 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year
15 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2512), is further
16 amended by striking “120 days” and inserting “30 days
17 and not later than 180 days”.

18 (c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by
19 subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the en-
20 actment of this Act and apply with respect to each fiscal
21 year that begins on or after such date of enactment.

1 **Subtitle B—National Defense**
2 **Stockpile**

3 **SEC. 1411[Log 60514]. EXTENSION OF DATE FOR COMPLE-**
4 **TION OF DESTRUCTION OF EXISTING STOCK-**
5 **PILE OF LETHAL CHEMICAL AGENTS AND**
6 **MUNITIONS.**

7 Section 1412(b)(3) of the Department of Defense Au-
8 thorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145; 50 U.S.C.
9 1521) is amended by striking “December 31, 2017” and
10 inserting “December 31, 2023”.

1 **Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence**
2 **and Intelligence-Related Activities**

3 **SEC. 1621.[Log 59823] EXECUTIVE AGENT FOR OPEN-**
4 **SOURCE INTELLIGENCE TOOLS.**

5 (a) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—Chapter 21 of title 10,
6 United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the
7 following new section:

8 **“§ 430a. Executive agent for open-source intelligence**
9 **tools**

10 “(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than April 1, 2016,
11 the Secretary of Defense shall designate a senior official
12 of the Department of Defense to serve as the executive
13 agent for the Department for open-source intelligence
14 tools.

15 “(b) ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND AUTHORI-
16 TIES.— (1) Not later than July 1, 2016, in accordance
17 with Directive 5101.1, the Secretary shall prescribe the
18 roles, responsibilities, and authorities of the executive
19 agent designated under subsection (a).

20 “(2) The roles and responsibilities of the executive
21 agent designated under subsection (a) shall include the
22 following:

23 “(A) Developing and maintaining a comprehen-
24 sive list of open-source intelligence tools and tech-
25 nical standards.

1 “(B) Establishing priorities for the integration
2 of open-source intelligence tools into the intelligence
3 enterprise, and other command and control systems
4 as needed.

5 “(C) Certifying all open-source intelligence tools
6 with respect to compliance with the standards re-
7 quired by the framework and guidance for the Intel-
8 ligence Community Information Technology Enter-
9 prise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enter-
10 prise, and the Joint Information Environment.

11 “(E) Performing such other assessments or
12 analyses as the Secretary considers appropriate.

13 “(c) SUPPORT WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DE-
14 FENSE.—In accordance with Directive 5101.1, the Sec-
15 retary shall ensure that the military departments, Defense
16 Agencies, and other components of the Department of De-
17 fense provide the executive agent designated under sub-
18 section (a) with the appropriate support and resources
19 needed to perform the roles, responsibilities, and authori-
20 ties of the executive agent.

21 “(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

22 “(1) The term ‘Directive 5101.1’ means De-
23 partment of Defense Directive 5101.1, or any suc-
24 cessor directive relating to the responsibilities of an
25 executive agent of the Department of Defense.

1 “(2) The term ‘executive agent’ has the mean-
2 ing given the term ‘DoD Executive Agent’ in Direc-
3 tive 5101.1.

4 “(3) The term ‘open-source intelligence tools’
5 means tools regarding relevant information derived
6 from the systematic collection, processing, and anal-
7 ysis of publicly available information in response to
8 known or anticipated intelligence requirements.”.

9 (b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections
10 at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting
11 after the item relating to section 430 the following new
12 item:

 “430a. Executive agent for open-source intelligence tools.”.

1 **SEC. 1622.[Log 60679] WAIVER AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTI-**
2 **FICATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO FA-**
3 **CILITIES FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION**
4 **OR FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS ABROAD.**

5 (a) ADDITION OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION
6 REQUIREMENT.—Section 2682(c) of title 10, United
7 States Code, is amended—

8 (1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary of
9 Defense”; and

10 (2) by adding at the end the following new
11 paragraph:

12 “(2) Not later than 48 hours after using the waiver
13 authority under paragraph (1) for any facility for intel-
14 ligence collection conducted under the authorities of the
15 Department of Defense or special operations activity, the
16 Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional de-
17 fense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of
18 the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intel-
19 ligence of the House of Representatives written notifica-
20 tion of the use of the authority, including the justification
21 for the waiver and the estimated cost of the project for
22 which the waiver applies.”.

23 (b) CODIFICATION OF SUNSET PROVISION.—

24 (1) CODIFICATION.—Section 2682(c) of title
25 10, United States Code, is further amended by in-

1 serting after paragraph (2), as added by subsection
2 (a)(2), the following new paragraph:

3 “(3) The waiver authority provided by paragraph (1)
4 expires December 31, 2017.”.

5 (2) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Subsection (b) of
6 section 926 of the National Defense Authorization
7 Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125
8 U.S.C. 1541; 10 U.S.C. 2682 note) is repealed.

1 **SEC. 1626.[Log 60356] CLARIFICATION OF ANNUAL BRIEF-**
2 **ING ON THE INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE,**
3 **AND RECONNAISSANCE REQUIREMENTS OF**
4 **THE COMBATANT COMMANDS.**

5 Paragraph (1)(A) of section 1626 of the National De-
6 fense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law
7 113–291; 128 Stat. 3635) is amended by striking “each
8 of the” and inserting “the United States Special Oper-
9 ations Command and each of the other”.

DIRECTIVE REPORT LANGUAGE

Table Of Contents

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Civil Support Team Information Management System

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Detection and threat identification technologies

Situational Awareness Prototype Constellation for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General review of advanced semiconductors and microelectronics
Comptroller General review of technology transition efforts of the Department of Defense

Special Operations Forces Combat Diving Program

Strategic Capabilities Office transitions of technology

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families Program

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

OTHER MATTERS

Comptroller General Review of Homeland Response Forces

Comptroller General Review of Pandemic Civil Support Planning

Comptroller General Review of Transferring Improvised Explosive Device

Knowledge and Technology Gained by Department of Defense to Civil Authorities

Proposed Retirement of Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 and 85 Aircraft

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND

INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Cyber Support to Civil Authorities

Mission System Cybersecurity

Multi-source Cyber Intelligence Analysis Needs

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Civil Support Team Information Management System

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams (CST) currently field a system called the CST Information Management System (CIMS), to provide a common operating picture, promote information-sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and support the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. Given that other National Guard Bureau forces, such as the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High explosive Enhanced Response Force Package (CERFP) and Homeland Defense Response Force (HRF) units are in need of similar capabilities, and in order for these forces to effectively communicate and operate during large-scale domestic events, the committee encourages the National Guard Bureau to expand CIMS to those CERFP and HRF forces.

Furthermore, the committee believes it is important that this CIMS capability increase interoperability and efficiently use prior investments to expand and enhance communication capability without creating unwarranted redundancy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by November 1, 2015, detailing what steps have been taken to date to expand CIMS to CERFP and HRF units, as well as what action is planned with regard to the expansion of CIMS to CERFP and HRF forces to include timeline, milestones, and a detailed description of any other influencing factors.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Detection and threat identification technologies

The committee is aware that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency continues to have a strong partnership with each of the military services, as well as with U.S. Special Operations Command, which has contributed to the development and fielding of technologies that reduce, counter, and eliminate the threat of

chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high-yield explosive materials. The committee remains concerned about credible threats posed by state and non-state actors in their attempts to acquire and weaponize chemical and biological materials for use against the United States and its allies. Therefore, the committee encourages the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to continue the genomic research and development of innovative and emerging detection, threat identification technologies and medical countermeasures to ensure prompt transition of validated capabilities to address the emerging infectious disease threats. The committee emphasizes the importance of advancing genomic research as a method to stay ahead of the changing emerging threats from highly infectious viruses.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2015, on its efforts to prioritize the prompt transfer of funding to the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Disease to advance research as it relates to genomics and highly infectious threats, to include the potential for lightweight, handheld devices for diagnostics, detection, and analysis.

Situational Awareness Prototype Constellation for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction

The Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) situational awareness prototype Constellation is described as a next-generation information gathering, sharing, analysis, collaboration, and visualization system to improve situational awareness across the CWMD enterprise. The committee is supportive of efforts to improve coordination and situational awareness and recognizes the contribution of Constellation to a synchronized, informed whole-of-government response to the Ebola crisis. The committee is also aware of other efforts that have a similar function in tracking and analyzing CWMD threats and believes the Department of Defense should avoid duplication of efforts in this area. The committee further believes that a common platform must be successfully integrated with the other relevant Department of Defense and U.S. Government partners. The committee urges the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to continue to engage the interagency to ensure efforts are fully coordinated and not duplicative.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the status of the Constellation prototype and the activities for ensuring that it avoids duplication with other CWMD systems.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General review of advanced semiconductors and microelectronics

The committee recognizes that the development and delivery of critical capabilities of the Department of Defense, Intelligence Community, and other Government organizations are dependent, in part, on incorporating rapidly evolving, leading-edge semiconductors and microelectronic devices into their systems, including technologies for which there is no commercial demand. Once dominated by domestic sources, today's microelectronics manufacturing is largely conducted outside of the United States.

The committee is aware that foreign dependence on microelectronics may increase security risks, such as introduction of corrupt technologies into weapon systems, loss of national security-related intellectual property, and disruption of supply of critical microelectronics. For more than a decade, the Government has relied heavily on a single, U.S.-owned company for sensitive, leading-edge trusted microelectronics through the Trusted Foundry Program. However, the proposed acquisition of this firm's microelectronics fabrication facilities and related intellectual property by a foreign-owned entity creates uncertainty about the Government's future access to leading-edge trusted microelectronics and other advanced semiconductor materials and presents risk for Department of Defense programs that rely on these microelectronics.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's actions and measures to address the risk of losing access to the source of trusted leading-edge microelectronics, and to submit a report on the findings to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016. The report shall address the following:

- (1) What efforts have been made to identify the potential impacts to defense research and weapon systems' acquisition programs;
- (2) What actions, if any, have been taken by Department of Defense programs to mitigate the potential risk;
- (3) What actions, if any, have been taken to identify and acquire alternative sources of trusted leading-edge microelectronics, or to create new sources through Government investments, such as Defense Production Act investments; and
- (4) The use of new or innovative manufacturing techniques, such as split manufacturing, or other emerging capabilities.

Comptroller General review of technology transition efforts of the Department of Defense

The Department of Defense's science and technology enterprise is responsible for identifying, pursuing, and developing new and advanced technologies to improve and enhance military capabilities. The committee continues to be concerned, however, about the lack of technology transition that occurs between the Department's science and technology activities and acquisition programs of record. Previous studies by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and others have identified a number of factors that contribute to this situation, including insufficient processes and mechanisms within the Department

to conduct technology demonstration and testing, prototyping, and generally ensure that high-value technologies are mature and available to be incorporated into weapon system programs. In the past, the committee has expressed concern that the Department has not put sufficient emphasis on technology transition, but the renewed focus on warfighting experimentation to support transition and the effective use of the Rapid Innovation Program indicate that some progress may have been made. The committee also believes that funding for up-front acquisition activities, such as operational analysis to support requirements definition and maturation, modeling and simulation for trade space analysis, and funding to support technological maturation to get some activities through the "valley of death" also make potentially valuable contributions to supporting technology transition, though the impact of these activities needs to be better understood and the return on investment quantified.

The committee last asked the Department to assess its technology transition activities in 2008, but it took more than 3 years for that report to be completed. The committee believes that the landscape for technology transition has changed significantly in the intervening period, and a review by the GAO would provide a better understanding of the factors that effect successful technology transition, and what recommendations might be made to improve the Department's return on investment for technology transition.

The committee continues to be concerned that the way in which the Department of Defense funds technology transition activities, including funding for advanced component development and prototyping, as well as system development and demonstration activities, may be hampering the effective and timely transition of mature technologies into acquisition programs. Therefore, the committee directs Comptroller General of the United States to review how the Department's research and development funds are used and whether this approach to funding effectively supports technology risk reduction activities, operations analysis, prototyping, experimentation, and technology transition. The Comptroller General should submit a report on the review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016. In addition, the Comptroller General should include recommendations for better ways for the Department to support the delivery of mature technologies to acquisition programs.

Special Operations Forces Combat Diving Program

The committee understands that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) included within the budget request for fiscal year 2016 a new-start program called Special Operations Forces Combat Diving. The committee strongly supports inclusion of this program which is designed to provide for the modernization and advancement of engineering, manufacturing, testing, development, and transition of special operations-peculiar diving technologies for special operations and combat divers. The committee encourages the aggressive and timely development of commercial and developmental underwater breathing

technologies, diver thermal regulations systems, diver communications, tracking and monitoring systems, diver propulsion systems and devices, advanced concept breathing mixtures, and next-generation combat diver life supports systems and technologies.

The committee also encourages the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to develop next-generation diver technologies, to ensure that these individual diver systems are matured in coordination with the development of USSOCOM's broader Undersea Mobility strategy, and in particular, the dry combat submersible platforms and prototypes currently being developed by USSOCOM. The committee also expects USSOCOM to leverage commercial technologies and advancements in this area when practical, and to continue coordination with similar research and development efforts underway within the Department of Defense. As such, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the development of technologies and capabilities within the Special Operations Forces Combat Diving Program.

Strategic Capabilities Office transitions of technology

The committee continues to monitor with interest the efforts of the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO) to identify, analyze, and demonstrate promising concepts and capabilities to counter strategic adversaries. With technologies from SCO maturing and beginning to transition from demonstration to operation, the committee needs to have a better understanding of how those transitions are planned for and executed. The Joint Explanatory Statement (Committee Print No. 4) accompanying the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 recommended the development of more robust processes to tie these efforts "to the needs, requirements and priorities of the combatant commands," as well as "an estimated cost to field the capability, if the demonstration proves successful, to support transition planning activities."

Recognizing that such investments are still in the demonstration phase, the committee believes it is important to do as much as possible to plan concurrently for the possibility of transition into a program of record for fielded capability.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2016, on the technology transition process for SCO activities. As part of the briefing, the Under Secretary should address the following issues:

- (1) The status of transition agreements with operational sponsors or service programs of record, including the threshold for performance for objective fielded capabilities needed to trigger or ensure transition;

- (2) The process for doing analysis of alternatives (AOA) for those demonstration capabilities to support proposed transition;

- (3) Cost estimation procedures to determine the funding benchmarks for objective fielded capabilities; and

(4) Examples of programs currently transitioning or transitions planned for fiscal year 2016, including any supporting documentation, like transition agreements, AOAs, or cost estimation, which may be used for decisions to proceed beyond engineering and manufacturing development stage.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families Program

The budget request includes \$55.9 million from Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for the U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families (POTFF) program. The committee is pleased with the holistic balance of programs and activities across all elements of the POTFF program, including Human Performance, Social Performance, Spiritual Performance, and Psychological Performance programs. The committee remains very supportive of, and notes the renewed emphasis on, suicide prevention efforts for Special Operations Forces, and notes increased funding within the budget request for the Psychological Performance program of POTFF. The committee understands that the increase in requested amounts of funding for this important element of POTFF will continue resourcing for the operational embedded behavioral health care providers, and support specialized suicide prevention training, screening, and assessments. The committee is supportive of these programs and activities and urges continued coordination with the Defense Health Program to ensure continued and holistic care for U.S. Special Operations Forces and their families.

The committee notes that sections 582 and 586 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) directed reviews and assessments of suicide prevention efforts across U.S. Special Operations Command and Special Operations Forces. The committee looks forward to examining the outcomes of those reports and continuing to work with the Department of Defense on implementing forthcoming recommendations. Elsewhere in this report, the committee also provides a 2-year extension of authority for U.S. Special Operations Command to continue pilot family support programs for immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces assigned to Special Operations Forces, as originally provided in section 554 of the the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), until 2018. The committee encourages continued coordination of these pilot programs that should be integrated into the larger Preservation of the Force and Families program and activities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services

not later than July 30, 2015, on the status of the Preservation of the Force and Families program, to include additional authorities and the coordination with the Defense Health Program.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

OTHER MATTERS

Comptroller General Review of Homeland Response Forces

The National Guard has completed fielding 10 regionally aligned Homeland Response Forces to assist civil authorities in responding to disasters, including Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosives (CBRNE) incidents. The Homeland Response Forces are also meant to serve as a bridge between initial National Guard response to an incident and the arrival of assistance from Federal military forces. Each Homeland Response Force is designed to provide life-saving, command and control, and security capabilities and is expected to plan, train, and exercise within its designated region with the goal of establishing links between local, State, and Federal authorities. Previous Government Accountability Office work identified personnel, training, equipment, and command and control challenges with related National Guard response forces that could materially affect the preparedness or operational effectiveness of the Homeland Response Forces.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the preparedness of the Homeland Response Forces to accomplish their mission. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing on preliminary results of the assessment to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016. The assessment should address the following:

(1) The current state of readiness of each Homeland Response Force with respect to personnel, training, and equipment on hand, and their capability to respond to CBRNE events.

(2) The extent to which the Department of Defense has integrated the Homeland Response Forces operationally with other Federal and State-level response forces, including the National Guard's Civil Support Teams and CBRNE Enhanced Response Force Packages, and the Defense CBRNE Force.

(3) Any related matters the Comptroller General finds appropriate.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide the Comptroller General's final results to the House Committee on Armed Services at a subsequent date and format to be agreed upon at the time of briefing.

Comptroller General Review of Pandemic Civil Support Planning

Planning activities across Federal Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, are key to responding to a potential outbreak in the United States of a pandemic disease. The Federal Government anticipates an influenza pandemic would occur in multiple waves over a period of time, rather than as a discrete event. During the peak weeks of an outbreak of a severe influenza pandemic, an estimated 40 percent of the U.S. workforce may not be at work due to illness, the need to care for family members who are sick, or fear of infection.

The Department of Defense would play a key role in responding to a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease by supporting domestic civil authorities in accordance with the National Response Framework. Coordination with Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial authorities, as well as private sector partners, to plan, train, and exercise a coordinated response may prove essential. This coordination and support would be complicated, because a large number of Department of Defense personnel could potentially be affected by an influenza pandemic, which could adversely affect the military's readiness.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department of Defense's planning to support civil authorities in the event of a pandemic disease outbreak and to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2016, on the preliminary results. The review should address the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense planned for supporting civil authorities in the event of a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease?

(2) To what extent has the Department of Defense coordinated with Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial authorities, and the private sector, in preparation for a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease?

(3) To what extent has the Department of Defense conducted or participated in training exercises with civil authorities and private sector emergency medical response teams in preparation for a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease?

(4) Any related matters the Comptroller General finds appropriate.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide the Comptroller General's final results to the House Committee on Armed Services at a subsequent date and format to be agreed upon at the time of briefing.

Comptroller General Review of Transferring Improvised Explosive Device Knowledge and Technology Gained by Department of Defense to Civil Authorities

The committee is aware that the Comptroller General of the United States is conducting a review of Federal Government coordination efforts to counter improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in the United States.

The committee encourages the Comptroller General to continue this review and to include within its analysis a review of Department of Defense support to civil authorities for counter-IED activities. The committee believes that there are considerable amounts of expertise, technologies, and capabilities resident within the

Department of Defense for the counter-IED mission that could now be leveraged for domestic use and to assist Federal, State, and local authorities charged with counter-IED missions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the status of the ongoing review of Federal Government coordination efforts to counter improvised explosive devices in the United States.

Proposed Retirement of Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 and 85 Aircraft

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy plans to retire Helicopter Sea Squadron (HSC) 84 and 85 aircraft beginning in the third quarter of fiscal year 2015. These aircraft are currently providing organic and inherent special operations-peculiar rotary wing capabilities to Naval Special Warfare training and operational components, and Theater Special Operations Commands within U.S. Central Command and U.S. Pacific Command.

The committee understands that the retirement of these aircraft could cause a considerable capability gap particularly for maritime interception operations, personnel recovery, helicopter visit, board, search and seizure (HVBSS) operations, and the countering weapons of mass destruction mission sets. As such, Naval Special Warfare Command expects a major degradation in capability and readiness for its forward deployed crisis response units.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the planned retirement of HSC-84 and 85. The briefing should include but not be limited to: plans for retirement of HSC-84 and 85 including any cost-benefit analyses conducted to justify retirement; plans to field replacement capabilities to meet all operational requirements including special operations-peculiar requirements of the geographic combatant commanders and U.S. Special Operations Command; capability gaps and limitations identified as a result of the potential retirement; any other matters deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Defense.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Cyber Support to Civil Authorities

The committee recognizes that the danger of disruptive and destructive cyber attacks is growing and that the U.S. military and civilian cyber infrastructure is being targeted by malicious government, criminal, and individual actors who try to avoid attribution. Although the Department of Defense generally does not resource support to civil authorities in response to a domestic cyber incident, the

Department possesses an array of capabilities that may be requested when civilian response capabilities are overwhelmed or exhausted, or in instances where the Department offers unique capabilities not likely to be found elsewhere. For instance, the nexus with the authorities and responsibilities of the National Guard provides a valuable link between military capabilities and civilian State, local, tribal and Federal needs.

In 2012, the Government Accountability Office highlighted gaps in the Department of Defense's plans and guidance for assisting civil authorities in the event of a domestic cyber incident. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has worked in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to agree upon shared roles and responsibilities for Federal cyber security. The committee also notes that among the challenges the Department of Defense continues to face are determining the scope of the potential cyber support it may be requested to provide, and the appropriate mixture and involvement of Active and Reserve Component military cyber forces to meet anticipated defense cyber civil support needs. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on March 4, 2015, the Commanding General of U.S. Army Cyber Command stated that "While title 10 authorities are clear, title 32 and State active duty require the application of varied State constitutional, legislative, and executive authorities and coordination with state Agencies and officials. While every State is different, there is merit in developing a common approach for authorities and capabilities to facilitate rapid and effective response in cyberspace."

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's plans and actions for providing support to civil authorities in the event of a domestic cyber incident, and to provide a report on the findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing on preliminary results to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, with the report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of briefing. The assessment should address the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense planned and identified its critical capabilities for responding to domestic cyber civil support incidents, including the use of Active and Reserve Component cyber capabilities and personnel for civil support?

(2) To what extent has the Department of Defense trained and exercised for domestic cyber civil support incidents and coordinated with the Department of Homeland Security and other relevant Federal agencies?

(3) To what extent has the Department of Defense or the Department of Homeland security developed a common approach for title 32 and State Active Duty forces that balances the differences in State approaches, authorities, and responsibilities?

Mission System Cybersecurity

The committee is aware that the weapon and mission systems upon which warfighters rely are increasingly being networked together for greater effectiveness and interoperability. However, this has happened without a sufficient appreciation of the cybersecurity threat environments currently facing such systems. As noted in the final report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat from January 2013, the Department should be doing more to build a cyber-resilient force that should extend beyond traditional networks and information systems to include these weapon and mission systems. Included in this would be the introduction and incorporation of cyber resiliency requirements throughout the Department, for both new and emerging systems, and developing the means to red-team, test, model and provide feedback to the acquisition community and Intelligence Community.

Despite Department of Defense policies designed to address this threat, such as Department of Defense Instruction 5200.44, and the formation of task forces for the Navy and the Air Force, the committee is concerned that progress on the identification and remediation of cyber vulnerabilities on vital legacy platforms may be lagging. Moreover, the committee is concerned that without the direction and funding to immediately address these vulnerabilities, program leaders will continue to focus limited resources on other platform needs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the military service chiefs, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, detailing the process for identifying and assessing vulnerabilities on legacy weapons and mission systems, as well as for designating funding to remedy these vulnerabilities. The briefing shall also include an accounting of the legacy weapon and mission systems that the military service chiefs have directed to be assessed through this process, the budget and acquisition processes designed to support assessment and remediation efforts, and a schedule and proposed budget for conducting the required assessments and completing any necessary remediation.

Multi-source Cyber Intelligence Analysis Needs

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense is making significant strides in building out a cyber mission force to operate and defend critical Department information systems, and is on track to have full operational capability by 2017. However, the committee is concerned that those teams, while they have needed organic intelligence analysis capability, may not be adequate to meet the full multi-source cyber intelligence collection and analysis needs required to support and enable those cyber mission forces. As recommended in the final report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on the Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat from January 2013, the Department should be working with the Intelligence Community to increase the priority of support for collection and analysis of high-end cyber threats, including the identification and understanding of adversarial cyber weapon development organizations, tools,

leadership, and intentions, and the development of targeting information to support initiatives to counter cyber weaponization. While the National Security Agency provides significant support to those units, the need to provide multi-source intelligence support from the Defense Intelligence Agency and the service intelligence centers remains. It is unclear to the committee whether resourcing decisions related to personnel to support cyber has extended to the multi-source intelligence support centers within the Department.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to assess and validate the multi-source cyber intelligence collection and analysis needs of the Department of Defense, and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by November 1, 2015, on the findings of the analysis. The assessment should cover both the number of personnel needed, as well as the types and priority for current missions and tasking.