

lining possible corrections. This section would further require that the Secretary of Defense provide a report to the congressional defense committees containing a description of the excessive cost growth reported under this section and an assessment of the corrective actions proposed within 120 days of the end of the fiscal year.

#### Section 848—Phone Cards

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that new contracts for morale, welfare and recreation telephone service for personnel serving in combat zones are awarded using competitive procedures and that the contract proposals include options that minimize the cost of phone services to individual users while providing users the flexibility of using phone cards from phone service providers other than the entity offering the proposal. The section would also require that the Secretary of Defense, when considering an extension of existing contracts for such phone services, examine, with the contractor, the potential to further reduce the cost of services to service members by allowing the use of phone cards from phone service providers other than the contractor.

#### Section 849—Jurisdiction under Contract Disputes Act of 1978 over Claims, Disputes, and Appeals Arising out of Maritime Contracts

This section would amend section 603 of title 41, United States Code, to extend the coverage of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 USC 601–613) to maritime contracts.

#### Section 850—Clarification of Jurisdiction of the United States District Courts to Hear Bid Protest Disputes Involving Maritime Contracts

This section would clarify that any actions arising out of a maritime contract shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and shall not be heard in a U.S. District Court under the Suits in Admiralty Act (chapter 309 of title 46 USC) or the Public Vessels Act (chapter 311 of title 46 USC).

## TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### Acquisition Management and Joint Operations of Unmanned Aerial Systems

On April 19, 2007, the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces held a hearing, which highlighted the different views of the military services on the efficacy of designating an executive agent for the Department of Defense for medium- and high-altitude unmanned aerial systems (UASs).

The Department of the Air Force believes that the appointment of an executive agent for medium- and high-altitude UASs would achieve efficiencies in acquisition and enhance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) interoperability by providing common architectures for

data links and radios. Further, the Air Force contends that in order to make the best use of limited operational resources, all medium- and high-altitude UAVs assigned to Operation Iraqi Freedom, regardless of service, should be available to the Coalition Forces Air Component Commander for tasking to the highest operational priority at any given time.

The other military services believe that the status quo better serves the Department of Defense. The Army contends that giving up the operational control of any of its UASs would expose its commanders at the tactical level to additional risk. They also argue that this would sever the feedback loop between training and development of UASs and feedback from Army operators.

The committee believes that this issue has not been adequately addressed for the past two years, potentially resulting in waste of limited resources and inefficient operational use of high value, limited UAS assets. The committee further believes that there may be potential benefits to a single service being given authorities and responsibilities as an executive agent to guide the Department's acquisition efforts to include research, development, testing and evaluation activities; procurement; logistics; and training. This could serve to reduce or eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort; enhance interoperability by directing standard architectures, data-links, radios, ground control stations; and achieve commonality with existing ISR processing, exploitation and dissemination systems.

Furthermore, the committee notes that Subtitle E of Title IX of this bill would require the Secretary of Defense to review the roles and missions of the Department of Defense. In conducting the review, the subtitle requires the Secretary to define the core mission areas of the Department, to identify the core competencies of the military departments, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, each Defense Agency, each Field Agency, and each of the combatant commands with acquisition authority, as associated with each defined core mission area. The committee firmly believes that if the core competencies of the military services were clearly articulated and the requirements system were aligned with such competencies, as required in Subtitle E, that unintended duplication of effort, interoperability issues, and disagreements over authority for operational control of medium- and high-altitude UASs could be mitigated.

Therefore, pending full implementation of Subtitle E across the department, the committee directs the Secretary to complete a review of UAS-related capabilities in accordance with subsections 943(a) and (b) of Title IX of this bill. This review shall determine whether the designation of a military department as executive agent for UAS for the Department of Defense would serve as the best means of eliminating unnecessary duplication of effort; enhancing interoperability by directing standardized architectures, data-links, radios, and ground control stations; and achieving commonality with existing ISR processing, exploitation, and dissemination systems. Finally, this review shall also ensure that a clear, objective assessment be included of operational risk to each military service as a result of changes proposed by the Air Force Chief of Staff in a March 5, 2007 memorandum to the Chairman Joint Chiefs of Staff, combatant commanders, and chiefs of other military services on designation of the Department of the Air Force as exec-

utive agent for medium- and high-altitude UAS. A report on this review shall be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

Nothing included herein or in Subsection E of Title IX of this bill is intended to restrict in any way the current authority of the Secretary of Defense to appoint an Executive Agent for medium- and high-altitude unmanned aerial systems pending the outcome of the reports required by this bill and report on roles and missions.

#### Defense Policy Reorganization

In section 901 of the conference report (H. Rept. 109–702) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the conferees outlined several significant concerns about the long-term impact of the reorganization of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (OUSD(P)) on the effective development, implementation, and review of national defense policies. These concerns included the possible implications of this reorganization on important policy areas such as special operations and low-intensity conflict, strategic capabilities, and combating weapons of mass destruction.

The committee understands that the intent behind the OUSD(P) reorganization was to balance the various geographical and functional areas of responsibility among the five Assistant Secretaries of Defense (ASDs) within OUSD(P) and that this re-balancing would allow those ASDs to interact more effectively with other national security officials and address more effectively the full range of current and emerging national security challenges. However, the committee has not received sufficient assurances that OUSD(P) officials are adequately addressing the issues reflected in the conference report. For example, the committee believes that the placement of responsibility for “strategic capabilities” and “force transformation” policies within the ASD for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities may dilute that ASD’s statutory responsibility to supervise special operations and low-intensity activities, including oversight of related policies and resources in this critical area. It is unclear how OUSD(P) is mitigating, or is planning to mitigate, that risk.

The committee continues to expect that Department officials will consult frequently and openly with the congressional defense committees as they implement, review, and adjust, as necessary, this reorganization of a major Under Secretariat. OUSD(P) officials should make every effort to consider seriously the input of these committees and provide sufficient feedback to ensure that the committees remain informed as the reorganization moves forward.

#### Full Spectrum Analysis on Irregular Warfare

The committee recognizes that the nation must be prepared for both conventional and unconventional threats and that violent extremist organizations, such as Al Qaeda, often resort to irregular warfare to engage the U.S. through asymmetric and indirect approaches. Additionally, the committee recognizes that Special Operations Forces (SOF) represent the Department’s premier capability to counter such unconventional threats.

Accordingly, the committee commends the recommendation contained in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) to increase U.S. Special Operations Forces (SOF) and supports the plan of U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to increase total active duty personnel endstrength by more than 24 percent, or 11,000, between fiscal years 2007 and 2013. The committee strongly supports SOCOM's plan to add to the force five Special Forces (SF) battalions, three civil affairs (CA) battalions and five companies focused on psychological operations (PSYOP). The committee recognizes such growth as essential for improving unconventional warfare capabilities within the SOF community, consonant with a concomitant increase of CA and PSYOP units in the U.S. Army Reserve. The committee views the growth in and emphasis on SF, PSYOP and CA as necessary to improve SOCOM's capability to conduct unconventional warfare and encourages further effort in this area. In addition, the committee recognizes that conventional forces have been called upon to operate outside of their traditional conventional missions as they contribute to combating these unconventional threats.

The committee remains ultimately concerned about the long-term sustainment of the Department's ability to conduct irregular warfare operations that often require an "indirect" or "non-kinetic" approach. These techniques require a mature, highly skilled and well-educated force to achieve success, and SOF, specifically formed to provide such a force, will continue to be the Department's primary unconventional force. Across the Department, stable long-term resource allocations are required to produce such a capability but the existence of an innovative, flexible personnel management system is also necessary. The requirements of unconventional warfare and COIN campaigns are unique. Fundamentally, their success often relies upon individual judgment at the small unit level by operators familiar with specific locations, indigenous communities and their unique and residential customs. Such requirements place a premium on the importance of recruiting, developing, and promoting individuals familiar with and best suited for the sensitivities of such missions.

To support and promote an effective irregular warfare capability, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Department of Defense's (DOD's) plan to address the unique needs of irregular warfare. The report shall include but not be limited to:

- (1) An assessment of the respective manning level rates at indirect action units within SOCOM as compared with the manning levels at units primarily engaged in the discipline of direct action;
- (2) An assessment of how conventional units are being trained in and are conducting irregular warfare missions such as counterinsurgency;
- (3) A description of the conventional force in the future and how it is expected to address the unique needs of irregular warfare missions;
- (4) An assessment of the adequacy of DOD's personnel management programs in developing and supporting irregular warfare capabilities, and an explanation of SOCOM's role in monitoring and influencing the professional development and acces-

sion of both commissioned and non-commissioned special operators throughout the SOF community;

(5) Recommended legal, regulatory, and policy changes to improve personnel management programs to better support irregular warfare;

(6) The consideration of specific guidance to promotion and command screening boards to encourage a balance in the selection of individuals who have both conventional and unconventional backgrounds, or in the case of SOF, who come from “indirect” and “direct” action units; and

(7) An assessment of alternative organizational structures that could best provide an unconventional warfare capability within the Department and an assessment of how SOCOM can best ensure a balanced approach in the allocation of resources between the respective disciplines of direct and indirect action.

This report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2008.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

#### Section 901—Additional Requirements Relating to the Limitation on Major Department of Defense Headquarters Activities Personnel

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to annually update the definition of major headquarters activities in the budget submission to Congress with the new definition that would take effect January 1 of the following year. This section would also allow a service secretary to waive the limitation on headquarters personnel if the secretary certifies to the Secretary of Defense that such a waiver is necessary to eliminate a contract for services in order to reduce costs or to bring back into the government a position that carries out inherently governmental functions.

Section 130a of title 10, United States Code, limits the number of personnel assigned to major Department of Defense (DOD) headquarters activities to 85 percent of the number assigned to those headquarters activities on October 1, 1999, and further defines those activities by referencing a DOD directive. The Department has requested a revision to section 130a of title 10, United States Code, to allow for greater flexibility in defining major DOD headquarters activities and for relief from the limits on headquarters personnel to allow some outsourced positions to be brought back into the government. The committee shares the goal of reducing the reliance on outsourcing for inherently governmental functions, and agrees that some updating of the definition of major headquarters activities may be appropriate.

#### Section 902—Flexibility to Adjust the Number of Deputy Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs

This section would provide the secretaries of the military departments with greater flexibility to determine the number of Deputy Chiefs of Staff or, in the case of the Navy, Deputy Chiefs of Naval Operations, and Assistant Chiefs of Staff or, in the case of the Navy, Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations. The total number of positions for each service would not exceed eight.

Section 903—Change in Eligibility Requirements for Appointment to Department of Defense Leadership Positions

This section would reduce the period of time before a commissioned officer of a regular component of an armed force must wait after relief from active duty to become eligible for appointment to the position of Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy from ten years to five.

Section 904—Revisions in Functions and Activities of Special Operations Command

This section would modify the authorities governing U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to accurately reflect current mission requirements. This section would codify SOCOM's responsibility for the synchronization of DOD efforts to combat terrorists and associated alliances. This section would further revise the statute governing special operations activities, place greater emphasis on unconventional warfare techniques and missions, and require the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to assess the abilities of the special operations community to meet the demands of unconventional warfare. Finally, this section would establish a reporting requirement detailing and providing an assessment of DOD personnel management programs as they relate to the unique needs of the SOCOM community.

Section 905—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its Secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

Section 906—Management System of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assign duties relating to the strategic oversight of all significant management issues of the Department of Defense to a senior official of a rank not lower than an Under Secretary of Defense. This section would also require that the Secretary adopt a management structure for the Department of Defense, including business support areas, which supports the essential management goals of the Department. This section would also require the Secretary to establish essential management goals for the Department, including, at a minimum, a comprehensive business transformation plan; a well-defined enterprise-wide business systems architecture; and financial statements that receive clean audit opinions during independent financial audits. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report, within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, on the implementation of this section.

#### Section 907—Acquisition Parity for Special Operations Command

This section would modify existing law to eliminate the requirement that the acquisition programs of U.S. Special Operations Command support the acquisition priorities of the respective military services. This section would further modify the consultation requirement to ensure that the DOD senior acquisition official takes steps to encourage the heads of defense agencies to support the priorities of the respective military departments.

#### Section 908—Department of Defense Board of Actuaries

This section would repeal section 1464 of title 10, United States Code, in its entirety as well as subsection (e) of section 2006. It would streamline advice provided to the Secretary of Defense and his other senior advisors by consolidating the Department of Defense Retirement Board of Actuaries and the Department of Defense Education Benefits Board of Actuaries into the Department of Defense Board of Actuaries. This section also would consolidate the authorities to appoint and remove future members of the Board with the President, rather than divide those authorities between the Secretary and the President.

### SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

#### Section 911—Space Protection Policy and Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an analysis and assessment of current and future space situational awareness and space protection requirements and capabilities and to report that strategy to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2008, and every other year thereafter.

The committee is concerned that space situational awareness and the protection of U.S. space assets have not received adequate emphasis in the past. The Chinese anti-satellite test in early 2007 highlighted the vulnerability of our space assets, but represents only one of a range of threats to our nation's space capabilities. The committee believes further information about current and future needs is required to guide efforts to strengthen our ability to deter, deny, and recover from various possible attacks to U.S. space assets.

#### Section 912—Biennial Report on Management of Space Cadre Within the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report every two years on the management of the cadre of space professionals within the Department of Defense.

The committee commends existing space professional development efforts within the military departments, to include increased education and training opportunities, establishment of space-related specialty codes, and development of personnel databases. However, a September 2006 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report found that management actions are needed to better identify, track, and train Air Force space personnel. Without an assessment of space cadre requirements and the development and use of metrics, the committee believes it will be difficult to track

progress in ensuring the Department has sufficient numbers of personnel with the expertise, training, and experience to meet current and future national security space needs and understand the impact to space acquisition and operations resulting from the Air Force reduction of 65,000 personnel from fiscal year 2004 through fiscal year 2009.

#### SUBTITLE C—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION PROGRAM

##### Section 921—Chemical Demilitarization Citizens Advisory Commission

This section would modify existing law to allow a Chemical Demilitarization Citizens' Advisory Commission to remain in existence, at the discretion of the Governor of the State, until after all closure activities are completed at a chemical agent destruction facility pursuant to the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended. The extension of authority included in this section would accommodate communities concerned with additional remediation or regulatory work still required at demilitarization sites after the destruction of the stockpiles. This section would also include a technical amendment to reflect the proper office of responsibility within the Department of the Army for serving as the Army's representative to the commissions.

##### Section 922—Sense of Congress on Completion of Destruction of United States Chemical Weapons Stockpile

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should continue with its plan for on-site disposal of the assembled chemical weapons alternative (ASWA)-managed stockpiles located at Pueblo Chemical Depot, CO, and Blue Grass Army Depot, KY, and ensure that extensive consultation and notification processes exist between representatives of the Department and representatives of the relevant States and local communities.

#### SUBTITLE D—INTELLIGENCE RELATED MATTERS

##### Section 931—Reports on Foreign Language Proficiency

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and secretaries of the military departments to assess and submit an annual report on the foreign language capacity and capabilities of the Department of Defense. This section would reaffirm concerns about the management of linguists in the armed forces expressed by the committee in previous legislation and would build upon the report required by section 581 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), which the committee notes it has not yet received. The committee recognizes work by the Department to improve and define language requirements for present and future operations and requires additional information to assess progress in improving foreign language capacity and capabilities within the Department.

The committee expects the Secretary of Defense and secretaries of the military departments will use a table format in its annual reports to ensure consistency in data reporting. This section would

require the Department to report on 14 specific metrics which are explained in further detail below. The Secretary may also recommend elimination of language-related reporting that is duplicative of this requirement.

(1) Organization—separately identify each branch of the armed services and other elements of the Department of Defense that maintain foreign language competencies.

(2) Language—identify specific language requirements, including specific dialect requirements.

(3) For each organization and language and specific dialect identified, include—

(a) Billets Authorized.

(b) Requirement Current Year—number of billets required in the current fiscal year.

(c) Requirement 1–5 years—number of billets for each of the five years after the current year.

(d) On Board—actual number of linguists regardless of their current billet.

(e) Using Language—number of linguists filling a language billet in that language and dialect.

(f) Not Using Language—number of linguists whose primary duty is not language-related.

(g) Qualification Level—number of personnel at each level of proficiency based on the Interagency Language Roundtable Guidelines (ILRG). Include number of personnel within each category for each language or dialect (ILRG levels 1 through 5). Annotate separately if this meets the needs of each organization.

(h) Unqualified—number of linguists who are unable to perform duties as a linguist

(i) Accessions during the past year.

(j) Departures during the past year.

(1) Allies—percentage of language requirements fulfilled by allies. Annotate separately if this meets the needs of each organization.

(2) Contractors—percentage of language requirements fulfilled by private contractor personnel. Annotate separately if this meets the needs of each organization.

#### Section 932—Technical Amendments to Title 10, United States Code, Arising from Enactment of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004

This section would amend 16 provisions in title 10, United States Code, to clarify whether the prior reference to the “Director of Central Intelligence” should be considered as a reference to “Director of National Intelligence” or “Director of Central Intelligence Agency.” The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 separated the responsibilities and authorities of these positions and this section would clarify the assignments.

## SUBTITLE E—ROLES AND MISSIONS ANALYSIS

## Section 941—Analysis and Organization of Roles and Missions of the Department of Defense

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to require that a review of the roles and mission of the Department of Defense be performed every four years. The review would be performed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and would be required to organize the missions of the Department into core mission areas such as dominance of ground, air, maritime and space environments, expeditionary warfare, mobility, homeland defense, and cyber operations. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report on each review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by the date that the budget request for the next fiscal year is submitted. The first review would be performed during 2008. This section would repeal a superseded requirement that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff perform a roles and mission analysis as a part of the Quadrennial Defense Review required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code.

## Section 942—Identification of Core Competencies of the Military Departments and Other Entities within the Department of Defense

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary of Defense identify the core competencies of the military departments, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, each defense agency, and each defense field activity. This section would require that each core competency be clearly associated with a core mission area of the Department of Defense. The section would require the Secretary complete identification of the core competencies and submit a report on this matter by January 1, 2009.

## Section 943—Review of Capabilities of the Military Departments and Other Entities within the Department of the Defense

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense conduct a review of the capabilities that each of the military departments, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, each defense agency, and each defense field activity is maintaining or developing. This review would determine whether these capabilities are outside of each entity's core competencies or of the core mission areas of the Department of Defense, and would have to establish a justification, if any, for duplication of capabilities. This review would also determine whether any core competencies required to effectively perform the core mission areas of the Department are not being maintained or developed. This section would require the review to be completed by June 1, 2009, and would prohibit the start of any new major defense acquisition program after June 1, 2009, until the review has been submitted to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

#### Section 944—Joint Requirements Oversight Council Additional Duties Relating to Core Mission Areas

This section would amend section 181 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) to organize its review of requirements according to the core mission areas established by the Secretary of Defense by June 1, 2009, and to complete the organization of previously approved requirements documents according to the capability portfolio structure by October 1, 2009.

This section would clarify the necessity for the JROC to provide the military services with clear guidance on the priority assigned to each requirement and on the expected resources allocated to fulfill such a requirement. Accordingly, this section would add the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) as permanent members of the JROC to help the council provide this guidance. This section would require the JROC to organize its review of requirements by core mission area and would stipulate that the officer or official assigned to lead the review of a core mission area must be of a different military department than the deputy for that core mission area. This section would also make explicit the responsibility of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure the effective coordination of military requirements.

The committee is concerned that the current requirements process is too insulated from the realities of the acquisition and budget processes to produce requirements that most efficiently guide the expenditure of the Department of Defense's resources. By incorporating clear priorities and budget guidance into the JROC process, this section would ensure that decisions made in these areas are truly joint, and are not driven primarily by the military department's budget considerations. This section would also define the term "joint military requirement" for purposes of this section to clarify that the purpose of the JROC's review of requirements is to establish the capabilities required to perform the core mission areas of the Department, rather than the specific performance characteristics of a weapon system.

#### Section 945—Requirement for Certification of Major Systems Prior to Technology Development

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to require that the major systems of the Department of Defense be certified by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) prior to the start of technology development. This section would require the JROC to certify and affirm that the system fulfills an approved initial capabilities document, that the system is being executed by an entity with a relevant core competency, and that a cost estimate for the system has been submitted that is consistent with the level of resources associated with the relevant initial capabilities document. This section would also require that if, at any time prior to Milestone B, the system experienced cost growth of more than 25 percent of the cost estimate submitted to the JROC at the time of certification, the system would be returned to the JROC for a decision on whether to terminate or continue the system.

#### Section 946—Presentation of Future-Years Mission Budget by Core Mission Area

This section would amend section 222 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the future-years mission budget of the Department of Defense be organized by core mission area. This section would also require that the future-years mission budget be submitted at the same time as the future-years defense program. This section would be effective starting with the fiscal year 2010 budget.

#### Section 947—Future Capability Planning by Joint Requirements Oversight Council

This section would amend title 10, United State Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, to prepare an extended planning annex for each operational and contingency plan of the Department of Defense. These extended planning annexes would include an assessment of the capabilities needed to successfully accomplish the missions for which the plans were created. The assessment would be required biannually, or any time the plans of the Department are substantially changed, and would require a time-phased capability assessment using a 15-year planning horizon. This section would also require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, through the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, to assess the ability of fielded systems and existing science and technology efforts to meet the capability requirements established by the extended planning annexes.

### SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 951—Department of Defense Consideration of Effect of Climate Change on Department Facilities, Capabilities, and Missions

This section would require the next National Security Strategy and the next National Defense Strategy to include appropriate guidance to military planners to assess the risks of projected climate change to current and future missions, guidance for updating defense plans based on these assessments, and capabilities needed to reduce future impacts. Further, this section would require the next Quadrennial Defense Review to examine the capabilities of the U.S. military to respond to the consequences of climate change, in particular, preparedness for natural disasters from extreme weather events and other missions the U.S. military may be asked to support both at home and abroad.

The committee believes that the strategic, social, political, and economic consequences of global climate change are likely to result in increased instability in some parts of the world. Further, the committee believes that a failure to recognize, plan for, and mitigate the geopolitical effects of a changing climate will have an adverse impact on the national security interests of the United States.

### Section 952—Interagency Policy Coordination

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to appoint either the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy or another official to be the lead official in the Department of Defense for improving and reforming the interagency coordination process on national security. The duties of the official, if named by the Secretary, would include leading Department of Defense efforts to develop policy affecting the interagency process, advocating for greater interagency coordination and contributions in the execution of the National Security Strategy, serving as the Department of Defense representative at U.S. Government forums concerned with interagency policy, making recommendations as to changes in laws or regulations to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to work better with other agencies, serving as the coordinator for planning and training assistance designed to enhance the interagency process and that is supplied by the Department of Defense to other agencies, and serving as the lead official in the Department of Defense for the development of joint interagency task forces. The section would also require that the official named submit an annual report to Congress on the actions taken by the Department of Defense to enhance interagency coordination, the views of the Department of Defense on challenges to improving interagency coordination, and suggestions as to changes in law or regulation that would enhance the interagency process.

Over the past several years, the committee has undertaken several initiatives to enhance interagency coordination on national security matters, this section being only the latest. The committee has been generally pleased that officials of the Department of Defense have recognized that other agencies of the U.S. Government can make important contributions to the national security and to ongoing operations and that those officials have become strong advocates for reforming the national security interagency process. The committee is disappointed, however, that other agencies of the U.S. Government have not shared this recognition, and that others involved in the national security interagency process have not reciprocated the efforts of the committee and the Department of Defense. The committee notes with concern the Administration's failure to deliver the report on improving interagency support for security, stabilization, transition, and reconstruction efforts that was mandated by section 1035 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) by the April 1, 2007, deadline in that legislation.

### Section 953—Expansion of Employment Creditable Under Service Agreements Under National Security Education Program

This section would create an additional option in a position in the field of education for participants in the National Security Education Program to fulfill their service obligation for those who cannot secure other federal employment in accordance with the current provisions of the program.

### Section 954—Study of National Security Interagency System

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit or-

ganization to undertake a year-long study of the national security interagency system and to make suggestions about reforming that process. The section authorizes the use of up to \$4.0 million for this purpose.

The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense has expressed interest in undertaking a study like the one described above, but has hesitated to enter into such an agreement without the agreement of other cabinet secretaries. The committee supports the Secretary of Defense’s efforts to interest his colleagues in the cabinet in reforming the national security interagency process. The committee hopes that the secretaries of other agencies of the U.S. Government that are involved in national security will support the effort authorized by this section both with their full and complete cooperation and, if necessary, with financial assistance. The Department of Defense has much to gain from reforming and improving the national security interagency process, but so do other agencies and the nation as a whole, and other agencies will hopefully recognize this and act accordingly.

## TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

### ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

#### COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

##### Overview

The budget request contained \$936.8 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to \$193.3 million, for operational tempo, which is contained within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2008 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2008 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

FY08 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request .....	\$936.8
International Support .....	\$431.5
Domestic Support .....	\$206.2
Intelligence Technology and Other Demand Reduction .....	\$162.9
Demand Reduction .....	\$136.2
Recommended Decreases	
International Support .....	\$12.0
Recommended Increases	
Southwestern Border Fence .....	\$8.0
Airborne Counter-Narcotics/Terrorism Threat Protection .....	\$4.0
Recommendation .....	\$936.8

##### Items of Special Interest

###### *Budget Requests*

The budget request contained \$936.8 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, including all counter-drug resources in the Department of Defense (DOD) with the exception of those resources in the operating budget for the military services and those resources which are appropriated or requested in emergency budgets. For fiscal year 2007 alone, the committee notes that counter-