

SIGNIT capability is documented only as a “potential future capability,” and not a validated requirement as implied by Navy officials to Congress.

The Navy also proposes to prematurely remove highly-skilled personnel from the EP-3/SPA programs, resulting in a reduction of the number of available aircraft to support GFMAP and wartime requirements. Congress is concerned that harvesting these personnel to support an early version of TRITON that provides only optical and radar sensing, but little or no SIGINT capability, does not maximize utilization of highly-skilled personnel with perishable skill sets. Furthermore, the lack of a validated requirement for a robust SIGINT capability for TRITON raises concerns that the capacity and capability decline will turn out to be a permanent ISR capability loss.

We have serious concerns about the Navy’s non-compliant EP-3/SPA to P-8 QRC/TRITON Multi-INT transition plan. Therefore, we direct that:

(1) The JROC review and report to Congress the combatant commander requirements for the simultaneous ISR collection capability provided by EP-3/SPA assets under current Operational Plans and for the GFMAP;

(2) The Joint Staff and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI) identify and report to Congress alternative EP-3/SPA to P-8 QRC/TRITON Multi-INT transition options that do not result in a capacity decline or capability gap, including such options as using Navy reserve personnel to stand up the baseline TRITON system;

(3) The JROC collaborate with the Navy to develop and document a formal requirement for TRITON Multi-INT;

(4) The USDI develop, and report to Congress, a mitigation plan to address the ELINT obsolescence issues identified in the Senate report accompanying S. 1197 (S. Rept. 113-44) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014; and,

(5) The JROC and USDI to determine, and report to Congress, the force structure quantity and type of federated ISR systems and sensors required to wholly replace the EP-3/SPA force structure of aircraft to meet or exceed the current capacity and diversity of ISR collection capability inherently resident on the EP-3/SPA aircraft.

Multiyear procurement authority for Ground-Based Interceptors

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 141) that would provide multi-year procurement authority and advance procurement authority to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency for the procurement of 14 Ground-Based Interceptors.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Senate on the United States helicopter industrial base

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 152) that would express the sense of Senate on the health of the helicopter industrial base.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 201) authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and

evaluation as specified in the funding table in section 4201.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 201).

The agreement includes this provision.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Modification of requirements on biennial strategic plan for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (sec. 211)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 212) that would modify the biennial strategic plan requirement for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to make more explicit the linkages between the strategic objections of the agency with the missions of the armed forces. Additionally, the provision would reassign responsibility for submission of the plan from the Secretary of Defense to the Director of DARPA, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.

We recognize the value that DARPA brings to the Department of Defense, especially in terms of high risk research that can be potentially game changing. We believe that such research has the highest probability of successful transition when it is linked early with the operational defense community.

For example, DARPA’s Phoenix program has the potential to change radically how the United States approaches space systems development and servicing. As the only program looking at satellite servicing and advanced robotics for geosynchronous earth orbit systems, this program has significant national security, civil, and as well as, commercial potential. However, we note that the development of such capabilities may raise complex policy issues, as well as pose as a disruptive technology to established approaches and operations. We encourage DARPA to not only continue its technical leadership in this field, but to also work with other entities in the Department of Defense—such as the Air Force, the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Under Secretaries of Defense for Policy and Intelligence—to ensure the development of operational concepts for this capability.

Limitation on availability of funds for ground combat vehicle engineering and manufacturing phase (sec. 212)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 211) that would prohibit the Army from obligating post-Milestone B funds for the Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with technical and clarifying amendments.

Additionally, the Comptroller General of the United States is directed to submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment by the Comptroller General of the study of the Army on the Bradley Fighting Vehicle industrial base submitted to Congress pursuant to the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 4310 (112th Congress), the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (House Report 112-705). The report required shall include an assessment of the reasonableness of the study’s methods including, but not limited to, the sufficiency, validity, and reliability of the data used to conduct the study, and include findings and recommendations, if any, on the combat vehicle industrial base. In conducting this review the Comptroller General should not replicate the Army study.

Limitation and reporting requirements for unmanned carrier-launched surveillance and strike system program (sec. 213)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 212) that would prohibit the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics from approving a Milestone A technology development contract award for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) program until 30 days after the Under Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the software and system engineering designs for the control system and connectivity segment and the aircraft carrier segment of the UCLASS system can achieve, at a low level of integration risk, successful compatibility and operability with the air vehicle segment planned for selection at Milestone A contract award.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would modify the language to require that: (1) The Navy to limit the number of air vehicle segments acquired prior to receiving Milestone B approval for UCLASS; (2) The Navy provide periodic reports on cost, schedule and requirements changes for UCLASS; and (3) The Comptroller General conduct annual reviews of the UCLASS program.

Limitation on availability of funds for Air Force logistics transformation (sec. 214)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 213) that would restrict the obligation and expenditure of Air Force procurement and research, development, test, and evaluation funds for logistics information technology programs until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees a report on the modernization and update of Air Force logistics information technology systems following the cancellation of the expeditionary combat support system.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

Limitation on availability of funds for defensive cyberspace operations of the Air Force (sec. 215)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 214) that would limit the funds the Air Force may obligate or expend for Defensive Cyberspace Operations in PE 0202088F to not more than 90 percent until a period of 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the Air Force’s plan for sustainment of the Application Software Assurance Center of Excellence (ASACOE) across the Future Years Defense Program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision but included elsewhere in the committee-reported bill is \$10.0 million in PE 33140F for sustainment of the ASACOE.

The agreement includes this provision.

Limitation on availability of funds for precision extended range munition program (sec. 216)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 215) that would limit funds for the precision extended range munition program until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provides the congressional defense committees with certain written certifications and a sufficient business case analysis.

The Senate committee-report bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

Long-range standoff weapon requirement; prohibition on availability of funds for non-competitive procedures for offensive anti-surface warfare weapon contracts of the Navy (sec. 217)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 218) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a follow-on air-launched cruise missile, Long Range Stand Off (LRSO) weapon to the AGM-86 that achieves initial operating capability for both conventional and nuclear missions by not later than 2030 and is certified for internal carriage and employment for both conventional and nuclear missions on the next-generation long-range strike bomber by not later than 2034.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that requires the LRSO to achieve initial operating capability for conventional missions prior to the retirement of the AGM-86, for nuclear missions prior to the retirement of the nuclear armed AGM-86 and is capable of internal carriage and employment for both missions in the long-range strike bomber. The amendment provides that the Secretary may carry out the consecutive development of the nuclear and conventional capabilities, with the nuclear capability first, if it is determined to be cost effective.

The amendment further includes a provision that would prohibit, during fiscal year 2014, using available funds to contract for Navy offensive anti-surface warfare weapons using other than through competitive procedures. Development, testing, and fielding of aircraft-launched offensive anti-surface warfare weapons would be exempted from that prohibition. Included in the provision is a waiver of the prohibition by the Secretary of Defense if the Secretary determines that waiving this prohibition is in the national security interests of the United States.

Review of software development for F-35 aircraft (sec. 218)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 219) that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) to establish an independent team consisting of subject matter experts to review the development of software for the F-35 aircraft program and to report on the results of that review.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the USD(AT&L) to provide a plan for the sustainment of the Autonomic Logistics Information System for the F-35 aircraft.

Evaluation and assessment of the distributed common ground system (sec. 219)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 220) that would require that: (1) Beginning with the budget request for fiscal year 2015, future budget submissions include separate project codes for each capability component within each program element for each service version of the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS); (2) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) conduct an analysis of commercial link analysis tools that could be used to meet the requirements of each of the service versions of the DCGS; and (3) If one or more commercial link analysis tools were found to meet the requirements of the program, the responsible service secretary would be required to initiate a request for proposals to purchase those tools.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would include the requirement that: (1) The services' budget submissions include separate project codes for each capability component within each program element for each service version of the DCGS; and (2) The USD(AT&L) conduct an analysis of capability components of DCGS that are compliant with the intelligence community data standards and could be used to meet the requirements of the DCGS program. The provision would require the USD(AT&L) to submit a report of that analysis within 180 days of enactment of this Act. We expect that the USD(AT&L) will adjust the acquisition plans for DCGS if his analysis of the competitive acquisition options for capability components within DCGS shows that expanded competition shows promise.

Operationally responsive space (sec. 220)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 225) that would prohibit expending more than 50 percent of the funds authorized or expended for the space-based infrared system modernization initiative wide field of view test bed until the Executive Agent for Space certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary of Defense is carrying out the Operationally Responsive Space program office in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 2273a.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes an amendment requiring a report no later than 60 days from the date of enactment regarding a potential mission that would seek to leverage all the policy objectives of the Operationally Responsive Space Program in a single mission.

Sustainment or replacement of Blue Devil intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities (sec. 221)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 216) that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to procure the currently deployed Blue Devil intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) system or to develop a plan to replace that system with a comparable or improved system.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a plan to sustain the operational capabilities of the Blue Devil I ISR Systems, including precision signal geolocation, by procuring the existing Blue Devil I aircraft, developing a new system, or adapting and integrating capabilities from existing and development programs. The Secretary is required to submit a report that addresses the cost of procuring, operating, and sustaining Blue Devil I aircraft system; the ability of other platforms to provide similar intelligence capabilities; and a listing of related U.S. Air Force and Defense Advanced Projects Research Agency (DARPA) programs. The report should be coordinated with the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command and the Director of DARPA.

We agree that the necessary capability to sustain is both wide-area motion imagery combined with precision signal geolocation. The integration of these two capabilities provides significant operational utility.

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Improvements to acquisition accountability reports on ballistic missile defense system (sec. 231)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 234) that would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to make certain improvements to the cost estimates in-

cluded in its annual acquisition accountability reports on the ballistic missile defense system (BMDS), and to provide a report on the plans and schedule for making such improvements.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would clarify that each cost estimate shall include all of the operation and sustainment (O&S) costs for which the Director is responsible, and also include a summary description of the O&S functions and costs for which the military departments are responsible, consistent with the Deputy Secretary of Defense Memorandum of June 10, 2011, on funding responsibilities for BMDS elements.

We note that, although the MDA is required to provide life-cycle cost estimates of its acquisition programs—including O&S costs—it does not include in those cost estimates the O&S costs for which the military departments that own and operate elements of the BMDS are responsible. As the Government Accountability Office has noted, this makes it difficult to understand the comprehensive life-cycle costs of BMDS elements. Therefore, we direct the Director of the MDA to work with the military departments that own or operate elements of the BMDS to make a recommendation for how those functions and related costs should be reported in either future annual BMDS Accountability Reports or other similar reports to Congress, including annual budget submission justification materials. We believe that the military departments should provide to the congressional defense committees the life-cycle cost estimates for the O&S functions of the BMDS elements for which they are responsible, and urge them to do so as soon as possible.

Furthermore, we expect the Director of the MDA to take steps to ensure that the cost estimate improvements required by the provision are made in a manner as consistent as practicable with the guidance issued pursuant to section 832 of Public Law 112-81, relative to O&S costs, and with the guidance issued pursuant to section 2334(d) of title 10, United States Code, relative to confidence levels of baseline cost estimates.

Prohibition on use of funds for MEADS program (sec. 232)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 231) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2014 funds for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), and would also place conditions on the harvesting of MEADS technology.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 236) that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2014 funds for MEADS.

The agreement includes the Senate provision.

We note that the Department of Defense has invested more than \$2.5 billion in the development of MEADS technology, and has a substantial interest in making constructive use of any MEADS data and technology owned by the United States. We direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, providing: (1) An explanation of who owns the technology and data developed under the tri-national MEADS development program; (2) How the Secretary intends to ensure that the Department gets the maximum benefit from the U.S. investment in MEADS, including by making such technology and data appropriately available for "technology harvesting" for improvements to the Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) system program of record, taking into account the report required by House

Report 113–102, “*Technology harvesting of the Medium Extended Air Defense System*”; and (3) U.S. policy regarding 3rd Party Sales of such technology, which we believe could be of benefit to the United States and its allies.

Prohibition on availability of funds for integration of certain missile defense systems; report on regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 233)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 232) that would express the sense of Congress regarding regional ballistic missile defenses and would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status and progress of regional missile defense programs and efforts.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would clarify the elements of the required report. It would also include a prohibition on the use of fiscal year 2014 funds to integrate missile defense systems of the People’s Republic of China into U.S. missile defense systems.

We are concerned that the Government of Turkey made an initial decision to purchase a Chinese air and missile defense system for its territorial use. Such a system would not be compatible with, and should not be integrated with, missile defense systems of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

We direct that, not later than 60 days after submission of the report required by the provision, the Government Accountability Office shall provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees providing its views on the report.

We further direct that, not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Joint Staff and Joint Force Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense (JFCC–IMD) shall provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees with respect to any significant changes in the regional missile defense environment since the April 2011 Joint Capability Mix (JCM) III Study was completed, and whether and how the study could be updated to provide useful insights for future force structure levels and employment plans. The briefing should be based on updated intelligence information, updated missile defense systems efficacy and reliability information, and current and planned future budget levels, and any other matters the Joint Staff and JFCC–IMD consider useful.

Availability of funds for co-production of Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system in the United States (sec. 234)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 237) that would authorize \$15.0 million to enhance the capability for producing the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system in the United States.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would authorize up to \$15.0 million for non-recurring engineering costs associated with establishing the capacity for United States industry to produce parts and components of the Iron Dome system in the United States, subject to an agreement between the United States and Israel for co-production of Iron Dome parts and components. The provision would also require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit a report to Congress on the plan to implement such agreement, including the estimated costs, schedule, and steps to minimize costs to the government of the United States to implement the agreement. The provision would also clarify that it is not intended to alter the planned Iron Dome procurement schedule or numbers, and would express the sense

of Congress on the importance of a second production source in the United States. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of missile defense cooperation between the United States and Israel.

We believe it is important for industry to pay for a substantial share of the cost of establishing a co-production capacity in the United States. Further, we direct that the Missile Defense Agency not use funds from other programs of record to pay for establishing an Iron Dome production capacity in the United States.

Additional missile defense radar for the protection of the United States homeland (sec. 235)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 234) that would require the Missile Defense Agency to deploy an additional missile defense radar for homeland missile defense, and would authorize \$30.0 million for initial costs toward such deployment.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the Missile Defense Agency to deploy a missile defense radar at a location optimized to support defense of the homeland against long-range missile threats from North Korea, and would authorize \$30.0 million for initial costs toward such deployment. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the United States is able to deploy additional tracking and discrimination sensor capabilities to support defense of the United States from future long-range ballistic missile threats that emerge from Iran. The provision would require the Secretary to submit a report on what sensor capabilities will be available for deployment on the Atlantic side of the United States by 2019, or sooner if Iran flight tests long-range missiles before then, and the manner in which such capabilities will be maintained to ensure they can be deployed in time to support the missile defense of the United States from long-range ballistic missile threats from Iran. We note that the sea-based X-band radar platform and the Cobra Judy ship-based radar platform could serve as interim or surge sensor capabilities in the Atlantic region to support homeland defense against future long-range missile threats that emerge from Iran.

The agreement also authorizes an additional \$50.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency to develop enhanced discrimination capability for the Ballistic Missile Defense System, as reflected in the tables in section 4201. The Missile Defense Agency and the missile defense operational community have identified such discrimination enhancement as a priority for improving the future effectiveness of missile defenses, particularly for homeland missile defense.

Evaluation of options for future ballistic missile defense sensor architectures (sec. 236)

The Senate committee-reported bill included a provision (sec. 235) that would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate options for future ballistic missile defense sensor architectures and to report to the congressional defense committees the results of the evaluation.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with an amendment that would include consideration of options for maximizing the use of various sensors for missile defense and for other missions.

Plans to improve the ground-based midcourse defense system (sec. 237)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 236) that would require the Director of the

Missile Defense Agency and the Commander of the U.S. Northern Command to develop options and a plan to improve the kill assessment capability and the hit assessment capability of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, and to submit a report on the development of such capabilities.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would also require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit a plan for the use of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 funds to develop, test, and deploy an upgraded enhanced exo-atmospheric kill vehicle for the GMD system.

If the report required by the provision is not submitted by April 1, 2014, we direct the Department of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the subject matter required in the report not later than April 1, 2014.

The agreement authorizes \$100.0 million for design and development of common kill vehicle technology for an upgraded enhanced exo-atmospheric kill vehicle for the GMD system, an increase of \$30.0 million above the budget request, to accelerate design and development efforts, as reflected in the tables in section 4201.

Report on potential future homeland ballistic missile defense options (sec. 238)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 231) that would express the sense of Congress concerning the importance of homeland ballistic missile defense against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack from North Korea and Iran, and would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on potential future options for enhancing homeland ballistic missile defense.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision requiring the report, with a clarifying amendment.

The agreement authorizes an additional \$80.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency to continue efforts to understand the cause of the problem that resulted in the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system flight test failure on July 5, 2013, using the Capability Enhancement-I (CE-I) kill vehicle, and take the necessary steps to correct the problem and demonstrate the correction in an intercept flight test.

The CE-I flight test failure occurred after the budget was submitted, and no funds were planned or budgeted to analyze and correct the problem, or to conduct another intercept flight test to demonstrate the correction of the problem. The Missile Defense Agency has stated that its highest priority is correcting the problems associated with the flight test failures of the CE-II and CE-I kill vehicles, and demonstrating the successful corrections through additional intercept flight tests.

We direct that, not later than 60 days after the submission of the report required by the provision, the Government Accountability Office provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees providing its views on the report.

Briefings on status of implementation of certain missile defense matters (sec. 239)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 232) that would require the Missile Defense Agency to construct and make operational in fiscal year 2018 an additional homeland missile defense site, designed to complement the existing sites in Alaska and California, to deal more effectively with missile threats from the Middle East.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to

provide, not later than 180 days after the completion of the site evaluation study required by section 227(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), and 1 year later, a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the status of current efforts and plans to implement the requirements of section 227, including progress and plans toward preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement required by section 227(b), and the development of the contingency plan for the deployment of an additional homeland missile defense interceptor site, in case the President determines to proceed with such an additional deployment, as required by section 227(d).

The agreement authorizes an additional \$20.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency to continue activities relative to the site evaluation study, the Environmental Impact Statement, and planning activities consistent with the requirements of section 227(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, including the development of the contingency plan for the deployment of an additional homeland missile defense interceptor site. Such planning activities should include efforts to update the relevant planning documents from the deployment of missile fields at Fort Greely, Alaska, and plans for the possible deployment of a ground-based-interceptor site in Europe, to prepare for the potential deployment of an additional missile defense site in the continental United States, as well as such other preliminary planning activities as can practicably be commenced prior to site selection, or updated upon site selection.

Sense of Congress and report on NATO and missile defense burden-sharing (sec. 240)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 238) that would require the President to seek specific levels of funding from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for various phases of the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) to missile defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would express the sense of Congress concerning the increasing importance of burden-sharing among the NATO allies for missile defense, and would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees providing: (1) The estimated costs for the EPAA; (2) A description of the level of NATO burden-sharing for the costs of NATO missile defense, including the EPAA; and (3) An assessment of, and recommendations for, areas where the Secretary believes NATO and its members could make additional burden-sharing contributions to NATO missile defense, including the EPAA.

We note that, as declared at the 2010 Lisbon Summit, the United States and its NATO allies share a strong interest in developing and deploying an operationally-effective and cost-effective missile defense capability to defend the territory, population, and military forces of NATO—including forward deployed United States forces—in Europe. The United States and its NATO partners are making a variety of contributions, both individually and collectively, to NATO missile defense, including through national contributions, host-nation basing agreements, and collective funding arrangements. The United States is contributing to the EPAA as its national contribution to NATO missile defense, and a number of NATO allies are providing important support for the EPAA, as well as other support for NATO missile defense. The cancellation of Phase 4 of the EPAA eliminated the contribution that the EPAA would have made toward aug-

menting U.S. homeland missile defenses against potential Iranian intercontinental ballistic missiles.

We believe that burden-sharing is an important NATO principle, and is important to the recently adopted NATO mission of missile defense of NATO territory, population, and military forces. Therefore, while recognizing the important support provided by a number of NATO allies for key aspects of the EPAA, we believe the U.S. Government should encourage other NATO members to provide additional support for NATO missile defense, including the EPAA, to ensure an appropriate level of burden-sharing.

Sense of Congress on deployment of regional ballistic missile defense capabilities (sec. 241)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 233) that would limit the use of funds to remove United States missile defense equipment in East Asia until after certain conditions are met.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes a provision that would express the sense of Congress concerning the deployment of regional ballistic missile defense capabilities.

Sense of Congress on procurement of capability enhancement II exoatmospheric kill vehicle (sec. 242)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 239) that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should not procure additional Capability Enhancement II (CE-II) exo-atmospheric kill vehicles for deployment until after the date on which a successful operational flight test of the CE-II has occurred.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with a technical amendment.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Annual Comptroller General report on the amphibious combat vehicle acquisition program (sec. 251)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 251) that would require the Comptroller General to provide an annual report on the Marine Corps' amphibious combat vehicle acquisition program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision.
Annual Comptroller General of the United States report on the acquisition program for the VXX Presidential Helicopter (sec. 252)

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 251) that would require the Comptroller General to produce an annual report on the VXX presidential helicopter program until the program enters full-rate production or is cancelled, whichever comes first.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the Senate provision with a technical/clarifying amendment.
Report on strategy to improve body armor (sec. 253)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 252) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive research and development strategy for achieving significant weight reductions for body armor components.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with a technical amendment.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Establishment of Communications Security Review and Advisory Board (sec. 261)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 261) that would require the Secretary of De-

fense to establish a senior-level body, to be known as the Cryptographic Modernization Review and Advisory Board, to assess and advise the cryptographic modernization activities of the Department of Defense.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would require the Chief Information Officer to chair the Board, with the Board monitoring overall communications security, cryptographic modernization, and key management efforts of the Department.

Extension and expansion of mechanisms to provide funds for defense laboratories for research and development of technologies for military missions (sec. 262)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 263) that would extend section 219 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2009 (Public Law 110-417) to September 2020. In addition, this provision would allow for funds to be accumulated for not more than 5 years for individual Department of Defense laboratory revitalization projects with costs up to \$4 million, provided prior notification of the total project cost is provided to the congressional defense committees.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 215) that extended section 219 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2009 (Public Law 110-417) to September 2020.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that requires an annual report on the use of the authority granted by this provision, as well as some other clarifying elements.

Extension of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 263)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 264) that would extend the authority of the Department of Defense to award prizes for advanced technology achievements until September 2018.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a similar provision (sec. 213) that would extend this authority until September 2017.

The agreement includes the House provision.

Five-year extension of pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems (sec. 264)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 265) that would extend the Defense Exportability Features pilot program until October 1, 2020.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained an identical provision (sec. 214).

The agreement includes this provision.

Briefing on biometrics of the Department of Defense (sec. 265)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 216) that would place limitations on the Department of Defense to obligate or expend more than 75 percent of funds for future biometric architectures or systems until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees assessing the future program structure and architectural requirements for biometrics enabling capability.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment that would remove the funding limitation and request a briefing, including an assessment of the governance process for requirements across the Department of Defense, as well as interagency and international partners.

Sense of Congress on importance of aligning common missile compartment of Ohio-class replacement program with the United Kingdom's Vanguard successor program (sec. 266)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 223) that would make a series of findings and express the sense of Congress regarding the importance of aligning the common missile compartment of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine program with the Vanguard-class successor program of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes this provision with an amendment that eliminates the findings contained in the House provision.

Sense of Congress on counter-electronics high power microwave missile project (sec. 267)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 224) that expressed a sense of Congress urging the Air Force to consider the Counter-electronics High Power Microwave Advanced Missile Program (CHAMP) technology capability demonstration as a potential weapon option available to combatant commanders by 2016.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement includes the House provision with an amendment clarifying the need to complete developmental planning for such weapons systems if requirements are established by the combatant commanders in the future.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS NOT ADOPTED

Conventional Prompt Global Strike program

The Senate committee-reported bill contained a provision (sec. 211) that would prohibit any funds for the Conventional Prompt Global Strike (CPGS) program until 60 days after they deliver a report to the congressional defense committees addressing the policy consideration concerning the ambiguity problems regarding the launch of CPGS missiles from submarine platforms.

The House bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We agree that no more than 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Defense for research, development, test and evaluation and available for the Prompt Global Strike Capability Development program (PE#64165D8Z) for the CPGS program should be obligated or expended for any activities relating to the development of a submarine-launched capability under that program until 60 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a report that addresses the policy considerations concerning any potential ambiguity problems regarding the launch of a conventionally-armed missile from submarine platforms, potential verification measures, any target sets the Secretary believes a submarine-launched conventionally-armed missile could reach that a missile on board another platform could not reach, the comparative cost considerations of submarine-launched conventional missiles and such systems launched by other platforms.

We also note that in congressional testimony, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, stated that “[t]oday, the only prompt global strike capability to engage potentially time-sensitive, fleeting targets continues to be ballistic missile systems armed with nuclear weapons. We continue to require a deployed conventional prompt strike

capability to provide the President a range of flexible military options to address a small number of highest-value targets, including in an anti-access and area denial environment.”

Unmanned combat air system demonstration testing requirement

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 217) that would require the Secretary of the Navy to demonstrate unmanned, autonomous aerial refueling within the X-47B aircraft testing and evaluation program. The X-47B is an unmanned aircraft being tested under the Unmanned Combat Air System (UCAS) demonstration program.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We understand that the Chief of Naval Operations has decided that, unlike the original Navy plan, the Navy will continue flying the X-47B during fiscal year 2014, and will pursue a number of risk reduction activities. We support these Navy plans for continuing risk reduction activities for UCAS, and encourage the Navy to consider performing the aerial refueling demonstration as part of these additional risk reduction activities.

Requirement to complete individual carbine testing

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 221) that would require the Department of the Army to complete planned testing for an individual carbine.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not contain this provision.

We understand that during the Army's testing of eight candidate carbines under the individual carbine program that none of the carbines met the Army's target for improved reliability requirements. We further understand that these results may be attributable to the interactions between the carbines and the recently introduced M855A1 standard 5.56mm rounds that were used during the test and evaluation. These test results suggest the Army may have used an unrealistically high reliability standard.

Accordingly, we urge the Army to re-evaluate the reliability standard used for this test, as well as other standards as appropriate. We encourage the Secretary of the Army to consider a process for continuous test and evaluation of alternatives to the M4A1 carbine that is based on realistic operational requirements and with significantly improved, but reasonably achievable, performance and reliability. We note that, while the Army may have reduced needs and limited funds to procure large numbers of new rifles or carbines in the near future, maintaining research and development efforts for new small arms in this class is essential to ensure that the industrial base can respond to sudden increases in demand as it did during Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. In this regard, the Secretary of the Army, or designee, is directed to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing that details the Army's long range standard rifle and carbine modernization strategy. This briefing shall be provided not later than April 1, 2014, and shall include the Army's plans, including where appropriate, schedules and funding profiles, for requirements development, technology research and development, procurement, and test and evaluation of commercially available and militarily suitable alternatives.

Establishment of funding line and fielding plan for a Navy laser weapon system

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 222) that would establish a funding line and

fielding plan for a Navy laser weapon system for fiscal year 2018 and beyond.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We are supportive of accelerating the development and transition of directed energy weapons to programs of record, in the Navy as well as the other military departments. However, we believe that it is premature to create such a funding line. We also note that many of the current activities supporting development of directed energy weapons are already embedded in existing research and development program elements, and therefore the creation of a consolidated funding line at this stage could be disruptive to those efforts and potentially detrimental to overall efforts to develop and field a militarily-relevant system.

Analysis of alternatives for successor to Precision Tracking Space System

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 235) that would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to perform an analysis of alternatives for a successor sensor system to the Precision Tracking Space System.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress on 30th anniversary of the Strategic Defense Initiative

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 240) that would express the sense of Congress concerning the 30th anniversary of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Sense of Congress on negotiations affecting the missile defenses of the United States

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 242) that would express the sense of Congress concerning negotiations with the Russian Federation that would affect the missile defenses of the United States.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Report on main battle tank fuel efficiency

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 253) that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on an investment strategy to accelerate fuel efficiency improvements to the engine and transmission of the M1 Abrams tank.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the Army and Marine Corps currently have no plan to replace the M1A2 or M1A1 Abrams main battle tank. We are also aware that the Army intends to proceed with a series of engineering change proposals that will incrementally enhance the platform's capabilities. We believe that the Army should accelerate the next series of Abrams upgrades where warranted by capability gaps or opportunities, technological maturity, and affordability. In this regard, the Army and Marine Corps should consider replacement of the current engine with a modern, fuel efficient power train. Therefore, the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than June 1, 2014, on a business case analysis and an investment strategy that could accelerate

the technology development and engineering change proposal processes to include a modern fuel efficient engine and transmission for the M1 Abrams series main battle tank.

Report on powered rail system

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 254) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees that comprehensively reviews and compares powered rail systems for the M4 Carbine system.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

The Secretary of the Army, or designee, is directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2014 on an assessment of the current M4/M16-mounted battery requirements associated with a 3-day dismounted mission for an Army infantry platoon compared to the same unit and mission if the members were equipped with an integrated weapon-mounted power source. The assessment should compare the battery requirements, numbers, weight, costs, as well as the likely impact on the operational functionality of the M4/M16 configured with an integrated power source, including weapons system effectiveness, efficiency, ergonomics, maintainability, reliability, and related risk. The assessment should also include a business case analysis of the potential acquisition and sustainment costs and savings associated with transitioning to an integrated M4/M16-mounted power technology to replace batteries for individual weapon-mounted components. Finally, the assessment should address the potential utility, if any, of incorporating a data link via such a weapon-mounted power source between soldier communications systems and soldier and weapon sensors. The Director, Operational Test and Evaluation is also directed to oversee the Army's live fire or other operational testing, if any, conducted as part of gathering data for this report.

Report on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics scholarship program

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 255) that would require the Secretary of Defense to assess whether the Department of Defense Science, Mathematics and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship program, or similar programs, could meet the undergraduate and graduate science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) workforce needs of the intelligence community (IC).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include the provision.

We note that the national security community, in general, faces growing challenges with meeting its STEM workforce needs, in particular, attracting top-level U.S. citizens that are eligible for security clearances. The SMART program was established by the Department of Defense to attract and retain promising candidates and STEM leaders into the Department, including components of the IC. SMART provides scholarships to students pursuing technical degrees in disciplines of interest to the Department and the IC. We recognize that the SMART program has been useful in meeting its intent and believe that data provided on the program shows that the SMART program could be used by a broader community within the IC, but any further expansion would require further socialization to increase participation, as well as additional resources to fund any additional students supporting the needs of the IC.

Clarification of eligibility of a State to participate in defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 262) that would modify the eligibility requirements for the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCOR) to bring it more in line with the eligibility requirements of the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCOR) under the National Science Foundation (NSF).

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that while the Department of Defense maintains the statutory authority for DEPSCOR, the Department has not included funds to support the program since 2009 due to changing research needs and priorities. Additionally, even should funds be made available for DEPSCOR in the future, we would be concerned about potential duplication with NSF's EPSCOR. DEPSCOR was originally established as a separate activity from EPSCOR in section 257 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337) because the needs of the Department were not being met by the EPSCOR. Should the Department choose to revitalize the DEPSCOR activity, we believe it should maintain a separate and distinct eligibility requirement to ensure that it is able to meet the separate and distinct research needs of the Department of Defense.

Briefing on power and energy research conducted at university-affiliated research centers

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 266) that would require the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense authorizing committees on power and energy research conducted at university-affiliated research centers.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

Approval of certain new uses of research, development, test, and evaluation land

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 267) that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense or the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government from finalizing any decision regarding new land use activity on ranges, test areas, or other land used by the Department of Defense (DOD) for activities related to research, development, test, and evaluation and determined to be critical to national security unless the secretary concerned approves such activity in writing.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We note that the DOD Siting Clearinghouse was created to preserve military readiness and protect DOD capabilities from incompatible energy infrastructure development by collaborating with DOD components and external stakeholders to prevent, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts on military operations, readiness, and testing. The Clearinghouse is intended to be the single point of contact and principal advocate for DOD equities in all such deliberations.

We understand that as a result of the Clearinghouse review of the Sun Zia Southwest Transmission Project, DOD raised significant concerns and identified potential impacts on the capabilities of the White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) in New Mexico. According to an August 7, 2013, letter from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of De-

fense for Installations and Environment to the Principal Deputy Director of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the route of the proposed transmission line, without mitigation, "would result in an unacceptable risk to national security. If a bulk power transmission line is constructed along the selected route, it would preclude our capability to fully test the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Architecture and other weapon systems under realistic threat environments at WSMR. This testing is absolutely necessary and it should be clearly understood that no other location exists in the United States where it is possible to conduct flight tests with the footprint requirements these weapons systems present. Critical to fully testing joint military weapons are the preservation of the restricted airspace (from the surface to unlimited) on the range area on WSMR, and the permanently-designated and specially-allocated restricted airspace in the northern extension area."

We expect that as the Sun Zia Southwest Transmission project approval request proceeds, DOD concerns will be addressed by the executive branch to preserve this critical resource. We expect that appropriate mitigation measures will be included concurrent to the issuance of a Record of Decision by BLM.

Should DOD concerns not be addressed in this case, we direct the Secretary of Defense to review the processes and effectiveness of the DOD Siting Clearinghouse and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after a Record of Decision with proposals that will improve the ability of the Clearinghouse to assess impacts to national security in a timely manner and ultimately preserve military readiness and protect DOD capabilities from incompatible energy infrastructure development.

Canines as stand-off detection of explosives and explosive precursors

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 268) that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide a report on the capability and infrastructure required to support canines as stand-off detection of explosives and explosive precursors.

The Senate committee-reported bill contained no similar provision.

The agreement does not include this provision.

We direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The report shall make a determination based on requirements if the DOD, and each military service, intends to develop and maintain the capability and infrastructure required to support canines as stand-off detection of explosives and explosive precursors. If deemed appropriate by the Secretary, the report shall also detail: (1) The acquisition process with respect to canines as stand-off detection of explosives and explosive precursors; (2) The procedures established by the DOD to ensure that canines reach or exceed the appropriate performance standards; (3) A plan to ensure that the latest data and information regarding canine capabilities are distributed throughout the DOD; (4) Any technologies capable of replacing the canine as a stand-off detection capability; and (5) A determination of the relevant office to oversee the above elements.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Operation and maintenance funding (sec. 301)

The House bill contained a provision (sec. 301) authorizing appropriations for fiscal