
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING

FEBRUARY 29, 2012

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. THORNBERRY

Mr. THORNBERRY. If you were to relocate the headquarters of US AFRICOM, what weighted factors would you deem important in determining the location for the command? What confluence of features and parameters create an ideal location for the headquarters of US AFRICOM? What kind of community would properly support the mission of the command?

General HAM. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is currently leading a comprehensive, congressionally mandated, Basing Alternatives Study which will assess the cost-benefit with moving the headquarters from its current location to the United States. We provided the requisite operational data to support their analysis of the comparative costs, benefits, and risks.

Strategically and operationally, our current location provides for effective command, control and coordination of operations. We demonstrated this during Operation ODYSSEY DAWN (OOD) in Libya. A key factor in OOD's successful execution was that the Headquarters lies in the same time zone (+/- 3 hours) of the entire African continent, including Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa, the command's service components, U.S. European Command and our European allies and partners active in Africa.

Cost is also a consideration. Alternative options must account for the significant expense associated with a move from Stuttgart including the infrastructure costs related to any new headquarters facility. The cost associated with travel to the continent to meet face to face with our African partners, where strong personal relationships are valued and critical for working effectively together to address threats, is essential and will be a recurring obligation.

Until a final decision is made, we will continue to accomplish our mission from Stuttgart, where our proximity to Africa, both geographically and in terms of time zones, facilitates our ability to build relationships with our African partners, and where our service members, civilians and their families can serve from a safe and well-supported location. Once the study is complete, we will comply with the guidance and decision of the Secretary of Defense.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. Admiral Stavridis, in past years, several nations in the EUCOM AOR have been subject to sophisticated cyberattacks in conjunction with political and military conflicts. To what extent do we communicate with these countries on cyber threats?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. EUCOM is the executive agent for five Information Assurance/Cyber Defense Information Exchange Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs), which are negotiated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Chief Information Office. These agreements facilitate sharing classified information with key regional partners, building robust relationships, and strengthening collective cyber security. Absent such MOUs, we can exchange only unclassified information.

CYBER ENDEAVOR is EUCOM's premier cyber security program for advancing collaboration, familiarization, and engagement with partner nations. It is designed to strengthen cyber defense capabilities through seminars, events, and exercises with NATO, partner nations, academia, and industry. Owing to the critical role that the cyber domain plays in military operations, CYBER ENDEAVOR is essential to maintaining and improving force readiness for deployment in support of multinational crisis response activities, combined exercises, and future missions.

Mr. LANGEVIN. How has your communication with other countries changed as a result of the inclusion of cyber in the 2010 NATO strategic concept, and are there limitations on your ability to communicate with these and other EUCOM AOR countries on cybersecurity-related matters that need to be addressed?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mr. LANGEVIN. To what extent is EUCOM involved with cyber threats that are associated with terrorism and organized crime?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Both terrorist organizations and organized crime syndicates are certainly well-versed in employing the cyber domain to assist them in their nefarious activities. Primarily, however, the cyber domain is employed by these two groups as a means of facilitation: recruiting, fundraising, propaganda messaging, or cyber crime schemes to defraud unwitting victims. While certainly problematic, these uses of the internet do not rise to the level of “cyber threats,” as the relative lack of “cyber sophistication” generally demonstrated by these groups does not threaten EUCOM networks in the way that more tech-savvy adversaries might be able to.

Mr. LANGEVIN. How has EUCOM’s cyber threat environment changed over the past year, and where do you see it going in the near term? Are we adequately prepared?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. EUCOM’s threat environment over the past year has seen an increase in hacker-activist (colloquially termed “hacktivist”) threat activity from non-state actors. The expectation is that the hacktivist threat will continue to increase in the near term. Preparing for an evolving and changing threat such as hacktivism is a challenge, but the agile and flexible work force at EUCOM is the best defense for such a dynamic adversary.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Are EUCOM’s lines of communication and responsibility well defined with regards to operational cyber?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The recently adopted construct for command and control (C2) of cyberspace operations specifies command relationships, roles, and responsibilities of Combatant Commands, Services, and Agencies for operations in the cyber domain, consistent with existing authorities, requirements, and capabilities. This standardized framework will help EUCOM configure, operate, and maintain its Theater networks, allowing it to effectively operate in and through cyberspace in support of command requirements. The cyber C2 construct will continue to be refined as it is implemented over the coming year.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I have been very concerned over time about the capabilities of our bases here in the United States to withstand a cyberattack directed against outside supporting infrastructure, such as the electrical grid. Have you examined the ability of overseas bases in your areas of responsibility to operate in the event of such an attack?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mr. LANGEVIN. Do you see significant challenges or capability shortfalls where our research and development investments and capabilities could help you in achieving operational goals?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Research and development investments and capabilities play a key role in satisfying our capability shortfalls. We have a robust process of identifying and validating our capability shortfalls, in coordination with OSD and Joint Staff, which leverages ongoing research and development efforts. We proactively engage the research and development community to identify capabilities that would enhance our ongoing operations. Several areas in which we have seen benefits include ballistic missile defense, countering illicit activities, cyber security, and knowledge management.

The most significant challenge to addressing operational requirements with research and development (R&D) investment exists in the potential for Combatant Command (COCOM)- oriented R&D programs to be curtailed. Programs such as the Joint Capability Technology Demonstration (JCTD) provide the COCOM with the ability to target R&D efforts to rapidly identify new solutions to meet joint urgent and emergent operational needs. Continued support of the JCTD program, combined with the efforts of the Service Laboratories, enables new technologies to be developed supporting a broad range of capabilities. Recent challenges to R&D funding have had a measurable effect on the pursuit of technological solutions to meet operational requirements.

EUCOM has identified a number of challenges and capability shortfalls where increased R&D will indeed help find solutions to operational goals, managed formally through the Comprehensive Joint Assessment (CJA) process (which identifies longer-term theater requirements appropriate for R&D). More immediate-term shortfalls are identified in the EUCOM Integrated Priority List. Despite the timing differences, there are a number of common topics identified in these two documents. Three areas where we believe there needs to be additional effort are in ballistic missile defense, energy security, and cyber defense.

Energy Security. There are dramatic changes occurring in the energy domain that portend real risks to forces in terms of sourcing and vulnerability. These changes require earnest effort into developing energy-independent platforms and facilities as

well as visibility and accountability of how we use energy and entirely different and significantly less vulnerable ways to power the force.

Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD). BMD is taking on an increasingly important role due to current events, which requires more attention in the R&D community. We are accepting real risk in system capabilities such as data fusion and defense planning tools, as well as in operational and communications capabilities and enhancements.

Cyber Defense. Threats to our cyber domain are continually increasing. Despite significant Department-wide efforts, we are concerned that we are not allocating significant resources to mitigate these potentially crippling threats. We are a leading partner in development of cyber domain command and control, enumeration of adversary, insider, friendly, and environmental activities, and experimentation in cyber authority delegation, but more R&D work and investment is urgently needed in these areas.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I have been very concerned over time about the capabilities of our bases here in the United States to withstand a cyberattack directed against outside supporting infrastructure, such as the electrical grid. Have you examined the ability of overseas bases in your areas of responsibility to operate in the event of such an attack?

General HAM. We have examined whether our systems would be able to withstand a cyber attack directed against outside supporting infrastructure at Camp Lemonnier, in Djibouti, our only enduring location in our area of responsibility, and at locations where we maintain a temporary military presence. We also regularly conduct assessments to determine the likely effects of an attack and measure redundancy to ensure we are able to continue operations. As needed, we refine our plans to ensure continuity of operations. While the loss of outside supporting infrastructure would have a detrimental effect, we would be able to sustain critical functions.

Mr. LANGEVIN. General Ham, to what extent has the transnational terrorism threat in Africa changed over the past year, and have you seen communication and coordination between different terrorist elements or criminal organizations?

General HAM. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mr. LANGEVIN. Do any developments demand a change in U.S. posture with regard to training, support, or counter-terrorism programs, both military and civilian?

General HAM. Events in Africa over the past year provide both opportunities and challenges. The Arab Spring gives us the opportunity to assist in the development of new governments and militaries while instability in East Africa and the Sahel region of North Africa requires greater vigilance to address threats posed by violent extremist organizations. Despite the dynamic nature of Africa, however, no major changes in U.S. posture, other than my previously stated requirement for additional collection assets, are required at this time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Do you see significant challenges or capability shortfalls where our research and development investments and capabilities could help you in achieving operational goals?

General HAM. There are several areas where the Research and Development (R&D) community can assist us in meeting our operational goals. Our top priority is for improved Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) systems that include near-real time processing, exploitation, dissemination, and communications capabilities to improve on-station time, persistence and timely delivery of information. Also, we would benefit from ISR systems with foliage penetration or counter-concealment capability. Additionally, investment in Identity Resolution capabilities such as biometrics, document exploitation, and forensics capabilities could provide critical indications and warnings. R&D investments in a Friendly Force Tracking capability integrated with a command and control system for Joint Personnel Recovery (JPR) locator beacons would improve JPR operations. In the medical arena, timely and cost effective rapid diagnostic testing, surveillance, monitoring and reporting capabilities would help us keep our personnel healthy while they are conducting operations, engagements, and exercises on the continent in remote areas of known infectious diseases. Lastly, given the diverse environment and lack of a reliable infrastructure, further investment in portable, lightweight, long enduring, regenerating power technologies would enable continuous operations while reducing the amount of weight and demand for replenishment of power (e.g. batteries, fuel).

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. TURNER

Mr. TURNER. As you know, the European Phased Adaptive Approach is being offered by the United States as a contribution to NATO. This means we're offering it free-of-charge. What discussions are taking place to make sure that our allies chip in a fair share of this system which, as you know, solely defends Europe until at least 2020? As a corollary, does EUCOM know how much this system will cost it through the four phases of the EPAA?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Many of our Allies already possess low-tier Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) capabilities, either in the form of U.S. Patriot systems or French SAM-T systems. Germany and Italy remain committed to development of the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) program which would provide increased lower tier capability. For upper-tier capability development, The Netherlands recently committed to upgrading their maritime forces to be able to support BMD operations (sensor only for now); Germany, Denmark, and Norway are examining the feasibility of similar upgrades for their maritime forces. Finally, it is important to note that the basing access which Spain, Turkey, Romania, and Poland are providing for our planned EPAA forces is yet another form of Allied contribution. As to the long term costs of EPAA, this question is best answered by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) who can consolidate Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and Service-related costs.

Mr. TURNER. Second, this document (**See the chart on page 171**) is from a recent NATO PA Joint Committee meeting, specifically a presentation to the NATO PA from Mr. Frank Boland, Director of Planning for the Defence Policy and Planning Division on the NATO International Staff. What it shows is that even accounting for inflation, the United States foots the overwhelming majority, perhaps as much as 75%, of the defense spending in NATO. This was a clear lesson from the operation in Libya, when even some of our strongest allies ran out of basic munitions. Given your dual role as EUCOM Command and Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, please explain what this chart means to you?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. What this slide shows is that since 9/11 the United States has invested heavily in its armed forces, ensuring that they have the right resources for the mission and its operations across the globe. This slide, unfortunately, does not capture what part of the U.S. defense budget is committed to the Alliance, and what part is committed to other global defense and security priorities. With the exception of a very few (France, UK, to an extent Canada) Allied defense spending is 100% dedicated to NATO defense. Hence, comparing the U.S. defense spending to Allies' defense spending is difficult to do since many Allies focus on defense purely in support of NATO. We know that the financial crisis has hit many of our Allies hard, and it is indeed affecting U.S. defense spending in a similar manner, but we are all seeking ways to best address the challenges we face. What is important to remember is that the Alliance is working hard to ensure that it has the appropriate capabilities to meet the ambitions set out in the 2010 Strategic Concept. Much of the focus for the NATO Summit in Chicago this May will be on defense capabilities and ensuring the Allies, and hence the Alliance, remain capable to meet their Washington treaty obligations.

Mr. TURNER. We also spoke briefly about the fine work of our Georgian Allies in Afghanistan. As you know, three of their soldiers were killed last week in an IED attack and one of their officers is at the Walter Reed Army hospital right now, having suffered multiple amputations. a. Can you speak to the contributions of the Georgians in Afghanistan? b. As you know, there are at least seven Non-NATO states present at that facility undertaking NATO coordination activities for Special Operations. Yesterday, four members of the U.S. NATO PA delegation and I wrote to you (**See the letter on page 172**) asking you to review what needs to be done for Georgia to join the NATO SOF HQ. Do you support such a step?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. To date, the Georgian contribution to ISAF has been indispensable to the overall effort and has contributed considerably to United States capabilities and success in Regional Command Southwest. They have already sent four battalions on six-month deployments since 2010, and recently offered to double their commitment, and beginning in October will provide two battalions every six months. They have served valiantly to date suffering significant casualties while volunteering to conduct all the same missions as the U.S. Marines. The Georgians also secure a significant amount of territory (own battle space) in Helmand Province, an exception among other non-NATO partners.

To begin dialog on participation in the NATO Special Operations HQ (NSHQ), Georgia would need to gain a special security arrangement with NATO in accordance with the NSHQ governing legal framework, which first requires meeting certain NATO operational security benchmarks. Georgia would then need to establish

a formal sponsorship arrangement with one of the NSHQ participating NATO member nations. Such a sponsorship arrangement would likely require as a prerequisite a full assessment of Georgian SOF capabilities and follow-on training support.

Pending resolution of these issues, I support Georgian participation in the NATO Special Operations HQ.

Mr. TURNER. Ms. Sanchez and I are the heads of the Congressional Romania Caucus, which has 32 members. When we spoke last week we discussed the interest of Romania in purchasing F-16 fighters from the United States. Can you speak to where that proposal stands? Do you believe a part of “smart defense” should be making sure our allies are properly equipped?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. BORDALLO

Ms. BORDALLO. President Obama has made reducing reliance on contractors and rebalancing the workforce a major management initiative of his Administration. In your opinion, given the restrictions on the size of your civilian workforce imposed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, does the current EUCOM workforce construct reflect an appropriately balanced workforce between civilian, military and contract support across all major capabilities, functional areas, and requirements? Please support your response with workforce and cost data as required by statutes and policies.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, EUCOM Headquarters reorganized to embrace an inter-agency and “whole of society/government” approach to maintaining security and stability in Europe and Eurasia, while shaping existing structures to accommodate the security environment through 2020. Our assessment allowed us to reshape EUCOM Headquarters to ensure an organization that “effectively conducts the mission efficiently.” Directorates prioritized all permanent billets in order to identify those with the lowest priority. Directorates also developed a prioritized list of manpower requirements, drawn from the “gaps” that we identified in our assessment. Both the assessment and the prioritization of on hand resources looked at the enterprise across the board, and took into account all categories of available manpower (civilian, military, contractor, and Reserve Component). Permanent manpower requirements were accommodated from within the HQ USEUCOM staff, using lowest priority billets as offsets and other available human resources for mitigating or bridging any capability gaps.

The results allowed EUCOM Headquarters to execute an internal staff rebalance without incurring any growth. In accordance with our new mission-set the staff developed a re-prioritization of all permanent billets. This new prioritization presented leadership a picture of our bottom 10% zone in anticipation of additional reductions in manpower and fiscal resources that we took as directed by the SECDEF.

To achieve these ends, EUCOM Headquarters relies on the guidance and policy published in DODI 1100.22, Policy and Procedures for Determining Workforce Mix and CJCSI 1001.01A, Joint Manpower And Personnel Program. EUCOM Headquarters supplements and provides further procedural guidance within the Command through its command instructions, ECI 1601.02, Manpower (currently under revision) and command guidance ECG 5101.01, EUCOM Organization and Functions (currently under revision). Additionally, the Command conducts regular directorate manpower reviews and detailed Strength Reports that highlight trends across all categories of manpower.

Ms. BORDALLO. In your prepared statement, you stated that EUCOM has implemented Contract Management Boards to review all manpower contracts for possible in-sourcing or reduction. How do you define manpower contracts and how does that reconcile with requirements of 10 USC 2330a?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Manpower Contracts are services contracts provided by industry to government to place subject matter experts and specialists or consultants in place to perform specific requirements in place of non-available military or civilian manpower. EUCOM's Contract Management Board considers the information set forth in 10 U.S.C 2330a(c)(2), relating to the reporting requirements for manpower contract issues.

Ms. BORDALLO. Your prepared statement indicated that EUCOM uses Manpower Governance Boards to validate authorized billets, and have willingly accepted greater risk in our Program Objective Memorandum in order to fund our most important missions and functions. To what extent do these Boards ensure compliance with statutory requirements and Personnel & Readiness issued policies related to workforce mix, cost, and risk?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The Manpower Governance Board (MGB) is the strategic governing body within USEUCOM to review and recommend changes to EUCOM's total force manpower. The purpose of the MGB is to ensure EUCOM's manpower resources, as well as its manpower policies and processes, are aligned to achieve the most important strategic and functional objectives of the Command within available funding. According to its charter, the MGB will:

a. Provide oversight and policy guidance to the manpower governance processes to include the Compensation Review Board (CRB), Joint Reserve Requirements Board (JRRB), and the Contract Management Board (CMB) actions that will result in contracted manpower. The MGB represents the decision-making authority for these governance processes and will serve to synchronize manpower decision-making.

b. Ensure that requests for increased manpower, permanent and temporary over-hires, are prioritized and consistent with EUCOM strategic objectives.

c. Ensure that internally-generated initiatives to realign manpower (e.g., across directorates; convert temporary positions to permanent) are consistent with EUCOM missions, avoid redundancy, and minimize risk to accomplishment of work. This includes contractor to civilian conversions (Concept Plan submissions), and military to civilian conversions (Defense Manpower Review Process and Reserve Component).

d. Ensure that EUCOM has sufficient manpower deployed to its most critical missions and functions.

e. Provide transparency in manpower resource decision-making and resource allocation within and across directorates.

The membership of the MGB includes: EUCOM Assistant Chief of Staff (ACOS) and Deputy ECJ1, who serve as co-chairs. The ACOS serves as the voting member for the Special Staff. The MGB also includes primary and alternate O-6 or GS-15 deputy-level representatives from each EUCOM numbered J-code directorate. The MGB submits recommendations to the EUCOM Chief of Staff for final approval.

The Manpower, Personnel, and Administration Directorate (ECJ1) staff will provide facilitation and analytic support to the MGB, and serves as the office of primary responsibility for the MGB. ECJ1 serves as manpower requirement and personnel policy subject matter expert to the J codes/Special Staff and the MGB, owns the operation of the manpower governance processes, analyzes business case analysis-based manpower increase requests (to assess the validity and priority of the request, as well as the best sourcing options for the requirement), and conducts analysis of current manpower alignment to ensure that internally-generated manpower realignment initiatives (e.g., across directorates; convert temporary positions to permanent) are consistent with EUCOM missions and minimize risk to the accomplishment of work.

Ms. BORDALLO. Did EUCOM seek relief from DOD-mandated civilian personnel levels in order to insource contracted work more cost-effectively performed by civilians?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. No, not during the last fiscal year. But, yes, over the last 5 years in order to accomplish insourcing. And EUCOM coordinated with the Joint Staff to ensure our manpower requirements were adequately reflected within the existing civilian personnel level.

Ms. BORDALLO. To what extent has EUCOM used insourcing to reduce reliance on contractors, rebalance its workforce, and generate efficiencies?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. EUCOM Headquarters has been reducing reliance on contractors since 2006 and rebalancing our workforce. Several contracts have been cancelled due to mission accomplishment or when no longer needed. More than 60 contractor billets have been transitioned to civilian positions, creating efficiencies and cost avoidance of more than \$3 million.

Ms. BORDALLO. Are you comfortable that all contracted services currently supporting EUCOM are the most cost-effective and risk-averse source of labor?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes. EUCOM continues to integrate updated DOD guidance to support a more efficient manpower solution. Through our contract management board process, we review alternatives to contracted services as well as conduct a "cost benefit analysis" to ensure that we are meeting the intent of 8108(c) and the Campaign to Cut Waste Guidance. We feel confident that we have taken the necessary measures to develop a process that achieves a cost effective source of labor, and our contract management board decisions continue to yield cost savings.

Ms. BORDALLO. What processes are in place within EUCOM to ensure the workload associated with reductions being made in the civilian workforce is in fact ceasing, as opposed to being absorbed by other labor sources such as contractors or military personnel?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. After the SECDEF Efficiency Initiatives reduction to the EUCOM Headquarters, EUCOM initiated EUCOM 2020 Phase III to review and as-

sess manpower against functions and rebalance the staff, if necessary, in order to correctly align appropriate manpower against the highest priority missions and functions, while taking additional risk in lower priority missions and functions.

The EUCOM staff prepared organizational functional risk assessments and identified areas of risk or functions that could either be deleted or transferred. The risk assessments and staff rebalance was approved by the EUCOM Deputy Commander on 8 June 2011, and the list of deleted functions was approved on 11 November 2011.

Subsequently, the EUCOM Organization and Functions Manual is being completely revised. Combined with the risk assessment tool developed during EUCOM 2020 Phase III and the Annual Manpower Process, through which organizations identify additional manpower requirements within EUCOM, the Command will conduct an analysis on an annual basis to ensure that manpower is correctly allocated, and that any reduction in either the military or civilian workforce reflects the elimination or reduction in the associated mission or function.

Ms. BORDALLO. In the EUCOM plan for the inventory of contracts for services in accordance with section 8108(c) of last year's appropriations act, signed by your Director of Manpower, Personnel, and Administration on October 1, 2011, and submitted to the congressional defense committees as part of the consolidated DOD plan, EUCOM planned to begin modifying statements of work beginning October 1, 2011. How many contract actions have been executed with the new requirements since October 1, 2011?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Contract actions initiated by EUCOM Headquarters are processed by several contracting organizations in Europe and the United States. Contracting Officer's Representatives have been coordinating with these contracting agencies and have commenced contract modifications as existing contracts come up for renewal. At least 12 out of 24 services contracts supporting EUCOM Headquarters have been executed with the new requirements. We expect to have all contracts modified by the beginning of fiscal year 2013.

Ms. BORDALLO. There was a lot of discussion last year about the "exceptions" to the FY10 civilian levels Secretary Gates' mandated. Please provide a detailed list of all exceptions EUCOM has had approved to date and the reason for those exceptions, as well as any exceptions that were requested but not approved, and the justification for such.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Subsequent to the Secretary's August 2010 announcement of a civilian "freeze," EUCOM did request exceptions to the limit. None of those requests were granted.

Specifically, in September 2010, EUCOM requested exceptions for the following 28 positions:

Ballistic Missile Defense—13 positions Interagency engagement—1 positions Strategy for Active Security—2 positions Academic coordination—1 position Critical Infrastructure (counter-terrorism, information technology, cyber)—3 positions Defense Intelligence Agency conversion of 20 Air Force military positions—8 positions

There were no specific justifications for denial of these requests for exceptions.

Ms. BORDALLO. As efficiencies are being executed across EUCOM, is the workload and functions associated with those being tracked as eliminated or divested through the annual inventory of functions?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Beginning in August 2010, EUCOM participated in the Secretary of Defense Efficiency Initiatives that resulted in a loss of both manpower and funding to the headquarters. From December 2010 to June 2011, the management headquarters staff conducted EUCOM 2020 Phase III, a project that involved conducting a headquarters-wide functional risk assessment and resulted in reorganizing and rebalancing the staff. The functional risk assessments also resulted in recommendations for functional deletions, which was approved by the Deputy Commander on 9 November 2011.

The U.S. European Command Organization and Functions Manual (ECM 5100.01) has been completely revised from previous versions. The last version to be approved by the EUCOM Chief of Staff was dated 1 October 2009. On 22 June 2011, the Director, ECJ1 signed an interim guidance ECG 5100.01, which captured organizational changes to the Command but did not review or update the associated functions.

The starting point for this version of ECM 5100.01 is the functions developed during the EUCOM 2020 Phase III organizational risk assessments and approved by the EUCOM Deputy Commander on 8 June 2011. Reductions in manpower also forced directorates and special staff sections to reorganize in order to operate more efficiently. The current version reflects functions eliminated during EUCOM 2020 Phase III. Future versions will track further reductions.

It is expected that the EUCOM Organization and Functions Manual will provide a common foundation as the Command continues to periodically update the organization functional risk assessments and potentially absorb additional reductions in manpower or changes to missions and priorities.

Ms. BORDALLO. President Obama has made reducing reliance on contractors and rebalancing the workforce a major management initiative of his Administration. In your opinion, given the restrictions on the size of your civilian workforce imposed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, does the current AFRICOM workforce construct reflect an appropriately balanced workforce between civilian, military and contract support across all major capabilities, functional areas, and requirements? Please support your response with workforce and cost data as required by statutes and policies.

General HAM. Our headquarters has an adequate, balanced and skilled workforce. We are currently authorized 804 military and 827 civilians. As the command formed, we bridged some personnel gaps with contractors until permanent manpower was assigned, but have since divested many of those contracts.

From Fiscal Year (FY)10 to the end of FY12 we will have reduced a total of 67 contractors for a savings of over \$17 million. Specifically, in FY10 we replaced 50 contractors with permanent military and civilian personnel for a savings of \$13.5 million; in FY11 when contractor to civilian conversions were no longer authorized, we reduced one contractor for a savings of \$275K; in FY12 we will divest another 16 contractors with an expected savings of over \$4 million.

In our Intelligence Directorate, the majority of positions are authorized and managed by the Defense Intelligence Agency. In FY12, the Secretary of Defense directed geographic combatant commands to resize their Joint Intelligence Operations Centers. This will result in a FY12 reduction of \$2.8 million in funding for contracts equating to 10 Contract Manpower Equivalents and an additional \$5.2 million in FY13 equating to 19 Contract Manpower Equivalents. Additionally, in complying with the President's guidance, we have consistently vetted contract requirements through a corporate board for validation and funding. The board meets as often as biweekly in a continuous effort to reduce contract support.

Ms. BORDALLO. You indicated in your prepared statement, you indicated that throughout Africa, small teams of soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, coastguardsmen, and DOD civilians and contractors, along with teammates from many other U.S. Government agencies, conduct a wide range of engagements in support of U.S. security interests. How many contractors does AFRICOM currently have operating throughout Africa and what work are they performing? Given the mission and operating environment, is this the most appropriate and cost-effective form of labor to meet support U.S. security interests?

General HAM. As of 1 Feb 12, 370 contractors were accompanying U.S. forces in Africa. These contractors provide communication support, transportation, training, base support, general logistics and construction. Some of the considerations in deciding to hire contractors to perform a particular mission on the African continent are a review of factors such as the mission duration, the immediacy of the presence, and the availability of service members or civilians with the required skill set within the Department of Defense (DOD) or other federal agencies. Given limited DOD resources, contractors are often required to fill gaps in capability. A majority of the contracts on the continent are awarded based on full and open competition with a desire to maintain a small footprint. Any sole source requirement is accompanied with required justification. The labor mix (contractor/DOD civilian/military) has been evaluated and determined to be appropriate. The contract costs associated with labor are determined based on best contracting practices. These numbers do not reflect contractors that our components may use to provide basic support services to our deployed personnel at various locations on the African continent.

Ms. BORDALLO. Did AFRICOM seek relief from DOD-mandated civilian personnel levels in order to insource contracted work more cost-effectively performed by civilians?

General HAM. Yes; we requested relief to continue in-sourcing positions. There was a short window of opportunity to identify these positions. Our Operations Directorate had a standing plan to convert 33 positions over two years. We were successful in having these approved for Fiscal Year 12. Further guidance from the Department of Defense absolved the possibility of in-sourcing. Even without in-sourcing, we continue to reduce reliance on the use of contractors.

Ms. BORDALLO. To what extent has AFRICOM used insourcing to reduce reliance on contractors, rebalance its workforce, and generate efficiencies?

General HAM. During the initial establishment of the Command, we relied heavily on contractors to fill gaps until permanent personnel arrived. In Fiscal Year (FY)10

we began an in-sourcing plan in our Operations Directorate which targeted contractors in key mission areas, such as our current operations, future operations, information operations, and anti-terrorism divisions. Based on the guidance at the time for in-sourcing, we identified approximately 50 contractor positions to in-source over a two year period. In FY10 we identified 22 positions, with the remainder to follow in FY11 and FY12. We continue to scrutinize contracts vetting each contract requirement through a corporate board for validation and funding. The board meets as frequently as biweekly in a continuous effort to reduce contract support. We have also generated efficiencies by internal realignments while managing acceptable risk to mission accomplishment.

Ms. BORDALLO. Are you comfortable that all contracted services currently supporting AFRICOM are the most cost-effective and risk-averse source of labor?

General HAM. Yes; however we continue to evaluate ways to implement cost savings whenever possible. Part of any decision to hire contractors to perform a particular mission in Africa is a review of such factors as the duration of the mission; the immediacy of our participation; and the availability of service members or civilians with the required skills within the Department of Defense or other agencies. A large portion of our contract support lies in skills that are not readily available in the government workforce with the required skill currency.

Ms. BORDALLO. What processes are in place within AFRICOM to ensure the workload associated with reductions being made in the civilian workforce is in fact ceasing, as opposed to being absorbed by other labor sources such as contractors or military personnel?

General HAM. We have a number of internal processes to review labor activities. These processes include a Civilian Hiring Review Board, a Joint Manpower Working Group and a Business Management Working Group which conducts a holistic review of all contracts, contract renewals and workforce related activities.

Ms. BORDALLO. In the AFRICOM plan for the inventory of contracted services in accordance with section 8108(c) of last year's appropriations act, signed by your Acting Director of Resources September 29, 2011, and submitted to the congressional defense committees as part of the consolidated DOD plan, AFRICOM planned to begin modifying statements of work beginning October 1, 2011. How many contract actions have been executed with the new requirements since October 1, 2011?

General HAM. AFRICOM does not have contracting authority, therefore we are supported by various contracting offices. Of the 17 contracts anticipated to be reported in the inventory of contracted services, 11 contracts have been modified to include the support for the Contract Management Reporting Application. We anticipate the contracting offices will have the remaining six contracts modified prior to 1 October 2012.

Ms. BORDALLO. There was a lot of discussion last year about the "exceptions" to the FY10 civilian levels Secretary Gates mandated. Please provide a detailed list of all exceptions AFRICOM has had approved to date and the reason for those exceptions, as well as any exceptions that were requested but not approved, and the justification for such.

General HAM. The Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) Global Offices of Security Cooperation (OSC) Review identified a 5 year expansion plan for U.S. Africa Command to meet expanding DSCA and command programs. We requested 17 civilian exemptions for Fiscal Year (FY) 11 and in FY12 we requested an exception for 24 civilian positions in support of this expansion of programs in our OSCs on the continent.

Also, for FY12 we requested an exception for 33 positions identified in our Operations Directorate in-sourcing plan from FY10 to divest the headquarters of contractors in critical mission areas. Additionally for FY12, we were awarded an exception for 13 civilian positions for the Management Headquarters which are critical to the command's engagement missions. We were not provided justification for additions or deletions.

Ms. BORDALLO. As efficiencies are being executed across AFRICOM, is the workload and functions associated with those being tracked as eliminated or divested through the annual inventory of functions?

General HAM. As we execute efficiencies, the workload is either eliminated, decreased or modified. Specifically, contracted manpower is decreasing due to the temporary nature of assigned tasks. Reorganization resulted in further reductions in administration and overhead and enhanced the efficiency of the command in terms of planning and operations. Our Operations and Functions Manual is currently being rewritten to reflect functional changes and workload.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. There is a significant decrease in the number of troops in the EUCOM AOR with two Army BCTs being relocated to CONUS. Is this going to create excess intra-theater airlift capacity in the EUCOM AOR?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. No, the inactivation of the two Army Heavy Brigades will not create excess intra-theater airlift capacity in the EUCOM AOR. The United States Air Forces in Europe (USAFE) provides intra-theater airlift capabilities to both the United States European Command (EUCOM) and the United States African Command (AFRICOM). These capabilities support a broad spectrum of EUCOM missions that include routine airlift channel missions, airlift in support of regional contingencies, exercises and training, airlift for EUCOM and AFRICOM components, and activities supporting building partnerships/building partnership capacity (BP/BPC).

The 173rd Airborne Brigade's Joint Airborne/Air Transport Training requirements was considered as one of the many factors in determining the intra-theater airlift capacity requirements for EUCOM; the two heavy Brigades were not included in the study as both were scheduled to return to CONUS during the study period. The 173rd ABCT is one of the two remaining BCTs in Europe.

Mr. CONAWAY. What OPLAN does the C-130J unit at Ramstein support and how many non-training missions does the C-130J unit fly per day?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mr. CONAWAY. With the reduction in A-10s and F-16s and the Army troop reductions in Europe, in your professional opinion, do we have excess basing capacity in Europe that could be warm-based or closed yet still retain access if the need were to arise?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The recent posture decisions did not include any F-16 reductions. The Army reductions will allow the U.S. to return the communities of Bamberg and Schweinfurt, Germany, in addition to the ongoing actions to return the communities of Mannheim and Heidelberg. EUCOM is assisting the Office of the Secretary of Defense in its 2012 National Defense Authorization Act-directed study of basing capacity. In addition, all of the Services continue to evaluate their stationing capacity seeking efficiencies where possible. Any Departmental decisions to warm-base or close bases that assume the U.S. will enjoy the same degree of access must be informed by a thorough assessment of the relationship with the affected country.

Mr. CONAWAY. Does the Department plan to make a final decision on the permanent location for AFRICOM's headquarters this year and if so, what are the criteria that are going to be used to select the location?

General HAM. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is currently leading a comprehensive, congressionally mandated, Basing Alternatives Study, which will assess the cost-benefit of moving the headquarters from its current location to the United States. We provided the requisite operational data to support their analysis of the comparative costs, benefits, and risks. Once the Basing Alternatives Study is complete, we will comply with the guidance and decision of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CONAWAY. Would you please give me an update on the final decision for permanent location of AFRICOM's headquarters?

General HAM. At this time, the Office of the Secretary of Defense is leading a comprehensive, congressionally mandated, Basing Alternatives Study which will assess the cost-benefit with moving the headquarters from its current location to the United States. We provided the requisite operational data to support their analysis of the comparative costs, benefits, and risks. Until a final decision is made, we will continue to accomplish our mission from Stuttgart, where our proximity to Africa, both geographically and in terms of time zones, facilitates our ability to build relationships with our African partners, and allows our service members, civilians and their families to serve from a safe and well-supported location. Once the study is complete, we will comply with the guidance and decision of the Secretary of Defense.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. WITTMAN

Mr. WITTMAN. Admiral, with the recent announcement that the United States Navy will be home port shifting four *Arleigh Burke* Class DDGs to Naval Station Rota, Spain, in the coming years, how do you see these ships impacting your theater operations? Do you envision these ships strictly supporting missions in EUCOM and AFRICOM. As you are well aware, these are very versatile and capable platforms outside of their BMD mission set. What operational and strategic advantage do these ships provide you as a Combatant Commander?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The four destroyers planned to be forward deployed to Rota, Spain, will provide EUCOM with the ability to maintain a continuous BMD presence in the region, while minimizing the impact of our missions on the overall readiness of the fleet. While these ships will primarily be assigned BMD duties, the multi-mission capabilities of these ships provides EUCOM with the tactical assets capable of responding to any number of emergent threats in the region. I envision these assets will primarily be employed in two ways: first, in steady-state operations providing EUCOM with the ability to carry out its BMD mission as assigned by the Secretary of Defense; second, these ships may be employed in contingency operations supporting national objectives and military operations, such as last year's Operation ODYSSEY DAWN.

Mr. WITTMAN. Admiral, EUCOM conducts many exercises with the Israel Defense Forces. The instability in the region coupled with the numerous threats to Israel has increased in the last year. What is EUCOM doing to ensure the defense of Israel and ensure the stability of the region?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. First, while Israel is certainly in a volatile region of the world, I would argue that the threats to Israel have not increased in the last year. If you take the broad view of the history of the modern state of Israel, it is certainly more secure now that it was in 1948, 1967, 1973, or even during the First or Second Intifadas. Israel currently has signed peace treaties with two of its four neighbors. A third neighbor, Syria, is currently undergoing a period of serious internal unrest and is in no position to threaten Israel militarily. The terrorist threat posed by Lebanese Hezbollah from within the fourth neighbor has been deterred from overt attacks since the war in 2006. Moreover, the Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas has renounced violence. Unrest in the West Bank has subsided significantly over the last few years. Similarly, since Operation Cast Lead in 2008, rocket attacks from the Gaza Strip have never been more than sporadic. The most recent attack, from March 9–12, saw nearly 250 rockets launched without causing a single Israeli casualty.

Second, since the Arab Spring, Israel faces a more uncertain neighborhood. This effect, particularly in Egypt, combined with the continued Iranian nuclear program gives the Israeli government reason for concern about the future.

EUCOM's robust bilateral and multilateral military exercise program offers the Israel Defense Forces strong reassurances of the United States' strong commitment to the security of Israel. The following list details the many EUCOM exercises and exercise planning conferences scheduled for 2012 in support of this commitment:

March Organization JCET Execution SOCEUR NOBLE DINA 12 Execution NAVEUR NOBLE MELINDA 12 Initial Planning Conference NAVEUR RELIANT MERMAID 12 Initial Planning Conference NAVEUR

April NOBLE SHIRLEY 12–1 Initial Planning Conference MARFOREUR Senior Leader Meeting EUCOM

May CBRNE Enhanced Response Force—Package National Guard NOBLE SHIRLEY 12–1 Main/Final Planning Conference MARFOREUR NOBLE MELINDA 12 Main/Final Planning Conference NAVEUR

June RELIANT MERMAID 12 Main/Final Planning Conference NAVEUR

July NOBLE SHIRLEY 12–1 Execution MARFOREUR

August NOBLE MELINDA 12 Execution NAVEUR RELIANT MERMAID 12 Execution NAVEUR NOBLE SHIRLEY 13–1 Initial Planning Conference MARFOREUR September None

October NOBLE SHIRLEY 13–1 Main Planning Conference MARFOREUR AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 Phase III FTX EUCOM AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 Phase III CPX EUCOM AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 Phase III WFX EUCOM

November AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 Phase IV CAX EUCOM AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 Phase V Tech Demo EUCOM AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 Phase V LFX EUCOM

Exercise Description:

NOBLE SHIRLEY: A biannual Marine Forces Europe (MARFOREUR) combined arms exercise, designed to enhance selective small arms shooting and small unit

movement tactics, training, and procedures (TTP) for employment in a counter-terrorism environment.

NOBLE DINA: An annual Naval Forces Europe (NAVEUR) trilateral combined exercise scheduled with the maritime forces of the United States, Israel, and Greece and focused on Maritime Interdiction Operations (MIO) and Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) operations.

NOBLE MELINDA: An annual NAVEUR bilateral exercise scheduled with the maritime forces of the United States and Israel, focused on Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD), mine warfare, and salvage skills. The exercise often includes both land-based EOD teams and divers.

RELIANT MERMAID: An annual NAVEUR trilateral combined exercise scheduled with the maritime forces of the United States, Israel, and Turkey and focused on maritime Search and Rescue (SAR) and Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief (HA/DR) operations.

JCET: An annual SOCEUR Joint Combined Exchange Training encompassing Air, Ground and Maritime Special Operations Forces (SOF) engagement with IDF counterparts.

CERF-P: A bilateral Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, Explosive (CBRNE) exercise coordinated by the National Guard Bureau involving units from the Indiana National Guard.

AUSTERE CHALLENGE: A bilateral joint Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) and Noncombatant Evacuation Operation (NEO) exercise that encompasses exercises JUNIPER COBRA 12 and JUNIPER FALCON 13.

Mr. WITTMAN. General, East Africa remains a key operating and training area for Al Qaeda associates, and specifically, the Somalia-based terrorist group al-Shabaab. How concerned is the Department about al-Shabaab's ability to attract and train foreign fighters—including recruits from the United States—who may project violence outward from East Africa and what exactly is the Department doing to counter this threat? Do you have a sufficient amount of Department resources—including intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) and SOF assets—working to mitigate the spread of Al Qaeda's influence in the AFRICOM AOR?

General HAM. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mr. WITTMAN. General Ham, the new strategy calls for us to build innovative partnerships in order to maintain our global force posture. In attempting to build these partnerships, how are AFRICOM and U.S. military efforts in Africa perceived by Africans and by other foreign countries, including China? Do you feel that we are winning or losing when compared to China in attempting to build relationships, trust and influence throughout Africa?

General HAM. We do not view China as a military adversary in Africa. I believe our African partners value a diverse set of relationships when it comes to meeting their security needs. Both the United States and China have the ability provide this support. I believe we should look for opportunities to partner with China in areas where our interests are similar.

The operations, exercises and security cooperation engagements of the U.S. military are, in large measure, warmly received across the continent. We have developed and continue to maintain strong relationships with many key African partners as we address shared threats. We also look to establish partnerships with the new governments and militaries in such countries as Libya, Tunisia, and South Sudan. I have discussed with the National Guard Bureau the expansion of the State Partnership Program by two additional state partners this year. The long term relationships developed through this program would be beneficial to the development of the militaries in these nations.

We also look to maintain strong relationship with non-African nations, non-governmental organizations and international organizations. We have strong relationships with the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Canada, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the European Union in order to partner to accomplish common goals in Africa. We are developing a relationship with the International Red Cross. In the future, I expect such combined efforts to increase.

Mr. WITTMAN. General Ham, according to the International Maritime Bureau, 56% of global piracy attacks conducted from January to October 2011 were orchestrated from the coasts of Somalia, and as of January 31, 2012, Somali pirates held 10 vessels and 159 hostages. Do you feel that this global piracy problem, resonating out of Somalia, which is continuing to cost the United States, its allies, and international commerce millions of dollars and numerous resources to combat; is improving, deteriorating, or remaining unchanged? Additionally, since this problem will not

be eliminated or even significantly reduced until the conditions in Somalia improve, is there any potential for positive changes inside Somalia in the near future?

General HAM. The international response to the Somali piracy problem is achieving some success. Over the last year, pirate success rates originating from Somalia dropped by nearly 50 percent. This drop was, in large part, achieved by the increased use of industry accepted best practices such as embarked armed security teams which have proven 100% effective in defending vessels against pirate attacks. Additionally, coalition and international forces may be contributing to the lower number of successful pirate attacks due to increased interdictions. Nevertheless, the total number of attempted attacks has remained essentially unchanged, suggesting that the pirates are continuing at the same operational tempo. Furthermore, due to the continuing trend of higher ransom payments, piracy generated revenue has remained steady. As long as the benefits outweigh the risks, Somali pirates will continue to conduct operations in this lucrative business. Ultimately, counter-piracy operations at sea must be complemented by the strengthening of law enforcement and judicial systems ashore.

I believe there is potential for positive change inside Somalia. The tactical and operational successes of the African Union Mission in Somalia, Kenyan, Ethiopian, and Somali forces against al-Shabaab over the last 12 months have greatly reduced the organization's control over south-central Somalia. Improvement of governance in Somalia, to include security sector reform, is key to establishing conditions that are not conducive to piracy. The recent London Conference on Somalia highlighted the international community's support for change in Somalia. During the conference Secretary Clinton announced the United States will work with Somali authorities and communities to create jobs, provide health and education services, build capacity, and support peace building and conflict resolution. The combination of a weakened al-Shabaab and international support for development within Somalia makes this the best opportunity we have seen for positive change in Somalia.

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSON. As you know, undercover journalists with Al Jazeera English recently documented high-level corruption in the office of Sierra Leone's Vice President, Samuel Sam-Sumana.

Footage presented in the Al Jazeera English documentary ("Africa Investigates—Sierra Leone: Timber!") appears to show that Vice President Sumana's aides solicited and accepted bribes on his behalf in exchange for illegal logging permits. The evidence was so damning that 19 Members of Congress have requested that the U.S. government push the Government of Sierra Leone to hold the perpetrators responsible.

General, you have agreed to convey to your partners in the Government of Sierra Leone and The Republic of Sierra Leone Armed Forces (RSLAF) how deeply concerned Members of the U.S. Congress remain concerning this matter. Will you please update us on your conversations to this effect?

General HAM. I have not yet had the opportunity to visit Sierra Leone to discuss the importance of good governance and fighting corruption, which is a conversation I believe, is best achieved in person. I will certainly provide an update after my visit. I believe it is worth noting that Sierra Leone has agreed to contribute troops to the African Union Mission in Somalia, the first nation to do so outside the East Africa region. I feel this is a positive step in the continued development of good governance.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. SCHILLING

Mr. SCHILLING. Admiral, you've emphasized that the U.S. relationship with Poland is crucial to long term stability in the region. Can you please explain further what you mean by that? Why do you think Poland is important?

How has our relationship changed with them and how will our future relationship be altered by the changes to the missile defenses plans in the region?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Poland and the United States are natural partners in promoting democracy and good governance. Poland takes seriously its commitment to NATO, spending more on defense (in relation to GDP) than any other country in its region, including Germany. And Poland has one of healthiest economies in the EU. Poland has consistently been a staunch supporter of US policy, contributing troops to Operation IRAQI FREEDOM and currently ranking 5th out of 49 partner nations in total force contributions to the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan. Poland has significantly invested in its Air Force through the pur-

chase of 48 F-16 aircraft and continues to improve its military police and special operations capabilities. Lastly, Poland's unique geopolitical position makes it, in both time and space, a key ally that can and does safeguard US and NATO Alliance interests in Europe.

The Ballistic Missile Defense Agreement with Poland was initially changed in 2010 when a US policy shift made the intended ground based interceptors untenable. Poland did not receive this change well but remains a steadfast, willing partner in our national and NATO Alliance pursuit of ballistic missile defense. Therefore, it is in our interest to follow through on the commitment we have made to deploying ballistic missile defense assets in Poland.

Mr. SCHILLING. Admiral, we focus a great deal on anti-terrorism efforts in the Middle East and in regards to the protection of the homeland. However, what challenges do you face with terrorist activities in the European theater and how are you dealing with them?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mr. SCHILLING. Admiral, it is my understanding that when our soldiers are hurt in the conflicts in the Middle East they are first sent to EUCOM to be treated.

How will the change in force structure in the European theater affect how we can take care of our wounded from overseas conflicts?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The current projected change in force structure in the European theater is not expected to alter the staffing at the Medical Treatment Facilities in EUCOM and, therefore, will not affect EUCOM's ability to care for wounded service members during contingency operations.

Mr. SCHILLING. You have had to address the threats that are posed by Al Qaeda and its affiliates in Africa, but also new emerging terrorist groups. Will you be able to keep the same amount of vigilance under the new budget and force structure?

General HAM. I do not anticipate any reduced vigilance under the proposed budget and force structure. We will continue to work with the Department of Defense to obtain additional ISR assets.

Mr. SCHILLING. You have stated that a lack of ISR capabilities have been challenging for AFRICOM. Will the changes to the Air Force's U2 and Global Hawk programs make this issue more pronounced?

General HAM. The U-2 multiple collection capability as well as anticipated future upgrades could expand our collection effectiveness on the continent. Though the RG-4 Block 30's single collection capability make it a less valuable mission platform when requirements necessitate the need for multiple sensors during a single mission.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. The E-8C JSTARS is a high-demand, low-density platform. What are some of the missions they could perform if they were assigned to EUCOM on a regular basis?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. EUCOM would utilize E-8C JSTARS for monitoring and tracking vehicular traffic in several different operational areas across the EUCOM area of responsibility. First, we would establish a Ground Moving Target Indicator (GMTI) baseline with which to compare future collection trends in support of indications and warning during Phase 0 and Phase 1 operations and continued collection upon Concept Plan (CONPLAN) execution. Specifically, GMTI can be employed to locate and track movements of military or non-state actors, either singly or in groups. In peacetime, this capability can be used to established patterns-of-life, as well as assist efforts to counter smuggling and illicit arms shipments to rouge states and terrorist organizations.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the role of the U.S. Coast Guard within your respective AORs in building partnerships?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) plays a very limited role within the USEUCOM area of responsibility as there were no operational Coast Guard ships or aircraft stationed in, or deployed to, Europe in 2011-2012. The tall ship USCGC EAGLE (WIX 327) visited her port of construction (Hamburg, Germany) and several other European ports in the summer of 2011 as part of her normal training and goodwill missions. The USCG has not deployed a cutter to participate in European naval exercises in four years due to other operational commitments.

Due to the capable and professional nature of many European navies and coast guards who work closely with their lesser developed neighbors, the USCG experiences limited demand signals for development and partnership building in Europe. What demand signal there is can only be met by the USCG under limited cir-

cumstances due to the agency's wide mission set and severely taxed resources. The USCG holds six priority countries within Europe: Greece, Malta, France, The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the Russian Federation. The first two countries are priorities for their preeminence in maritime shipping; the next three countries are priorities due to their Caribbean territories and counter-narcotics cooperation; and Russia is a priority based upon the need to manage a shared maritime boundary in the Bering Sea. The USCG's partnerships with these countries are focused upon unique missions and do not necessarily meet the traditional definition of building partner capacity.

The one USCG unit permanently stationed in EUCOM's theater is Activities Europe, a 28-man marine safety and inspection organization located in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. This unit does not report to, or directly interact with EUCOM. This unit conducts inspections of U.S.-flagged vessels and some foreign-flagged ships headed to the United States. Since September 11, 2001, the majority of the mission involves administration of the International Ship and Port Facility Security Code. Under this reciprocal inspection regime, Activities Europe personnel provide guidance to foreign port and vessel owners to assist in the improvement of facility security, employee training, and incident response.

As part of its limited international engagement authority, the USCG hosts students from dozens of countries in its U.S. schoolhouses every year. These students are nominated, vetted, selected, and managed by U.S. Embassy Offices of Defense Cooperation. The students' attendance is funded either via International Military Education and Training (IMET) monies allocated to their nations by the U.S. Department of State, or in large number by the Export Control and Related Border Security (EXBS) program. Nations may also self-fund their students. Between 30 and 70 European students attend USCG resident training each year.

USCG Mobile Training Teams (MTT) travel the world to provide initial, refresher, and advanced training in a wide variety of subjects. They are common sights in Central/South America and Africa. They are rare in Europe, but have visited Azerbaijan, Georgia, Greece, and Malta in recent years. These teams are funded by IMET, EXBS, or national funds.

At a higher organizational level, the USCG participates in many international forums, including the Arctic Council, the North Atlantic Coast Guard Forum, the U.N.'s International Maritime Organization, and the E.U.'s border control agency FRONTEX. This cooperation extends mostly into the policy and strategy domains with very little operational action, with the exception of the transfer of unclassified information regarding illicit trafficking. The USCG was the lead negotiator for the landmark international search and rescue agreement signed by the Arctic Council nations in May 2011.

The USCG provides a maritime advisor in Georgia under the Department of State's EXBS program. This effort includes a very robust program of MTTs, U.S. resident training, two to three month subject matter expert deployments, and numerous infrastructure projects. Infrastructure projects include dry-dock overhaul of patrol boats, construction and outfitting of a maintenance facility, installation of an English language lab, and creation of a large maritime domain awareness coastal surveillance system. This multimillion dollar project includes integrating data from six radar stations via microwave/Ethernet data network; installation of NATO-standard, encryption capable, multi-bandwidth communications; and integration of HF/VHF radio automatic direction finders.

A USCG officer teaches at the World Maritime University in Malmo, Sweden. A USCG exchange helicopter pilot flies search and rescue with the United Kingdom's Royal Navy. The only USCG Attaché outside of the western hemisphere resides on the country team of the U.S. Embassy in Malta. Two USCG liaison officers are assigned to U.S. Naval Forces Europe where they manage maritime strategy and military-to-military engagements with many partner nations.

Finally, the USCG has two personnel permanently stationed on the EUCOM staff. One is the Deputy Director of the Joint Interagency Counter Trafficking Center where he guides the organization's interactions with the law enforcement agencies of partner nations. The other is the USCG liaison and maritime strategist within the Policy, Strategy, Partnering, and Capabilities (ECJ5/8) Directorate who plays a role in shaping EUCOM's Arctic strategy. Both personnel facilitate interaction with USCG organizations while simultaneously executing EUCOM missions and tasking.

Mr. SCOTT. What were the contributions of the U.S. Coast Guard to EUCOM in 2011?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The tall ship USCGC EAGLE (WIX 327) visited her port of construction (Hamburg, Germany) and several other European ports in the summer of 2011 as part of her normal training and goodwill missions. The USCG has not

deployed a cutter to participate in European naval exercises in four years due to other operational commitments.

The USCG holds six priority countries within Europe: Greece, Malta, France, The Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the Russian Federation. The USCG cooperates closely with the maritime shipping regulators of Greece and Malta due to their pre-eminence in maritime commerce as vessel flag states and cargo transshipment points. The USCG maintains very close operational relationships with France, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom due to their Caribbean territories and counter-narcotics cooperation in that region. The USCG holds a unique position within the U.S. government as a trusted partner with Russia based upon the need to manage a shared maritime boundary in the Bering Sea. The USCG's partnerships with these countries are focused upon unique missions/initiatives and are not managed by EUCOM.

The one USCG unit permanently stationed in EUCOM's theater is Activities Europe, a 28-man marine safety and inspection organization located in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. This unit does not report to, or directly interact with, EUCOM. The vessel and port facility inspection mission of this unit has indirect effects upon USEUCOM partner nations through reciprocal inspection regimes, goodwill, and professionalization.

As part of its limited international engagement authority, the USCG hosts students from dozens of countries in its U.S. schoolhouses every year. These students are nominated, vetted, selected, and managed by U.S. Embassy Offices of Defense Cooperation. The students' attendance is funded via International Military Education and Training (IMET) monies allocated to their nations by the U.S. Department of State or in large number by the Export Control and Related Border Security program. Nations may also self-fund their students. In 2011, the USCG hosted 52 resident students from 16 European countries. Courses included law enforcement boarding officer, search and rescue, pollution response, International Maritime Officer Course, and apprentice level engineering.

At a higher organizational level, the USCG participates in many international forums, including the Arctic Council, the North Atlantic Coast Guard Forum, the U.N.'s International Maritime Organization, and the E.U.'s border control agency FRONTEX. This cooperation extends mostly into the policy and strategy domains with very little operational action with the exception of the transfer of unclassified information regarding illicit trafficking. The USCG was the lead negotiator for the landmark international search and rescue agreement signed by the Arctic Council nations in May 2011.

The USCG provides a maritime advisor in Georgia under the Department of State's Export Control and Related Border Security program. This advisor assists in the identification, acquisition, installation, training, and employment of maritime border surveillance and associated law enforcement tactics, procedures, and policies.

A USCG officer teaches at the World Maritime University in Malmo, Sweden. A USCG exchange helicopter pilot flies search and rescue with the United Kingdom's Royal Navy. The only USCG Attaché outside of the western hemisphere resides on the country team of the U.S. Embassy in Malta. Two USCG liaison officers are assigned to U.S. Naval Forces Europe where they manage maritime strategy and military-to-military engagements with many partner nations.

Finally, the USCG has two personnel permanently stationed on the EUCOM staff. One is the Deputy Director of the Joint Interagency Counter Trafficking Center where he guides the organization's interactions with the law enforcement agencies of partner nations. The other is the USCG liaison and maritime strategist within the Policy, Strategy, Partnering, and Capabilities (ECJ5/8) Directorate who plays a role in shaping USEUCOM's Arctic strategy. Both personnel facilitate interaction with USCG organizations while simultaneously executing EUCOM missions and tasking.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the role of military bands within EUCOM and are they a cost-effective way of bringing people together and fostering greater understanding?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Three Service component command headquarters maintain bands within the U.S. European Command (EUCOM) Theater: U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR); U.S. Naval Forces Europe (CNE); and U.S. Air Forces in Europe (USAFE). These bands are key elements in the command's outreach program, and their work is directly tied to two of EUCOM's expressed strategic priorities: 1) Building partnerships to enhance security, regional stability and support global initiatives; and 2) Countering transnational threats, which these bands do by endearing foreign publics to the United States.

Many of the bands' events are at no additional cost to the government. The CNE Band was invited to participate in the most prestigious military band event (called a "tattoo") in the world in August 2012—the Edinburgh Military Tattoo. The travel

and TDY expenses for this month-long engagement are covered by the event sponsor, and broadcast coverage is expected to reach 300 million people throughout the world, including China for the first time this year.

The engagements that do have costs attached to them typically have significant returns on investment. For example, the USAFE Band spent approximately \$140,000 to send a 42-person concert band to Russia last year. Through seven performances in six days in Ural and Western Siberia, the band played for a live audience of 5,800, and reached over 130 million people through positive media coverage. Based on post-event discussions and audience feedback, these Russians began to see Americans as “very sociable, warm people who engage easily with others—not at all like the Americans portrayed in movies.”

From an interagency perspective, the bands also help U.S. embassies reach out to people who would otherwise be inaccessible. In September 2011, the CNE Band played in an Azerbaijan internally displaced persons community where people do not have access to open information and lack understanding of the U.S. and its partnership with Azerbaijan. According to Chris Jones, cultural affairs officer for the U.S. Embassy Baku, “The Navy Band was one of the most effective tools I have seen for building relationships with both government elites and the population as a whole. They ‘made’ every event in Azerbaijan—providing that extra something that got us more media coverage, more public support, and more buy-in from high ranking officials.”

Military bands hold a rich tradition, but, more importantly, this “soft power” tool of the Department of Defense continually contributes to global and regional security and stability, enhances diplomacy and partnership, and builds vital goodwill.

Mr. SCOTT. The hospital ships *Comfort* and *Mercy* are high-demand, low-density platforms. If the United States had a larger fleet of hospital ships, what roles and missions could they perform within EUCOM’s AOR?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The current design and configuration of the COMFORT and MERCY makes it difficult to employ these vessels in the EUCOM Theater due to displacement and port access. Potential missions would include training and collaboration with partner nations in NATO and European Union that desire increased medical cooperation. The Hospital Ships would also support EUCOM Concept Plans (CONPLANS) within the Levant Region, as well as support to ongoing NATO humanitarian missions in Northern Africa.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the status of NATO’s ongoing engagement with Mongolia? What do they need to do in order to become formal NATO partner in “Partners Across the Globe.”

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The first Mongolia-NATO Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programme (IPCP) received the approval of the North Atlantic Council (NAC) on 19 March 2012. I expect the announcement shortly acknowledging Mongolia as a formal partner to NATO in the Partners Across the Globe framework.

Mr. SCOTT. Are U.S. flag and general officers banned from visiting any countries within your respective AORs? If so, which countries?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. In accordance with the September 2011 U.S. Department of State Cable signed by Secretary Clinton, no engagements between U.S. flag and general officers are to be conducted with Belarus. Therefore, senior official travel is essentially banned there.

Mr. SCOTT. How would you rate the performance of E-8C JSTARS aircraft within AFRICOM?

General HAM. During OPERATION ODYSSEY DAWN (MAR 2011), we employed JSTARS with good effect, but AFRICOM has not used JSTARS since that time.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the role of the U.S. Coast Guard within your respective AORs in building partnerships?

General HAM. The Coast Guard plays a critical role in building maritime security capacity by providing ships in support of the African Maritime Law Enforcement Partnership Program. By partnering with African nations’ maritime forces during real-world operations, the Coast Guard assists our African partners enforce their maritime laws and also provides training in search and rescue, small boat operations and maintenance, and maritime law enforcement. The Coast Guard is also valuable in developing maritime bilateral agreements to enhance both U.S. and partner nation security by establishing the framework for operational maritime law enforcement cooperation.

The Coast Guard’s congressionally mandated International Port Security (IPS) Program complements our mission and expands the number of countries that conduct engagement with the command by maintaining bilateral relationships with 31 African nations to assess their implementation of effective maritime anti-terrorism measures.

Mr. SCOTT. What were the contributions of the U.S. Coast Guard to AFRICOM in 2011?

General HAM. In 2011, the Coast Guard deployed the Coast Guard Cutter FORWARD in support of the African Maritime Law Enforcement Partnership Program and conducted real-world operations and training with six African partner nations. Coast Guard training teams also completed 29 training missions with partner nations and hosted 20 African students in resident training at U.S. Coast Guard training centers. International Port Security Liaison Officers of the Coast Guard's International Port Security program conducted maritime security anti-terrorism visits to ports in 31 coastal African states.

In May 2011, the Coast Guard decommissioned and transferred a Cutter to Nigeria as an Excess Defense Article. The newly renamed NNS THUNDER is now being used in the Gulf of Guinea to counter threats such as piracy, illegal oil bunkering, and to ensure the security of offshore oil infrastructure.

Additionally, Coast Guard expertise in maritime law was key to the success of our initiative to foster regional cooperation among the nations and regional economic communities in West and Central Africa, an important aspect of effectively combating piracy and maritime crime in the Gulf of Guinea.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the role of military bands within AFRICOM and are they a cost-effective way of bringing people together and fostering greater understanding?

General HAM. There are no bands assigned to U.S. Africa Command. However, in the past year the U.S. Air Forces Europe band and the U.S. Naval Forces Europe band performed in eight African countries. Military bands provide a cost-effective and unique public diplomacy opportunity for our country teams in Africa. They bridge cultural gaps and reach elements of the general population vital to U.S. relationships abroad by providing the best image of our men and women in uniform and Americans at large. The good will demonstrated by military bands highlights the professional nature of our armed forces and builds civilian trust in the U.S. and partner nation forces.

Mr. SCOTT. The hospital ships *Comfort* and *Mercy* are high-demand, low-density platforms. If the United States had a larger fleet of hospital ships, what roles and missions could they perform within AFRICOM's AOR?

General HAM. Hospital ships have tremendous trauma care capability for combat operations and can contribute to humanitarian assistance missions. However, hospital ships are not designed for capacity building due to their configuration for acute care and surgery. Additionally, the draft of large hospital ships limits access to many African ports. Many African nations have medical delivery systems that struggle to meet the most basic needs of the populace. The use of a hospital ship under these circumstances has to be coordinated carefully so as not to overwhelm developing medical systems. For these reasons we find the use of multi-mission ships that have the capability to operate in these constrained ports to be of greater overall benefit.

Mr. SCOTT. Are U.S. flag and general officers banned from visiting any countries within your respective AORs? If so, which countries?

General HAM. There are no countries within our area of responsibility that U.S. flag and general officers are banned from visiting for official business. However, there are policy and force protection restrictions that limit Department of Defense personnel from traveling in certain areas on the African continent. For example, Somalia has current policy restrictions that limit all Department of Defense visits and require special approval for travel. Sudan, Zimbabwe, and Eritrea are under sanctions and require close coordination with Department of State before flag officer travel. But, none of these restrictions specifically ban U.S. flag and general officers from visiting these countries.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MRS. ROBY

Mrs. ROBY. Admiral, how will the Administration's newly released defense strategy change the way you do business at EUCOM?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The Administration's recently released defense strategy, entitled "Sustaining Global Leadership—Priorities for 21st Century Defense" reads: "In keeping with [the] evolving strategic landscape, our posture in Europe must also evolve." As this occurs, the United States will maintain our Article 5 commitments to allied security and promote enhanced capacity and interoperability for coalition operations. You will see changes as we work with NATO allies to develop a "Smart Defense" approach that pools, shares, and specializes capabilities as needed. There is continuity in how we approach the challenges we face: we practice active security and forward defense focused on preserving our strategic partnerships in Europe;

building interoperability with the NATO Alliance; deterring would-be adversaries; sustaining progress and transition in Afghanistan; and, when directed, conducting decisive military and counterterrorism operations to fight and win. The change will come in an even greater emphasis on sustaining our partners' abilities to work with us to accomplish these missions. Additionally, we will be making changes to respond to new challenges emerging in missile defense and cyberspace.

Mrs. ROBY. Admiral, you've often discussed that the most effective approach to the national security challenges of the 21st century is through "Whole of Government" solutions. Can you describe for us what you've learned from this approach, and if you still believe this is the best path forward?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, I remain convinced that a "Whole of Government" approach is still the best path forward. Indeed my personal experience at EUCOM over the past three years continues to reinforce my belief that this approach is both effective and expands the solution sets that we use to address issues across our theater. In my testimony, I cited the numerous interagency partners that we are privileged to host within our Command's J9-Interagency Partnering Directorate. We host representatives from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of State, Department of the Treasury, Agency for International Development, Department of Energy, Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration and Customs and Border Protection. These representatives help us tremendously, both in educating my staff and in influencing our planning and exercises at the regional/operational level. Their presence in Stuttgart complements the effective interagency "whole of government" effort down to the "tactical/country" level at U.S. Embassy Country Teams across the 51 countries included in the EUCOM Theater.

What is even more encouraging is that these interagency representatives are not at EUCOM simply to represent the interests of their parent agencies or departments; rather, they are valuable members of the EUCOM team, all working to achieve common objectives in the pursuit of our Command's mission and our nation's interests. The character and competency of our interagency partners earns them the credibility needed to function well in a predominantly military culture. Every day this team and their many contributions personify the motto at our Command: we are truly "Stronger Together!"

Beyond work with other federal partners, EUCOM is also reaching out to collaborate with academia and the private sector in order to tap non-traditional military solutions to the challenges we face. This is more than a "whole of government" approach; it is actually a "whole of society" collaborative effort. A good example of this approach was EUCOM's outreach to the Business Executives for National Security (BENS) in May 2011. With the concurrence of the U.S. Country Team in Riga and the government of Latvia, I asked BENS to assess cyber vulnerabilities in Latvia's government networks, financial systems, and technology networks. BENS organized a "cyber dream team," whose experts generated a list of proactive steps that could be taken to strengthen Latvia's cyber security. This trip to Latvia was among the very best examples of useful and practical, public-private collaboration that I have ever seen. It is another testimony to the value of a "whole of government/society" approach in addressing the security challenges of the 21st century.

Mrs. ROBY. From you position as EUCOM Commander with responsibility for the defense of Israel, what is your assessment of Israel concerns about Iranian nuclear weapons development and what are the capability gaps or areas of concern in defending Israel from missile or rocket attacks?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. [The information referred to is classified and retained in the committee files.]

Mrs. ROBY. What are the costs associated with AFRICOM and how are these costs affected by AFRICOM's chosen headquarters location?

General HAM. Our Fiscal Year (FY)13 headquarters operating budget request is \$285M. There has not been a decision on the permanent location of the command's headquarters. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is currently leading a comprehensive, congressionally mandated, Basing Alternatives Study which will assess the cost-benefit with moving the headquarters from its current location to the United States. We have provided the requisite operational data to support their analysis of the comparative costs, benefits, and risks. Until a final decision is made, we will continue to accomplish our mission from Stuttgart, where our proximity to Africa, both geographically and in terms of time zones, facilitates our ability to build relationships with our African partners, and provided a location where our service members, civilians and their families are safe and well-supported. Once the study is complete, we will comply with the guidance and decision of the Secretary of Defense.

Mrs. ROBY. If U.S. Africa Command was to move back to the United States, how would it be placed—one location or over a geographical region?

General HAM. The decision on where to place the command headquarters will be made by the Office of the Secretary of Defense which is currently leading a comprehensive, congressionally mandated, Basing Alternatives Study to assess the cost-benefit of moving the headquarters from its current location to the United States. We have provided the requisite operational data to support their analysis of the comparative costs, benefits, and risks.

