

Advance Questions for Ms. Elissa Slotkin
Nominee for Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs

Defense Reforms

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and the Special Operations reforms have strengthened the warfighting readiness of our Armed Forces. They have enhanced civilian control and clearly delineated the operational chain of command and the responsibilities and authorities of the combatant commanders, and the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They have also clarified the responsibility of the Military Departments to recruit, organize, train, equip, and maintain forces for assignment to the combatant commanders.

1. Do you see the need for modifications of any Goldwater-Nichols Act provisions?

No, I do not. The Goldwater-Nichols Act has led to significant improvements, including increased operational effectiveness, greater unity of effort across our armed forces, and civilian oversight – all of which have strengthened our force.

2. If so, what areas do you believe might be appropriate to address in these modifications?

None.

Qualifications, Priorities, and Challenges

3. What background and experience do you have that you believe qualifies you for the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs (ASD ISA)?

I believe that my experiences over the past 11 years in government – in the Intelligence Community, on the National Security Council Staff, at the Department of State and now at the Department of Defense -- provide me with the background to handle the responsibilities of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. Working both in the field and here in Washington, I have worked on U.S. policy in the Middle East, Europe, Africa, and most recently the Western Hemisphere – as well as been involved in a wide range of international crises that span the entirety of the ISA account. I have benefited from close civil-military cooperation to the achievement of U.S. objectives – something that is critically important in meeting new threats.

4. In your view, what are the major challenges confronting the next ASD-ISA?

The next Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs will need to continue balancing competing demands across the five areas within the portfolio – Europe, Russia and Eurasia, Africa, the Middle East, and the Western Hemisphere – while providing exemplary support and thought leadership to the Secretary of Defense on emerging crises and longer-term

strategy on defense and security issues. The next Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs will also need to manage the International Security Affairs team and ensure it has the tools and resources to conduct the day-to-day affairs of the organization while working within real-world budget constraints.

5. If confirmed, what broad priorities would you establish in terms of issues which must be addressed by the ASD-ISA?

If confirmed, I would work to ensure that the Department of Defense (DoD) pursues a strategic and balanced approach as outlined in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review. Top priorities would include strengthening America's alliances with key partners and allies; ensuring the success and effective transition of the NATO mission in Afghanistan; improving and informing our counter-ISIL campaign and the international coalition that supports it; preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon; combating terrorism; strengthening security and stability across the Middle East; maintaining a strong relationship with Israel; expanding cooperation with our NATO Allies and European partners in the face of Russian aggressive behavior; working with the states of Africa to meet urgent security challenges and help foster stability; and providing DoD support to Colombia and the Central America strategy.

6. If confirmed, what management actions and timelines would you establish to address these problems?

If confirmed, I would address these challenges by refining the development and implementation of DoD and interagency strategies, policies, and plans on key issues relating to Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere. I would continue to work closely with other components of the Department of Defense in support of the Secretary of Defense, as well as our interagency counterparts, U.S. Allies and partners, and, where appropriate, the private sector and non-governmental organizations. I would pay particular attention to shoring up the policies, partnerships, and posture needed to meet the complex and often unpredictable challenges of the current security environment to ensure that they are updated as needed to reflect new challenges and new opportunities. Under the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, I would work to support the President and Secretary's guidance to shape a Joint Force for the future that will be smaller and leaner, but will be flexible, agile, ready, and technologically advanced.

Role within the Office of the Under Secretary for Policy

The Secretary of Defense has announced a plan to reorganize the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. The reorganization has begun and is expected to be completed by 2015.

7. What is your understanding of the major changes planned for the organization that you have been nominated to lead, and what do you believe will be the primary benefits of the reorganization plan?

Under the reorganization of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, the major change for International Security Affairs has already taken place: the integration of Western Hemisphere Affairs into the International Security Affairs. That transition occurred earlier this year, and I worked closely with the Western Hemisphere Affairs team, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, the Under Secretary of Defense, and Policy's Chief Operating Officer to ensure as smooth a transition as possible. I also stood up a Workforce Implementation Team – composed of action officers from both the Western Hemisphere office and from offices already in ISA -- to identify issues the workforce was most concerned with and raise them to management for discussion.

Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 5111.07 (11/7/2008) delineates the functions and duties of the ASD-ISA. Under this Directive, the ASD ISA is the principal advisor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P)) and the Secretary of Defense on international security strategy and policy on issues of DOD interest that relate to the nations and international organizations of Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and Russia), the Middle East, and Africa; their governments and defense establishments; and for oversight of security cooperation programs.

8. What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the ASD ISA?

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs is responsible for providing advice and support on defense policy and strategy for the Middle East, Europe, Russia, Africa, and, since the spring of 2014, the Western Hemisphere to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Secretary of Defense.

9. Notably absent from the Directive is the responsibility for the Western Hemisphere (which was add to the portfolio with the USD(P) reorganization), what is the role of the ASD-ISA with respect to the Western Hemisphere?

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs now provides advice and support on defense policy and strategy for the Western Hemisphere to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Secretary of Defense.

10. Based on the aforementioned reorganization, what, if any, updates need to be made to DOD Directive 5111.07 (11/7/2008)?

The DoD Directive will be updated to reflect the reorganization within OSD Policy, including the transition of Western Hemisphere Affairs to International Security Affairs.

Relationships

11. What do you see as the relationship between the ASD ISA and each of the following?

The Secretary of Defense

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs is responsible for advising the Secretary of Defense on defense and security policy and strategy related to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere. This advice is provided under the guidance of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense

Similar to the relationship with the Secretary of Defense, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs is responsible for advising the Deputy Secretary of Defense on defense and security policy and strategy related to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere. This advice is provided under the guidance of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

The Under Secretaries of Defense for Policy

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs is the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy's principal advisor on defense and security policy and strategy related to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs is the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy's principal advisor on defense and security policy and strategy related to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

The other Under Secretaries of Defense

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the other Under Secretaries of Defense to advance the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities, under the guidance and direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This includes providing policy input to each Under Secretary that relates to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

The Joint Staff

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works very closely with the Joint Staff to advance the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities, under the guidance and direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This includes providing policy input to the Joint Staff that relates to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia,

the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere, as well as ensuring that military advice from the Joint Staff is sought out and considered in policy development as appropriate.

The Secretaries of the Military Departments

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the Secretaries of the Military Departments to advance the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities, under the guidance and direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This includes providing policy input as appropriate to the Secretaries of the Military Departments that relates to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere, and working with the Secretaries of the Military Departments to help ensure their programs are synchronized with and support our policy in those regions.

The Service Chiefs

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the Service Chiefs to advance the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities, under the guidance and direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. This includes providing policy input as appropriate to the Secretaries of the Military Departments and the Service Chiefs that relates to Europe (including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

The Geographic and Functional Combatant Commanders

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the commanders of the regional combatant commands in connection with activities in Europe, Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere - U.S. Central Command, U.S. Africa Command, U.S. European Command, U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command - to advance the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities, under the guidance and direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs also works with the functional combatant commanders – particularly U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Transportation Command– to ensure that crosscutting functional efforts are appropriately synched and coordinated with the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities in the International Security Affairs regions. Particular areas of engagement include regional and bilateral strategy and policy, contingency planning, and policy oversight of operations.

The Director of the National Guard Bureau

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the Director of the National Guard Bureau with regard to the State Partnership Program and related activities in Europe, Russia, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

The Other Functional and Regional Assistant Secretaries of Defense

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the other functional and regional Assistant Secretaries of Defense within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to provide policy guidance to advance the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities, and to ensure the regional and functional policy recommendations are coordinated and reflect the best advice of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy's leadership team.

The Director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works with the Director of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency on the policy guidance for and the implementation of security cooperation activities, including Foreign Military Sales, to ensure these activities support the Secretary's objectives and policy priorities as they are implemented with countries in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

Transatlantic Relationship and NATO

12. In your view, how important to U.S. national security interests is the U.S. transatlantic relationship with our European partners?

The U.S. transatlantic relationship with European partners has stood the test of time through the Cold War, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, the September 11 attack on the United States and ensuing NATO action in Afghanistan, and ongoing operations to counter violent extremism and terrorism. European Allies remain the United States' principal partners in promoting global security. Not only is Europe home to our most stalwart and capable Allies, it provides essential access and support that ensures the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to respond to global challenges, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa. If confirmed, I would continue to work to reinforce this critical relationship.

13. In your view, what is the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Alliance in meeting U.S. security interests?

NATO is a uniquely important and capable Alliance, through which the United States and 27 Allies confront together the broad range of diverse and difficult threats to our shared security interests. NATO is composed of like-minded Allies who share our fundamental values of democracy, human rights, and rule of law, and it includes the most capable militaries in the world today. Fundamentally, NATO provides a standing forum for the consultations that forge consensus for needed actions, including military operations; it coordinates Allies' creation of the interoperable military forces and other capabilities needed for such actions; and it maintains a unique multinational command structure to lead those forces in action. NATO also has evolved into a global hub for security cooperation, connecting Allies with more than 40 partner nations who work with us on security challenges worldwide, and contributing to the political support and legitimacy accorded to actions by a wider international community.

NATO has played a fundamental role in Afghanistan in leading the ISAF mission and is poised to continue in the Resolute Support Mission starting in January 2015. Today, NATO Allies and partners continue to take significant steps in addressing Russia's actions in eastern Europe, and in forming the core of the coalition against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Other examples, from the Cold War through the Balkans to Iraq, Libya, counter-piracy and more, all illustrate NATO's ability to be a strong force-multiplier for helping meet U.S. security interests.

14. In your view, what are the major strategic objectives of the NATO Alliance in the coming years, particularly in light of the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine?

NATO's enduring purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of its members, and this includes promoting shared values and aiming to achieve a Europe, including Russia, that is whole, free, and at peace. The Russian Federation's aggressive actions against Ukraine threaten the Alliance's ability to achieve its strategic political objectives in the coming years. This requires both a united political response as well as continued security cooperation between Ukraine and the Alliance. In the coming years, the Alliance will aim to develop and maintain robust, mobile, and deployable forces with the ability to sustain concurrent major joint operations and several smaller operations; to develop the capability to defend its populations and territories against ballistic missile attack; and to develop further capabilities to defend against weapons of mass destruction and cyber-attacks.

NATO Mission in Afghanistan

At the NATO Summit in Wales in September, NATO members and partner nations re-affirmed their commitment to the post-2014 train, advise, and assist mission in Afghanistan, known as Operation Resolute Support.

15. What do you see as the major challenges for the NATO-led Operation Resolute Support mission to build the capacity of the Afghan security forces?

The key challenge for the NATO-led Operation Resolute Support mission will be ensuring we have the right advisors with the right skills for our capacity building efforts, and ensuring we build enough capacity in the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior to execute the funding being provided to them responsibly and transparently. If confirmed, I would work with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, and interagency colleagues, toward that goal.

16. If confirmed, what recommendations would you have for addressing these challenges?

If confirmed, I will continue the work within the Department of Defense and with our partners to provide the right advisors. General Campbell and his team are in regular dialogue with the Department on this and we are rotating personnel to the field to work in the ministries. If confirmed, I would also work to echo General Campbell's messages to his counterparts about the importance of responsible management of donated funds, which are used to pay army and police

salaries and other basic consumables. President Ghani's statements on attacking corruption are helpful to our efforts to build transparency and accountability with the Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Interior – and to keep our Allies and partners invested in Afghanistan.

General Campbell and General Dunford have both indicated that the loss of Mi-17 helicopter capability would “...be catastrophic to the mission and would give me cause to reassess the entire campaign.” General Campbell and General Dunford also point out that the Mi-17's are key to providing an outer layer of force protection to U.S. and coalition forces.

17. Do you agree with the statements of General Campbell and General Dunford on the critical importance of the Mi-17's to mission success and force protection in Afghanistan, and if so why?

Yes. The Afghan Air Force is using the Mi-17s to provide outer ring security for coalition forces. The Afghan Special Mission Wing is using the Mi-17s to conduct operations against terrorists and insurgents in otherwise unreachable areas of Afghanistan. The Mi-17 provides mobility in difficult terrain and is critical for denying enemy sanctuary in these non-permissive areas of the country. It also provides troop transport capability and serves as the primary casualty evacuation platform and as a close air support platforms. It is the centerpiece of the Afghan Air Force and the loss of the Mi-17 would be a serious blow to our operations in Afghanistan.

Russia

18. What role will you play, if confirmed, in establishing policy with respect to the U.S.-Russia security relationship, including in the NATO context?

If confirmed, I would play an active role in managing our evolving defense strategy toward Russia, ensuring that the Department is prepared and postured to enforce our Article 5 commitment, reassure our Allies with a persistent presence in central and eastern Europe for as long as necessary, support our partners so they are better able to secure their borders and provide for their own defense, and deter potential aggressive Russian actions against U.S. interests.

19. What do you believe are appropriate objectives for U.S.-Russian security relations?

Military-to-military relations between the United States and Russia are on hold due to Russia's illegal occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea, as well as its continued destabilizing activities in eastern Ukraine and failure to uphold the Minsk Agreement. Russia's behavior is not consistent with a responsible global stakeholder contributing to international stability, and we will not seek a cooperative relationship with the Russian military while it violates the sovereignty of one of its neighbors. Should Russia change its behavior by fully implementing the Minsk Protocol and withdrawing from Crimea, I believe the Department would be in a position to review the hold on military-to-military activities.

That said, the Department is prepared to work with the Russian Ministry of Defense on issues in which it is in our national interest to do so. For instance, the United States and Russia have worked together to secure Syria's declared chemical weapons stockpile, have common interests in promoting stability and countering terrorism in Afghanistan, and have a shared interest in avoiding misunderstandings or miscalculation concerning our global military presence.

20. What do you believe are the main areas of disagreement between the United States and Russia and the areas of common interest between the United States and Russia in the security sphere?

The Administration is committed to a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace; believes that nations have the right to associate freely with whatever organization it chooses; and does not accept that some nations have a sphere of influence or privilege—a vision I would uphold if confirmed. As demonstrated by its actions in Ukraine, Russia does not share these views, and is willing to challenge norms that have preserved international security for decades in order to assert its own vision.

However, there are convergent interests between the United States and Russia, and opportunities for constructive engagement with Russia continue to exist, particularly regarding nonproliferation, such as the P5+1 negotiations with Iran and removing Syria's declared chemical weapons stockpile. The United States and Russia also have a shared interest in counterterrorism, counter-piracy, developing the Arctic region, and ensuring stability in Afghanistan, and I believe the United States should be willing to engage with Russia on areas of mutual interest when it is in our national interest to do so.

On November 2, 2014 the New York Times reported that “Tanks and other military vehicles [are] pouring over the border from Russia into eastern Ukraine” despite the ceasefire reached in September.

21. In the context of Russian aggression in eastern Europe, do you believe that the deterrence of further aggression will require the permanent stationing of additional U.S. or allied forces in eastern European nations?

The Department continues to work with the U.S. European Command and allies and partners to develop additional reassurance and deterrence measures in the region. Adjusting U.S. force structure in Europe may be one of these measures; however, this must be done in the context of balancing other global requirements and managing limited fiscal resources. If confirmed, I would continue to support this effort.

22. What is your assessment of which American forces and capabilities have the greatest deterrent effect upon Russia and other aggressive actors in the region?

Effective deterrence relies on the combination of capabilities – but it is our will to defend the NATO Alliance from aggression that gives our capabilities credibility. Deterring aggressive

actors in Europe also requires a strong and unified Alliance willing to share the burden for defense, and if confirmed I would continue to work with our Allies to work toward that goal.

Force Posture in the Middle East

The Gulf continues to be a turbulent area, made more unstable by the malign influence of Iran and the growth of the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

- 23. Do you believe there is a need for the United States to mitigate the effects of a reduced aircraft carrier presence in the Gulf region and, if so, how would you propose doing so?**

The Department maintains a strong military posture in the Gulf region with a mix of air, land, and naval forces. We do not rely on any single capability to address regional threats. The Department regularly assesses its forward posture, including the deployment of aircraft carriers, to address most effectively the challenges faced globally. The Department also maintains our ability to respond quickly to a range of worldwide contingencies. Therefore, at the present time I understand our military commanders do not see a need to further mitigate the reduced aircraft carrier presence in the Gulf.

Iraq

The President has announced an increase in the number of U.S. military personnel to be deployed to Iraq to advise and assist Iraqi security forces and Kurdish peshmerga in countering the threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

- 24. How would you describe the key U.S. strategic interests and objectives in Iraq?**

I believe the United States has a strategic interest in a stable, secure, and united Iraq led by an inclusive government that has support from all of Iraq's communities. The United States shares many interests with Iraq – including countering ISIL, countering threats from Iran, and ensuring the region is peaceful and secure in the long-term.

- 25. What do you see as the greatest challenges for the U.S.-Iraq security relationship over the coming years?**

As we work to support the President's counter-ISIL strategy, supporting the Government of Iraq's efforts to build an inclusive and effective Iraqi Security Force will be a great challenge, and will take time. In order to reconstitute a sustainable, effective, and inclusive security force that can re-take territory and hold it in the long-term, the Government of Iraq must do the required reform and reconciliation among major sectarian groups in order to support the security forces. If confirmed, I would work with my colleagues toward that end.

26. Do you support President's approach for training and equipping security forces in Iraq to counter the ISIL threat?

Yes.

27. What do you see as the greatest challenges for efforts to train and equip Iraqi security forces to counter the ISIL threat, and if confirmed, what recommendations would you have for addressing these challenges?

As I noted, supporting the Government of Iraq's efforts to build an inclusive and effective Iraqi Security Force will be challenging, and take time. The Government of Iraq must offer a national program of reform and reconciliation in order for Iraqi security forces to succeed. If confirmed, I would continue to work with the Department of State and coalition partners on an engagement plan that urges the Government of Iraq to match capability development with political reform.

28. In your view, what conditions, if any, should the United States place on the provision of equipment or assistance to the Government of Iraq in its fight against violent extremism?

Given the severity of the ISIL threat, the United States should continue to exercise its ongoing foreign assistance and security cooperation activities with the Government of Iraq, in accordance with applicable legal requirements -- and continue to consult with Congress while doing so.

Iran

29. What is your understanding and assessment of the military and political threat posed by Iran?

The Administration's primary concern is preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. However Iran's ballistic missile forces, naval forces, cyber capabilities, and sponsorship of destabilizing activity in the region are also of significant concern. Iranian officials' boasting of their influence in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and Bahrain, as well as Supreme Leader Khamenei's recent inflammatory comments regarding Israel's right to existence, are also extremely provocative.

30. What is your understanding and assessment of U.S. policy with respect to Iran?

Our current priority remains to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and I support the President's decision to continue pursuit of a diplomatic resolution to this issue. Negotiations aside, I subscribe to the view that the United States and many other countries hold that Iran needs to become a more responsible presence in the region, as well as adhere to international norms, including in the area of human rights.

31. What are the risks, if any, associated with reducing U.S. presence in the Middle East with respect to the threat posed by Iran?

The Administration has no plans to reduce the U.S. presence in the Middle East, and the President has been clear to both Iran and other countries that might consider testing the United States that we will continue to protect our interests globally. The United States' ability to garner the political will and marshal the forces to counter ISIL as quickly as it did serve as evidence that we continue to advance security and stability in the region -- and will retain a robust force posture in the Middle East to protect our partners and our interests.

32. In your view, what role should DOD play in countering Iran's support of international terrorism?

In my view, the Department of Defense has an important role to play in countering Iran's support for international terrorism by supporting broader U.S. Government and partner nation efforts. We also conduct numerous military exercises in the region that focus on mine countermeasures, maritime defense, and integrated air and missile defense that prepare us for possible Iranian asymmetric threats. If confirmed, I would continue to work with our interagency and international partners to further these efforts and ensure Iran is held accountable on the full scope of its destabilizing activities in the region and beyond, as necessary.

Syria

33. What is your understanding and assessment of United States policy with respect to Syria?

The Administration seeks a stable Syria that provides freedom and security to its citizens and is at peace with its neighbors. The U.S. focus is on three main areas: disrupt, degrade, and destroy ISIL; promote a negotiated political settlement to the Syria conflict; and prevent the Syria crisis from further destabilizing neighboring countries.

The immediate focus is to disrupt, degrade and destroy ISIL. We seek to drive ISIL out of Iraq, deny it safe-haven in Syria, and disrupt its ability to project power. There is no sustainable solution to the Syria crisis without addressing the current ISIL threat. If confirmed, I would work to further the Administration's policy with regard to Syria.

34. What is your understanding and assessment of United States policy with respect to the Assad Regime?

As the President has said, Assad has been a magnet for extremism and has lost all legitimacy to govern. There must ultimately be a negotiated political settlement in which Assad cedes power in order to restore security and stability to Syria. If confirmed, I would work with my interagency partners to further the Administration's policy.

35. What role, if any, does ASD-ISA have within the U.S. Government policy community with respect to Syria?

If confirmed, I would assist the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in formulating, coordinating, and presenting the Department's Syria recommendations to the rest of the U.S. interagency. I would work closely with my counterparts on the Joint Staff and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict. I would also work with counterparts across the interagency as they develop options that work towards a resolution to the crisis in Syria. This includes options for disrupting ISIL, and ways to pressure the Assad regime to negotiate a settlement, bolster the moderate Syrian opposition, alleviate the suffering of the Syrian people, and address extremist threats.

36. What role, if any, does ASD-ISA have with respect to the DOD's proposed program to train the moderate, vetted Syrian Opposition?

If confirmed, I would provide advice to Department of Defense and interagency leadership on implementing the Department's proposed program to train and equip the moderate Syrian opposition.

Gulf Security Cooperation

The Administration has been working with Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) governments to enhance regional cooperation and security against ballistic missile threats, particularly from Iran.

37. What is your view of the potential for missile defense cooperation within the GCC to enhance regional security, and how do you see this potential cooperation fitting into the United States missile defense and security efforts in the Middle East?

During the Secretary's first formal Defense Ministerial with the GCC in May, it was clear that a robust and enduring multilateral missile defense architecture would be advantageous to counter the threat posed by Iran. Our partners in the region share this view, and the Department of Defense sees strong potential for cooperation. I understand, however, that this architecture will take time to build and will require continued support from member states to maintain it over the long term. If confirmed, I would work with the Services, the Combatant Commands, and our partners and allies to build effective deterrence and defense architectures for Europe and the Middle East against ballistic missile threats.

Libya

Following the evacuation of the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli on July 26th, there is no longer an active American presence in the country.

38. What is your understanding of how the departure of the U.S. presence is impacting our security interests in the country, to include its impact on our ability to collect timely intelligence and engage with Libyan security institutions?

I believe the suspension of operations at the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli in late July has adversely

affected our ability to engage with Libyan security institutions, but it was a necessary measure to ensure the safety of U.S. personnel. Unfortunately the fragmentation of the country has caused the United States and our partners to place on hold our security assistance programs with Libya, including a multinational effort to train a Libyan General Purpose Force. If confirmed, I would continue to work with my interagency colleagues to urge all Libyan parties toward a political solution and improved governance.

Israel

With regard to our relationship with Israel, President Obama has stated: “Our military and intelligence cooperation has never been closer. Our joint exercises and training have never been more robust. Despite a tough budget environment, our security assistance has increased every year. We are investing in new capabilities. We’re providing Israel with more advanced technology – the type of products and systems that only go to our closest friends and allies. And make no mistake: we will do what it takes to preserve Israel’s Qualitative Military Edge – because Israel must always have the ability to defend itself, by itself, against any threat.”

39. Do you agree with President Obama’s position and views with regard to the U.S. security relationship with Israel?

Yes. If confirmed, I would work to continue the Department’s substantial cooperation with Israel and maintain the strength of our security relationship.

Egypt

A stable and secure Egypt is important to maintaining the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt and Egypt played an important role in brokering peace between Israel and Hamas.

40. What is the purpose of the security assistance provided by the United States to Egypt?

The U.S. relationship with Egypt is significant and enduring. Egypt plays a key role in the stability of the Middle East. For more than 30 years, our defense relationship has served to further our joint interests. Our security assistance to Egypt, and our security relationship with Egypt, facilitates our access to the Suez Canal and Egyptian airspace, supports the security of Israel, advances joint counterterrorism efforts, and maintains the security of U.S. personnel in Egypt.

41. What, if any, impact would discontinuing or significantly reducing that assistance have on the bilateral relationship and regional security?

I believe discontinuing U.S. security assistance to Egypt would undercut key aspects of our relationship with Egypt, which has been a cornerstone of our security policy in the Middle East

since the 1980s. It would reduce U.S.-Egypt cooperation on shared interests --- including countering terrorism and access to Egyptian airspace for U.S. military aircraft.

Africa-related Security Matters

The new DOD strategic guidance, “Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense,” announced by President Obama on January 5, 2012, sets out the defense priorities for the 21st century and the key military missions for which DOD will prepare. The primary emphasis of the strategy relates to the Middle East and Asia. The strategy makes little reference to Africa and its myriad security challenges.

42. In light of the emphasis on areas outside of the African continent, if confirmed, how would you draw attention to the myriad security challenges confronting African nations?

The Defense Strategic Guidance and the more recent 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review both make clear that the Department of Defense will focus its resources on achieving U.S. objectives in the Asia-Pacific and Middle East regions in the years ahead. However, from a mission perspective, both documents emphasize the importance of maintaining a strong focus on counterterrorism and irregular warfare, particularly with respect to disrupting and defeating al-Qaeda and its affiliates (AQAA) wherever they manifest as a threat to the United States and partner interests. Given this emphasis, and the growing AQAA and potential ISIL presence in Africa, I will ensure African security challenges will continue to receive the focus that they deserve. If confirmed, I would support the Department’s ongoing efforts to build the capacity of African security forces, defense institutions, and regional organizations to combat terrorism and transnational threats, participate in regional peace operations, and respect international human rights norms.

In the last few years, there has been a growth of terrorist networks, capabilities, and operations in North and East Africa, including groups that reportedly intending to target Western nations, including the United States. Some have characterized the U.S. counterterrorism effort in North and East Africa as an “economy of force” effort.

43. Do you agree with that characterization of the U.S. counterterrorism effort in North and East Africa?

No. The growing terrorist threats across Africa present a complex challenge to U.S. national security interests; thus, I do not consider it to be an “economy of force” region. Africa’s ungoverned spaces have increasingly become safe havens for extremists who have been put under increasing pressure in other parts of the world. The Department of Defense’s approach to disrupting extremist networks in Africa relies on relatively low-cost, small footprint, innovative approaches, often involving partnering with regional or international partners. In light of pressure on the Department’s overall budget, we focus our efforts on those cases where the most significant U.S. interests are at stake, there is political will to address the given security challenge, and there is a credible likelihood that our targeted support will result in a decisive

effect. If confirmed, I would look for ways to build upon the success that we have seen to date in places like Mali, where U.S. support to French operations and UN peacekeeping forces have helped stabilize that country and reduce al-Qaeda's freedom of movement.

44. In your view, should these U.S. counterterrorism efforts be expanded, contracted, or remain the same?

I believe that U.S. counterterrorism efforts should be dynamic and of sufficient scale to address the threats facing the United States, our interests, and those of our allies and partners. If confirmed, I would continue to support robust counterterrorism efforts to disrupt and ultimately defeat al-Qaeda, ISIL, their affiliates, and other violent extremist organizations that pose risk to U.S. and allied interests, threaten regional security, and undermine economic growth and opportunity.

Somalia

To date, DOD has had a limited role in Somalia and the Department has not established a military-to-military relationship with the newly formed Somali National Army. Further, the DOD has not provided any security assistance to the Somali National Army.

45. What is the appropriate role for DOD with respect to Somalia and what, if any, assistance should the DOD provide to the Somali National Army?

To date, the Department of Defense has had a limited, but focused role in Somalia, which has included advice and assistance, training, and logistical support to the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) and the Somali National Forces as they strive to bring stability and peace to Somalia.

Following the January 2013 recognition of the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) by the United States, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy hosted the Somali President in the Pentagon, which was followed by a second visit and meeting with the Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon in September 2013. Through a deliberate engagement plan, the Department established a military-to-military relationship with the Somali National Armed Forces. This plan has included key engagements with Somali defense leaders, visits by the USAFRICOM Commander, the Commander of Joint Task Force Horn of Africa, and other Department of Defense personnel. Moreover, in July 2014, the Department installed a Defense Attaché to support the Special Representative to Somalia, who remains based in Kenya.

With respect to the Department's role in Somalia, the United States is in a unique position to play an advisory role at a new beginning in the development of Somali's security sector, and if confirmed, I would work to support that effort.

46. Are there any restrictions that prevent DOD from providing assistance to the Somalia

National Army? If so, what restrictions?

Yes. Provisions in the FY14 Foreign Operations bill currently prohibit the United States from providing lethal assistance to Somalia. As a result, the Department of Defense is unable to provide much-needed military equipment and training to the Somali National Army. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Congress to determine the appropriate approach to this prohibition.

U.S. Military Operations Against the Lord's Resistance Army

Despite pressure by the Ugandan People's Defense Forces (UPDF) and efforts by U.S. Special Operations personnel to support them, elements of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) – including Joseph Kony – continue to operate and commit atrocities against civilian populations. Some observers have identified operational concerns with this mission, including that: (1) supported forces are trying to find an elusive foe in an area roughly the size of California, much of which is covered in thick jungle; (2) technical support to U.S. forces and their UPDF partners from the defense and intelligence community continues to be inadequate; (3) limitations continue to be placed on the ability of U.S. Special Operations personnel to accompany UPDF partners outside of main basing locations, thereby limiting the level of direct support they can provide; and (4) logistics and operational enablers for U.S. forces.

47. In your view, what is the objective of Operation Observant Compass?

Under Operation Observant Compass (OOC), U.S. Special Operations Forces seek to enhance the capacity of local forces in the African Union Regional Task Force to end the threat to regional stability and civilian security posed by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA). U.S. military advisors are working with these forces to improve their intelligence gathering, fusion, and information-sharing; enable effective logistical support; enhance their staff coordination and operational planning; and assist efforts to increase overall operational effectiveness. Because there are no purely military solutions to this problem, the U.S. military supports a broader interagency and international effort that involves the U.S. embassies in the affected countries, U.S. Agency for International Development's programs, as well as contributions from nongovernmental organizations.

If confirmed, I would continue to support the current U.S. policy of pursuing a comprehensive, multi-faceted strategy to assist the governments and people of LRA-affected areas to end the threat posed by the LRA and to address the impact of the LRA's atrocities.

48. In your view, what is the appropriate level of priority to be accorded to efforts to counter the Lord's Resistance Army?

In my view, the level of priority currently accorded to OOC is appropriate and appears to have yielded significant results. Three of the top five LRA leaders have been removed from the battlefield. There has been a 75% decrease in the number of people killed by LRA attacks.

Since 2012, there have been 240 confirmed defections from the LRA, with 80 occurring between July and September 2014. Many who have fled the LRA have cited U.S.-supported defections messaging as influential in their decision to leave the group.

49. If confirmed, will you work to review the four concerns outlined above and report back to the committee?

Yes. If confirmed, I would work with the relevant experts in the Department to ensure that your concerns are reviewed. I would be happy to organize an update on current OOC operational efforts at your convenience.

‘New Normal’ Requirements within U.S. Africa Command

U.S. Africa Command consistently suffers from shortfalls in resourcing—particularly in the areas of force posture, mobility, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—and a lack of persistent access to the continent that impact its ability to meet requirements in theater, including crisis response.

50. What is your understanding and assessment of the ‘new normal’ requirements in U.S. Africa Command’s area of responsibility?

The crises in Africa and the complexity of the security environment have demonstrated the need for the Department of Defense to position forces to respond rapidly on the continent. The Department’s support has focused on two areas: assisting the Department of State in strengthening the security of high-threat, high-risk diplomatic missions in Africa and developing rapid response capabilities to bolster security during a crisis as a way to address the challenges presented by the size of Africa and the continent’s limited infrastructure.

51. What is your understanding and assessment of the impact of and resulting risk associated with U.S. Africa Command’s resourcing shortfalls and persistent access to the continent on its ability to meet its ‘new normal’ requirements?

I believe the U.S. Africa Command forces will remain resilient in their ability to meet new normal requirements and will be augmented as necessary should a crisis occur. If confirmed, I would work with colleagues in the Department to support those requirements.

Colombia

Plan Colombia has enabled the Colombian government to make significant gains against the FARC (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) and other paramilitary forces in Colombia, as well as enabled the government to secure many previously ungoverned areas. Since fiscal year 2000, the United States has provided more than \$7 billion to support Colombia’s efforts to counter the threat of transnational criminal organizations and various terrorist groups.

52. What are your views regarding the current situation in Colombia focusing upon: (1) the current military and political situation in Colombia; (2) the ability of the Colombian military to control its territory; and (3) ongoing DOD programs?

I believe the Government of Colombia has made substantial gains in recent years to enhance its internal stability and citizen security. Although stability in Colombia is not assured, Colombia has made progress in asserting more effective governmental control over its territory through a national consolidation campaign.

The Department's security assistance programs are focused on training, equipping, and mentoring Colombians; helping Colombia with defense institutional reform; and providing support to Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance programs. Colombia has also been an increasingly capable and willing partner in addressing shared security challenges and has contributed to efforts to improve stability more broadly in the Western Hemisphere, in particular by partnering with us in Central America.

53. In your view, is the Colombian government capable of sustaining the last decade's gains during this economic downturn and the scheduled decline in U.S. security assistance?

Yes. The Department has worked closely with Colombia to institutionalize the strategic, operational and technical capabilities that it has developed over the past decade, including through defense institutional reforms. Recognizing that continued U.S. assistance and support, such as Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance, will be critical to Colombia's continued success, the Department is working closely with Colombia to streamline our security cooperation programs in light of declining resources. If confirmed, I would continue working with our Colombian partners to help them consolidate and sustain their security gains while also addressing their emerging needs.

54. In light of budget conditions, do you believe continued U.S. security assistance to Colombia at the current levels is sustainable?

The Department has made difficult decisions about where to focus resources given the fiscal environment, and has also identified areas where continued U.S. support will remain critical for helping Colombia consolidate its security gains. Because of the significant progress that Colombia has made in improving its internal stability, security assistance to Colombia has been gradually reduced. Even as fewer resources are available for Colombia, if confirmed, I would work with my colleagues to assist this strategic partner as it moves toward improved stability and a greater role in exporting security within the region and globally.

55. In your view, what are the remaining U.S. supported programs that will need to be continued to "lock in" the progress that has been made?

Consolidating Colombia's security gains will require continued U.S. support to programs that strengthen Colombia's defense institutions. Such programs help provide Colombia the capacity to plan, resource, and maintain its enhanced abilities. As the FARC persists in conducting

attacks on infrastructure and other targets, it will be important for the United States to continue to provide support to programs that help the Colombian Government maintain the technical and tactical edge that will guarantee stability over the long term.

Central America and Mexico

While the unaccompanied children crisis is not in the ASD-ISA's portfolio, the root causes that drive many of these individuals to seek sanctuary in the United States are within the purview of ASD-ISA.

56. What are the root causes of insecurity in the region?

I believe insecurity stems from a wide range of persistent challenges in some countries in Latin America. Difficult economic conditions, widespread poverty and inequality, weak and sometimes corrupt government institutions, under-governed spaces, lack of sufficient infrastructure, and widespread crime and violence are only some of the significant and often overwhelming factors that contribute to insecurity in this region.

57. In your view, what role, if any, does DoD have in addressing the root causes?

The Department of Defense has a significant role to play in supporting broader U.S. efforts to strengthen government institutions and fight corruption, develop infrastructure, address control of under-governed spaces and help diminish criminal organizations and violence. Often in a supporting role, the Department provides unique capabilities and expertise to other lead U.S. agencies, and encourages more capable partners in the region to join in efforts to improve security conditions in the hemisphere.

58. What is your assessment of the threats posed by transnational criminal organizations in this region?

Transnational criminal organizations present a serious threat to the stability of the region, and many of our partners have become unable to control their growth and influence. Taking advantage of weak government institutions, endemic corruption, large under-governed spaces, and lack of viable economic opportunities for many Latin American citizens, criminal organizations have become entrenched in places like the Northern Triangle of Central America, further weakening already strained governments and citizenry. Dealing in the flow of illegal drugs, human smuggling and trafficking, counterfeiting, weapons, and other contraband smuggling across U.S. borders, these organizations also challenge the control of our southern borders and expose vulnerabilities to the southern approaches to the United States.

59. What is your understanding and assessment of DOD's ongoing current activities in Mexico and Central America?

The Department of Defense is helping Mexico and the countries of Central America improve their capacity to maintain security and advance hemispheric defense coordination, and if confirmed, I would continue to pursue those efforts. The Department's security assistance and

security cooperation activities in the region are focused on professionalization, including respect for human rights, and capacity building of regional security forces. The Department is also working with partners in Central America to facilitate internal defense institutional reform efforts that will help those governments plan, resource, and maintain their enhanced capabilities.

Cuba

60. What is your view of the need to review and, potentially, revise U. S. policies regarding Cuba?

I support the President's current policy with regard to Cuba, which includes targeted bilateral engagements that advance U.S. national interests and the enactment of measures that help reduce the dependence of Cuban citizens on the state. I support periodic review of the United States' Cuba policy and the Department of Defense's full participation in these interagency reviews.

61. What is your opinion about the need for, and the pros and cons of, military-to-military contact with Cuba?

U.S. law and policy restrict official engagement with the Cuban government, including the Cuban military. The Department of Defense currently conducts an annual disaster-relief exercise with the Cuban military at Guantanamo Bay, as well as limited military-to-military engagement with Cuba, including monthly fence-line talks at the Guantanamo Naval Base, which focus on avoiding misunderstandings across the fence line.

62. In your view, is Cuba currently supporting or sponsoring international terrorism?

Cuba is one of the countries designated by the Secretary of State as a State Sponsor of Terrorism. This list is reviewed on a recurring basis.

Building Partner Capacity

In the past few years, DOD has requested and Congress has provided a number of authorities to build the capacity of partner nations. These include the "Section 1206" global train and equip authority, targeted authorities to build capacity in Yemen and East Africa, and the Global Security Contingency Fund.

63. In your view, what are the strategic objectives and priorities for DOD's programs for building the capacity of partner nations?

The defense strategy articulated in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review emphasizes three pillars, including building security globally, as this type of global engagement is fundamental to U.S. leadership and influence. As the Department's budget declines, security cooperation efforts take on greater importance as a means to mitigate risk. In this regard, building the capacity of partners can ease the burden on U.S. forces by enabling them to act alongside of, in lieu of, or in support of U.S. forces across the globe, as well as to build national and regional security

architectures that can prevent potential contingencies from emerging.

Over the last decade, the Department's capacity-building efforts, enabled by the authorities cited above, have largely focused on counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency efforts. However, with reduced force structure and resources, the Department also will need to build capacity in other areas that could offset risk to U.S. forces, such as logistics and maritime security.

64. What improvements, if any, would you recommend, if confirmed, to the strategic direction, oversight, and management of DOD's programs for building partner capacity to ensure that these programs are executed consistent with U.S. national security goals and objectives?

Recognizing the need to align the Department's security cooperation resources and activities the defense strategy, in 2014 the Department established the office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Security Cooperation within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. I support this effort and believe the office will help prioritize competing requirements among and between partner countries, within and across combatant commands. I also expect the office to work closely with counterparts within the State Department to support implementation of Presidential Policy Directive 23 on Security Sector Assistance, which calls for whole-of-government approaches to security sector assistance in support of U.S. national security goals and objectives.

If confirmed, I would work closely with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to support further improvements to the security cooperation governance system. This includes seeking to complement tactical- and operational-level building partner capacity (BPC) efforts with initiatives to support partners' institutional needs.

65. What is your assessment of the implementation and effectiveness of DOD's programs for building partner capacity in achieving U.S. national security goals and objectives?

Overall, the Department of Defense's BPC programs have contributed to the achievement of U.S. national security goals and objectives, particularly with regard to counterterrorism, and regular program assessments have helped contribute to that success. If confirmed, I would work closely with security cooperation stakeholders to ensure that the Department continues to build on this and other assessment, monitoring, and evaluation efforts to ensure outcomes consistent with policy objectives.

Moreover, although individual BPC programs have demonstrated success, there is an opportunity to magnify their impact by linking together security cooperation programs in ways that are mutually reinforcing, so that activities at the tactical, operational, and institutional levels are woven together to create enduring, sustainable partner nation capabilities.

66. In your view, what should be the role of DOD, vis-à-vis the State Department and other civilian departments and agencies, in efforts to build the capacity of foreign security forces?

I believe each U.S. Government agency offers unique skills, subject-matter expertise, and experience to contribute to the planning, execution, and evaluation of efforts to build the capacity of foreign security forces. Simply put, whole-of-government approaches can bring about outcomes that are larger than the sum of their parts.

In my view, the Department of Defense (DoD) should play a supporting role to other departments and agencies, such as State, Justice, and USAID, in areas such as fostering political reconciliation, building accountable institutions of government, and restoring public infrastructure, so that DoD can focus its efforts on providing a safe and secure environment, while also assisting interagency partners in the building of accountable armed forces. As DoD continues to develop its approaches to building capacity at the ministerial and institutional levels, it should operate collaboratively and transparently with interagency partners to ensure that security sector reform efforts are mutually reinforcing.

Ballistic Missile Defense

In February 2010, the Defense Department issued its report on the first-ever comprehensive review of U.S. ballistic missile defense policy and strategy, the Ballistic Missile Defense Review (BMDR), as required by Congress.

67. Do you support the policies, strategies, and priorities set forth in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review?

Yes.

68. Do you agree that any ballistic missile defense systems that we deploy operationally must be operationally effective, suitable, survivable, cost-effective, affordable, and should address a credible threat?

Yes, I agree.

69. Do you agree that ballistic missile defense testing needs to be operationally realistic, and should include Operational Test and Evaluation, in order to assess operational capabilities and limitations of ballistic missile defense systems, prior to deploying such systems?

Yes.

Iran and North Korea each has hundreds of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles today that are capable of reaching forward-deployed U.S. forces, allies, and partner nations in the EUCOM, CENTCOM, and PACOM AORs. The Ballistic Missile

Defense Review Report of February 2010 stated that the United States intends to pursue regionally tailored phased adaptive approaches to ballistic missile defense against such missile threats in various regions.

70. Do you believe that such regionally tailored phased adaptive approaches are appropriate to provide our regional combatant commanders with the missile defense capabilities needed to defend our forward deployed forces and our allies and partners in their areas of responsibility?

Yes. Iran's ballistic missile arsenal presents a significant threat to our forward-deployed forces, allies, and partners in the Middle East and Europe. Our current policy calls for development of ballistic missile defenses in these regions that are tailored to their unique deterrence and defense requirements, giving specific consideration to their geography, the character of the ballistic missile threat, and the military-to-military relationships on which we are able to build cooperative missile defenses. I believe this approach affords us the best option for developing regional ballistic missile defense architectures in the Middle East and Europe that meet the needs of the responsible combatant commanders.

71. In addition to U.S. missile defense capabilities in these AORs, what role do you see for other nations to contribute to regional missile defense capabilities?

The United States maintains long-standing security cooperation relationships with allies and partners in Europe and the Middle East. The current U.S. ballistic missile defense policy seeks to leverage such relationships to build and expand cooperative missile defense partnerships that lead to appropriate levels of burden sharing for defense of common interests. In Europe, we are actively working toward deployment of the U.S. contribution to NATO ballistic missile defense and continuing to work with our allies and partners in the region to build their ballistic missile defense capacity for their own defense, and in support of the NATO architecture. In the Middle East, we are continuing to grow and strengthen our bilateral ballistic missile defense efforts with our partners in the region while also, in the case of the Gulf Cooperation Council states, promoting increased levels of multilateral ballistic missile defense cooperation. Given the significant Iranian ballistic missile threat, I believe strong partnerships are the critical foundation upon which we will build effective deterrence and defense architectures for Europe and the Middle East. If confirmed, I would continue to promote strong bilateral and multilateral ballistic missile defense cooperation in these key regions of U.S. interest.

Combating Terrorism

72. What is your assessment of the threat posed by al Qaeda, Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, and likeminded organizations in the geographical area of responsibility for ASD ISA to the United States, our allies, and our interests?

Violent extremists that operate across the geographic area of responsibility of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs continue to pose a significant threat to the U.S. homeland, to U.S. interests, and to U.S. allies and partners. Al Qa'ida, the Islamic State of

Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and other likeminded organizations pose a continuing, imminent threat to U.S. persons, facilities, partners, and allies. Extremist networks are exploiting political unrest and local grievances in parts of the Levant, North Africa and East Africa and using modern communications methods and social media to spread their ideology and plan operations. The Department of Defense conducts a range of operations to counter these threats, including direct and indirect action, cooperative efforts with allies and partners, and activities to help build the capacity of our key counterterrorism partners around the globe.

Looking ahead, the large numbers of foreign fighters that have joined the ranks of ISIL and other extremist groups in Syria and Iraq will pose a long-term threat to the United States and our allies and partners. The Department of Defense is therefore working with the U.S. interagency and foreign partners to implement appropriate counterterrorism measures to address the threat from attacks inspired or directed by violent extremists abroad.

73. What is your understanding of and familiarity with DOD's ongoing effort to combat al Qaeda in the geographical area of responsibility for ASD ISA?

I am familiar with the Department of Defense's ongoing efforts to combat al-Qa'ida in the geographic area of responsibility of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. The Department of Defense is engaged in a campaign to address the threat of al-Qa'ida, its affiliates, and other extremists throughout the Middle East and Africa. The Department supports the U.S. Government's national strategy to counter terrorism through a variety of functions, including, but not limited to kinetic strikes, training foreign partners, capacity-building efforts, counter-messaging, counter-threat finance, and intelligence collection.

74. What is your assessment of the threat posed by al Qaeda and its associated forces to the U.S. homeland, U.S. interests overseas, and Western interests more broadly?

Although the core of al-Qa'ida in Afghanistan and Pakistan remains degraded, the network's affiliates—most notably al-Qa'ida in the Arab Peninsula (AQAP)—continue to seek to attack the United States and its interests abroad. Strikes against the U.S. homeland, for instance, remain a common theme in al-Qa'ida's propaganda, stated aspirations, and planning. We take these threats seriously and, if confirmed, I would work to ensure the Department remains capable and ready to take appropriate action to counter them.

75. What do you believe is the terrorism threat from al Qaeda and affiliated groups in each of the Geographic Combatant Commands? And, of these threats, what do you consider the highest counterterrorism priorities?

I believe the highest counterterrorism priorities remain in the USCENTCOM area of responsibility. Though degraded by years of counterterrorism pressure, core al-Qa'ida, its affiliates, and adherents in Afghanistan and Pakistan remain a persistent and serious threat.

AQAP has proven its capability to initiate attacks against the United States, remains the most

lethal of al-Qa'ida affiliates, and is among our highest counterterrorism priorities. The Department is working closely with Yemeni forces to capture or kill key AQAP leadership and operatives, and our programs to train, advise, and equip Yemeni forces are critical to long-term efforts against AQAP.

In the Middle East and Levant, ISIL, al-Nusrah Front, and other extremist networks pose threats to U.S. interests and persons in the region. We also face a threat to the U.S. homeland by a group of seasoned al-Qa'ida operatives who traveled to Syria and are known as the Khorasan Group. These groups, along with the thousands of foreign fighters they have attracted over the past few years, will remain a serious concern and top counterterrorism priority for the United States and our international partners. If confirmed, I would support improving coordination and information sharing on foreign extremist flows from Syria, and would continue working with Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Israel to bolster regional stability.

In the USAFRICOM area of responsibility, our top counterterrorism priorities are al-Shabaab and al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). Somalia-based al-Shabaab poses a threat to U.S. and Western interests in the Horn of Africa. Several years of operations by the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), together with our counterterrorism operations, have weakened al-Shabaab and reduced its safe-havens in Somalia. Al-Shabaab remains, however, a threat because it has demonstrated a capability to stage complex, high-profile attacks against Western targets outside of Somalia and continues to advance similar plots to harm U.S. citizens in the region.

Algeria-based AQIM and its regional-based associates have flourished from instability in Libya and Mali; however, there is no current, credible evidence that AQIM is a direct threat to the U.S. homeland.

In the remaining Geographic Combatant Commands, the threat from al-Qa'ida is less pronounced. If confirmed, I would continue working with the intelligence community, interagency colleagues, and foreign partners to disrupt and dismantle any emerging threats from al-Qa'ida in the areas of responsibility of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

76. What is your understanding of the Department's role in the U.S. strategy to combat terrorism?

The U.S. Government is engaged in a multi-departmental, multi-national effort guided by the National Strategy for Counterterrorism. The Department of Defense supports this strategy principally by building the capacity of partner security forces, collecting intelligence, conducting information operations, and, when appropriate, conducting operations to capture or kill terrorists who pose a continuing, imminent threat to U.S. persons.

77. Are you aware of any nexus between non-state actors and criminal networks?

Yes. There is a significant nexus between non-state actors and criminal networks worldwide. Non-state actors and criminal networks together pose threats to our national security interests and those of foreign allies and partners. For example, the FARC in Colombia have depended on criminal networks for years to conduct terrorist operations. Drug cartels in Mexico rely on global criminal networks to distribute their products and expand into new markets. Across Africa, illicit trafficking of wildlife and other natural resources facilitated by criminal networks provides funding for insurgents, violent extremist organizations, and terrorist organizations. Somalia-based pirate groups depend on transnational illicit networks to negotiate and secure ransoms to finance their operations. In Afghanistan, the Taliban continues to generate a significant percentage of its revenue through regional trade and taxation of illicit drugs, posing a direct threat to U.S. and coalition personnel and to our broader interests in the region.

78. Given your current knowledge of DOD's programs, do you believe resources are aligned in a manner consistent with these counterterrorism priorities?

Yes. I believe the Department's counterterrorism resources are currently aligned and are consistent with the priorities outlined in the National Strategy for Counterterrorism. If confirmed, I would continue working with the Secretary, the Joint Staff, Combatant Commands, and interagency partners to ensure alignment of the Department's resources evolves with the nature – and geography – of the threat.

Use of Military Forces for Civilian Law Enforcement

Throughout the Western Hemisphere, there is increased use of militaries to conduct policing and public security roles.

79. Putting aside issues of corruption and capabilities, what is your assessment of this trend?

Our Latin American partners, particularly in Central America, have been left with few other readily available options, considering the almost complete breakdown of police and justice systems, and are increasingly looking to their militaries as a way to address the immediate security challenges. The Department of Defense supports the broader U.S. Government efforts to strengthen police and justice systems in these countries so they need not rely on their militaries.

80. In your view, are these permanent shifts or temporary measures taken while the capabilities of police forces are improved?

I think these are temporary measures. Militaries in some countries have been directed to provide breathing space for police forces so that they can address significant shortcomings in capabilities. Once the elected civilian leadership in these countries has determined the police forces are capable of providing local security, these militaries should return to more traditional military roles.

81. In your view, what are the benefits and risks of militaries taking on more public-security tasks?

In times of security crises, militaries can help civil authorities restore order, provide government presence and credibility, and aid public security forces to develop the capabilities and trust needed to reassume their lead role in maintaining citizen security and public order. However, the longer militaries in some Latin America serve in this role, the more likely it is that civil authorities could begin to depend on military forces, instead of focusing efforts on improving police forces.

National Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime

Transnational criminal organizations are having a debilitating impact on the ability of our foreign partners to govern their nations and provide opportunities for their people. The Department of Defense is by no means the U.S. Government's law enforcement agency, but it does bring unique enabling capabilities to our nation's Federal law enforcement agencies.

82. What is your understanding of the President's strategy to combat transnational criminal organizations?

The President's 2011 Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime recognizes that transnational organized crime (TOC) has expanded dramatically in size, scope, and influence over the past 20 years, and now poses a significant and direct threat to national and international security. The strategy organizes a U.S. Government approach to counter TOC networks by enhancing information and intelligence sharing of the interagency; strengthening law enforcement interdiction capabilities, investigations, and prosecutions; disrupting drug trafficking networks; and building and improving the capacity and cooperation of our foreign partners. The primary objective is to lower TOC from a U.S. national security threat to a manageable public safety concern. If confirmed, I would work to support the President's strategy on this issue.

83. What role, if any, should the Department play in combatting transnational criminal organizations?

The President's 2011 Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime calls on the U.S. Government to build, balance, and integrate the tools of national power to combat transnational organized crime and related threats. The Department of Defense provides unique capabilities and expertise in support of law enforcement and foreign partners' broader efforts to include intelligence, counter-threat finance, training, and detection and monitoring. If confirmed, I would work with the Department's senior leadership to ensure that the Department is appropriately organized, resourced, and authorized to support U.S. efforts against transnational criminal organizations that threaten U.S. national security.

84. What role does ASD-ISA play in combating transnational organized crime and in

training and equipping partner security forces who have been tasked with combating it?

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs works closely with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict and other elements of the Department with counter-drug and counter-transnational organized crime responsibilities. If confirmed, I would work to ensure that the Department's activities to combat transnational organized crime, such as training and equipping of partner nations' security forces, align with broader Department of Defense and U.S. national security objectives.

Illicit Arms Trafficking

85. What is your understanding of the problem of illicit arms trafficking and the role of the United States to deal with the problem?

The arms market is complex and global. Existing regional and national arms export control systems do not provide complete, worldwide coverage. This creates gaps that are being exploited by illicit arms dealers. The United States can continue to assist countries by sharing best practices and intelligence to help close these gaps.

86. In your view, to what extent, if at all, does the lack of national controls and enforcement on arms flows contribute to the illicit trafficking problem, and could efforts to respond to illicit trafficking be improved if other countries adopted and enforced national regulations on arms import, export, and transit similar to those of the United States?

Wherever illicit arms trafficking is widespread, the lack of effective national controls and secure borders contributes significantly to the illegal flow of arms. The adoption of national controls by affected countries, similar to those of the United States, would likely help to combat this problem. Our active participation in international export control regimes and other arms control fora are part of our strategy to help address the proliferation of arms and weapons technology.

87. Do you think the arms trade treaty would enhance U.S. national security interests?

Yes. The arms trade treaty (ATT) that was negotiated in 2013 will serve U.S. national security interests. The ATT establishes international obligations for State Parties related to the trade of arms, while reaffirming the right of self-defense and the legitimacy of arms transfers for security purposes, without undermining existing nonproliferation and export control regimes. These obligations undertaken by States Parties will help to regulate the global arms market and prevent weapons from reaching the hands of terrorists, insurgents and human rights abusers.

Multilateral Peacekeeping Operations

88. What is your view on whether the United States should contribute additional military personnel to both staff positions and military observers in support of U.N. peacekeeping operations?

If confirmed, I would support considering additional contributions of U.S. military personnel to staff officer positions. Support for international peacekeeping remains a security objective for the U.S. Government, and the United States has a stake in the success of UN peacekeeping operations. I believe that, where practicable, the United States should continue to provide military personnel for UN peacekeeping operations, especially for key staff positions that can help shape the direction and success of the mission. If confirmed, I would carefully evaluate any proposals to contribute military or civilian personnel to a UN peacekeeping operation, weighing the positive impact of U.S. participation in the mission against other military commitments we have around the globe, and the estimated cost of U.S. involvement.

89. What are the advantages and disadvantages of contributing additional military personnel to U.N. operations?

There are several potential advantages to contributing additional military personnel to UN missions including providing the opportunity to shape these missions and contribute to their overall success; professional development opportunities for military personnel to serve in a combined, multi-lateral environment; and receiving real-time information on emerging threats and crises from places where there might not otherwise be a U.S. presence. It also enables increased interaction between U.S. military personnel and numerous partner nations' military personnel, with whom we may not normally have the opportunity to serve.

The potential disadvantage of providing additional military personnel is the additional demands these assignments would impose on a U.S. military force that has seen extensive deployments in recent years, and that is still heavily engaged in overseas operations. However, I believe the selective placement of modest numbers of U.S. military personnel in addition to the personnel currently assigned to UN operations can have a positive impact on UN peacekeeping operations.

Mass Atrocities Prevention

President Obama identified the prevention of mass atrocities and genocide as a core U.S. national security interest, as well as a core moral interest, in August 2011 under Presidential Study Directive 10.

90. What is DOD's role in addressing atrocity threats, and what tools does DOD have for preventing or responding to atrocities?

The Department of Defense (DoD) is a member of the Atrocities Prevention Board, which has strengthened the Department's efforts and provided additional tools to prevent and respond to atrocities. DoD plays an important role in early warning and providing support to prepare and enable international partners to prevent mass atrocities.

DoD employs a range of atrocity prevention and response tools, from providing human rights training to partner security forces to supplying direct humanitarian assistance in active crises. If confirmed, I would continue to ensure that the Department contributes to U.S. efforts to prevent

mass atrocities, particularly for those regions that will be within the International Security Affairs area of responsibility.

U.S. Military Basing in Europe

The Department of Defense is currently undergoing a European Infrastructure Consolidation (EIC) effort. At the same time, the Department has requested additional funds for facilities in Europe, including almost \$175 million in military construction in fiscal year 2015 in support of the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI).

91. What is your understanding and assessment of the EIC and ERI initiatives and whether the goals of each can be accomplished in parallel.

The European Infrastructure Consolidation (EIC) and the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) are separate but complementary U.S. initiatives which can be accomplished in parallel. Both initiatives are about increasing U.S. military effectiveness in Europe -- the EIC through the consolidation of U.S. infrastructure to make U.S. forces more efficient, and the ERI through investments to U.S. presence, readiness, and responsiveness in Central and Eastern Europe. The EIC will not reduce our military capabilities in Europe, but will shift their location within Europe to lower costs, eliminate excesses, and maximize utility. The ERI will build on these adjustments by adding even more capability, including through a persistent U.S. air, land, and sea presence.

92. If confirmed, how would you define and recommend the use of the key U.S. strategic interests for consideration in determining the U.S. military's force structure in Europe over the coming years?

I believe force structure in Europe remains vital to U.S. security and that of our allies and partners, and U.S. forces and facilities in Europe are likely to continue to be involved in any significant military operation we would undertake in the Middle East or Africa. Furthermore, Europe is home to the United States' primary strategic partners and we will continue to rely on those partners and allies to share the burden of protecting common interests. In the 2014 QDR, the Department reiterated its commitment to build security abroad and project power decisively to defeat aggression. European force structure -- and the relationships and interoperability it enables -- is critical to that mission, and if confirmed, I would work to uphold our commitment to European force structure.

The United States has supported operations in both Africa and the Middle East from our military bases in Europe

93. What is your understanding and assessment of the potential impact, if any, on our ability to conduct operations in Africa and the Middle East if the U.S. were to lose access to or from bases in Europe?

Our partners and Allies facilitate U.S. forces' ability to counter security challenges to U.S. interests in Europe, the Mediterranean, North Africa, and the Middle East in a timely fashion. Base access in Southern Europe, for example, allows U.S. forces to conduct force protection missions, monitor and protect U.S. diplomatic posts, and evacuate U.S. diplomatic personnel and noncombatants in North and Central Africa. Losing access to this extensive network of facilities would harm our ability to protect U.S. assets and personnel in Europe and further afield.

Our footprint in Europe also affords U.S. personnel with opportunities to maintain relationships and interoperability critical to countering global security threats. For example, U.S. facilities in Germany, Italy, and Spain enable U.S. and European militaries to plan, train, exercise, and operate together effectively -- activities vital to forming effective coalitions as we look for ways to cooperate through austere times. Coalition efforts like Operation UNIFIED PROTECTOR in Libya, ISAF in Afghanistan, and Operation UNITED ASSISTANCE in West Africa depend heavily on access to bases in Europe.

Contingency Planning

One of the purposes of Goldwater-Nichols was to increase military and civilian attention on the formulation of strategy and contingency planning. The ASD-ISA supports the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy who is required to assist the Secretary of Defense in preparing written policy guidance for the preparation and review of contingency plans and in reviewing such plans.

94. What is your view of the civilian role, as compared to the military role, in the formulation of strategy and contingency planning?

If confirmed as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, I would view my role as providing the strategic context to complement the operational expertise that our combatant commanders apply. Specifically, I believe civilian leadership provides critical depth and expertise on regional dynamics, bilateral relationships and priorities, and U.S. regional policies, which help us shape the application of our military power.

95. In your opinion, does the civilian leadership currently have an appropriate level of oversight of strategy formulation and contingency planning?

Yes. I believe that the current level of civilian oversight of strategy formulation and contingency planning is appropriate.

96. What is your understanding and assessment of the capability and capacity of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Joint Staff to provide comprehensive, objective and realistic joint analysis in support of formulating and evaluating strategy and operational plans and related force planning?

I believe the Department maintains a satisfactory level of analytic capacity to support strategy and operational plan development. My understanding is that the Office of the Secretary of

Defense and the Joint Staff, working closely with the Services and Combatant Commands, have many analytic efforts and venues that support the Department's strategy development and planning oversight. I have benefitted from such analysis in my present role.

97. What steps do you believe are necessary to ensure effective civilian control and oversight of strategy, contingency, and force planning?

The Department's civilian leadership is responsible for leading the development of a range of Department of Defense planning efforts, with the support of military leaders. Civilian leaders must engage with military colleagues to understand military concepts and evaluate the validity of assumptions, particularly as they relate to political constraints, resource allocation, and strategic priorities. Civilian leaders should also ensure guidance continues to evolve as strategic and operational environments and objectives shift over time. Among my most important responsibilities, should I be confirmed, would be to ensure International Security Affairs informs force planning in a way that helps to define the future security environment and to support the President's policies.

Many Geographic Combatant Commands' contingency and operation plans are undergoing DOD review. These reviews are justified for a variety of reasons including geo-strategic change, risk assessments, potential adversary and our own capability enhancements, and fiscal realities.

98. If confirmed, how would you determine whether the alterations to a contingency or operation plan are warranted due to geo-strategic change, risk assessments, potential adversary and our own capability enhancements, and fiscal realities?

If confirmed, I would rely on support from the Intelligence Community and the regional and policy expertise resident in International Security Affairs to guide and evaluate the combatant commands' planning efforts. Plans should provide viable options to the Secretary and the President that reflect realistic resource assumptions, account for an evolving security environment, and reflect decisions and actions that are viable by bringing together senior experts to evaluate and refine plans.

Strategic Reviews

99. What is your understanding and evaluation of DOD's processes for strategic assessment, analysis, decision making, and reporting for each of the following strategic reviews?

The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) (section 118 of title 10, United States Code);

The National Military Strategy (section 153 of title 10, United States Code);

Global Defense Posture Review (section 2687a of title 10, United States Code);

The Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review (section 118b of title 10, United States Code).

The Unified Command Plan (section 161 of title 10, United States Code).

These strategic review documents and associated review processes offer opportunities for meaningful engagement with Members of Congress on the Department's strategic priorities, in addition to providing essential guidance to the defense enterprise. These reviews allow the Department to set priorities across the Services, Combatant Commands, and defense components, in the context of ever-shifting security and fiscal realities. They also communicate the Department's objectives to external audiences, including the U.S. public and our international partners.

The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) articulates the nation's defense strategy in support of the national security strategy. According to 10 U.S.C. Section 118, the Department must conduct a comprehensive examination of the national defense strategy, force structure, infrastructure, budget, and other elements with the end of articulating the United States' defense strategy over the next 20 years. This strategy serves as a guide for U.S. military force structure, plans, and programs and is essential in enabling the Department to meet the current and future security challenges our nation faces.

As directed in 10 U.S.C Section 153, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff prepares the National Military Strategy, which focuses on the U.S. military's strategic priorities. The National Military Strategy articulates the "ends, ways and means" in achieving the objectives outlined in the National Security Strategy and other strategic guidance documents, such as the QDR, as well as describing the strategic and operational risks associated with accomplishing the military's strategy.

The Global Defense Posture review is an annual report to Congress that is the product of a continuous review process to determine the best mix of continental U.S.- and overseas-based forces. The report is authored by the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Chairman. The review also supports senior leaders in the Department to make resource decisions based on the Department's operational needs.

The Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review (QRM), a report required under section 161 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department to complete a comprehensive assessment of the roles and missions of the Armed Forces and the core competencies and capabilities of the Department to perform and support such roles and missions.

100. If confirmed, what recommendations would you make, if any, to change title 10, United States Code, that would update, improve, or make these reviews more useful to the Department and to Congress?

These reviews provide opportunities to assess and alter, as necessary, the nation's defense strategy, required capabilities, and force structure for the nation's security interests, future security environment, and available resources. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities (ASD SPC) to ensure that these reviews serve the needs of both the Department's senior leaders and the U.S. Congress.

101. If confirmed, what recommendations would you make, if any, to improve DOD's processes for strategic assessment, analysis, policy formulation, and decision making relative to each review above?

I believe that successful strategic reviews include senior leader guidance and involvement, collaboration across the Department, and transparent deliberations.

Strategic reviews require a robust analytical effort to provide a common understanding of future challenges and a common starting point for evaluating the proficiency and sufficiency of different force structures. If confirmed, I would work with ASD SPC to recommend that insights from previous reviews, along the lines of those described above, be applied to future Department reviews.

According to the report of the bipartisan National Defense Panel, "the capabilities and capacities rightly called for in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review...clearly exceed the budget resources made available to the Department."

102. Do you concur with this assessment? Do you believe it will be necessary to repeal sequestration in order to make available sufficient resources to execute the QDR strategy?

I concur with the National Defense Panel's (NDP) concern that current and likely budget constraints are "dangerous and self-defeating," and significantly impact the Department's ability to do long-term force planning. I also concur with the NDP's advocacy for the Department's requested compensation reforms, which provide needed flexibility. A return of the sequester mechanism would break our defense strategy by denying the Department of Defense the budget level to prioritize its expenditure. This means that, as Deputy Secretary Work has said, not only would there be a risk to certain missions, but also other missions would be executed on longer timelines and with a greater risk to the force.

According to the report of the bipartisan National Defense Panel, "national defense needs should drive national defense budgets, not the opposite."

103. What aspects of a strategy would indicate that a strategy is budget-driven versus budget-informed?

A budget-driven strategy defines ends, ways, and means based on available resources, and contains little to no risk because, by definition, the strategy is designed to do only what can be done with available resources. A budget-informed strategy considers national interests and objectives, assesses how to achieve those objectives given the strategic environment, and develops specific ways and means to try to meet desired ends, informed by the likely available resource levels. A successful strategy should be budget-informed to have relevance; a defense strategy is effective only if it is executable.

According to the force sizing construct in the 2014 QDR, American forces should be able to “defeat a regional adversary in a large-scale multi-phased campaign, and deny the objectives of – or impose unacceptable costs on – another aggressor in another region.”

104. The portfolio of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs includes some of the most turbulent regions of the world. In the context of the recent and dramatic deterioration of the security environment in both the Middle East and Russia, as well as continuing instability in Asia, should the force sizing construct also mandate that American forces be able to defeat two adversaries at the same time, a standard embraced by previous QDRs?

U.S. forces will continue to be able to prevail in more than one conflict at a time. The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review envisioned an uncertain and complex security environment. Therefore, it directed the Department to size and shape the Joint Force to respond to a wide range of challenges. The current force-sizing construct allows us to plan and deliver agile, technologically advanced forces of sufficient size to defend our Nation and secure our interests globally while preventing America’s adversaries from achieving their objectives.

The law requires the QDR to identify the budget plan that would be required to provide sufficient resources to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in that national defense strategy at a low-to-moderate level of risk, and any additional resources (beyond those programmed in the current future-years defense program) required to achieve such a level of risk. The law also requires the QDR to make recommendations that are not constrained to comply with and are fully independent of the budget submitted to Congress by the President.

105. What is your understanding and assessment of the Department’s QDR analysis and decision making processes to address these two requirements?

The Department’s Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) process is both strategy-driven and resource-informed. It determines the best mix of capabilities and investment portfolios for the Department to pursue. The Department accounts for both the fiscal climate and the strategic environment, and then makes difficult choices—and the QDR provides the strategic direction required to do so. This year, the QDR provided a specific assessment of what a return to

sequester levels could mean for the risks associated with the execution of the Department's mission.

- 106. In your view, is there analytical and/or practical value in a defense strategy that is unconstrained by or independent of the current or projected budget requests or fiscal environment?**

An effective defense strategy should take a comprehensive view of the future security environment and ensure the Department appropriately prioritizes its efforts and addresses trade-offs in the needed capabilities, activities, and posture of the future force. If a Defense strategy were characterized by the application of fiscal constraints up front, its focus would be on establishing trade-offs within the force to meet budget targets, rather than on options for best achieving U.S. objectives.

Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC)

WHINSEC, which replaced the School of the Americas in 2001, has the mission of contributing to theater cooperation activities and capacity building efforts through the education and training of students in the Western Hemisphere from Canada to Chile.

- 107. What is your view of WHINSEC and its mandate?**

The Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) plays an important role as an educational institution focused on promoting democracy and human rights in the Western Hemisphere—and by providing professional education and training for military, civilian, and law enforcement personnel from countries throughout the Hemisphere. WHINSEC's mandate is to foster mutual understanding, transparency, confidence, and cooperation among participating nations, and to promote democratic values, respect for human rights, and knowledge and understanding of U.S. customs and traditions.

- 108. In your view, does WHINSEC promote the national security interests of the United States in the Western Hemisphere?**

Yes. WHINSEC promotes U.S. national security interests and supports strategic objectives of building lasting partnerships that will ensure security, enhance stability, promote respect for human rights, and enable prosperity throughout the Americas.

Global Force Posture

As the Defense Department continues its assessment of projected budget cuts on its end strength, force structure, and other programs, it must also consider the costs, benefits, and risks associated with the permanent stationing of military forces in countries around the world. Based on a series of reports by the Government Accountability Office, evidence indicates that the Department is challenged in its ability to comprehensively and reliably estimate the cost of our global defense posture.

109. What is your understanding and assessment of the cost and benefits of the U.S. global defense posture and the stationing of U.S. military forces overseas?

I believe U.S. global posture is the most visible illustration of U.S. national security interests. It provides our allies and adversaries a measure of American resolve, while deterring aggression from our adversaries.

In evaluations of U.S. global posture, the Department considers bilateral relationships, operational imperative, force management impact, and fiscal costs. When we choose to station forces home, we have to consider basing and facilities cost alongside the rotational costs incurred when those units have to deploy abroad. On the other hand, stationing forces overseas embeds additional costs in basing, personnel (through allowances such as Cost of Living Allowance and Overseas Housing Allowance), and facilities accounts.

As the Department seeks a balance between the forces kept at home and those stationed abroad, DoD pays close attention to operational demands and regional conditions. If confirmed, I would continue to push for innovative methodologies that leverage America's strengths and advantages.

110. In light of the force structure reductions associated with the Department's planned end strength cuts, and potentially even deeper future end strength cuts, if confirmed, how would you propose to allocate those reductions between forces based within the United States and forces stationed outside the United States?

Decisions affecting U.S. forces at home or abroad are considered through the lens I outlined above. Each decision is unique, but the Department uses a rigorous process that seeks to reassure our allies and partners while deterring our adversaries. If confirmed, I would work with my counterparts to determine the best options for military posture given the fiscal environment.

111. What is your understanding and assessment of the DOD methodology and assumptions used to evaluate the relative cost of overseas posture compared to stationing forces in the United States?

If confirmed, I would work with the ASD SPC to ensure that the Department considers posture impacts on the achievement of strategic objectives, secures the most advantageous cost-sharing arrangements with partners, and ensures that cost considerations are appropriately analyzed and considered before resources are expended. Finally, I am committed to building the capacity of partners globally, which will allow U.S. overseas forces to focus on our core interests.

112. If confirmed, what actions would you take or changes would you recommend, if any, to DOD's methodology and assumptions in determining the cost of overseas force posture compared to forces stationed in the United States?

If confirmed, I would work with the ASD SPC to ensure that U.S. forward-stationed posture is sized to meet operational requirements and leverages innovative presence paradigms. I would

also expect to play a significant role in ensuring that bilateral arrangements that support U.S. posture are as cost-effective as possible.

Detainee Treatment Policy

- 113. Do you support the provisions of section 1403 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 which state that no individual in the custody or under the physical control of the U.S. Government, regardless of nationality or physical location, shall be subject to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment?**

Yes. The prohibition on cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment reflects American values and is in our country's best strategic interest. In the 21st century, the strength and appeal of our ideas and moral principles will be as important as our military might to America's leadership in the world. We must hold to those ideas that make this country great, and continue to inspire the growth of freedom and tolerance around the world, if we are to defeat violent extremism.

- 114. Do you support the policy set forth in the July 7, 2006, memorandum issued by the Deputy Secretary of Defense stating that all relevant DOD directives, regulations, policies, practices, and procedures must fully comply with Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions?**

Yes.

- 115. If confirmed, will you take steps to ensure that all relevant DOD directives, regulations, policies, practices, and procedures fully comply with the requirements of section 1403 and with Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions?**

Yes.

- 116. Do you support the standards for detainee treatment specified in the revised Army Field Manual on Interrogations, FM 2-22.3, issued in September 2006, and in DOD Directive 2310.01E, the DOD Detainee Program, dated September 5, 2006?**

Yes.

Congressional Oversight

In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

117. Do you agree, if confirmed for this high position, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress?

Yes.

118. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the ASD ISA?

Yes.

119. Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate Committees?

Yes.

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

Yes.