

Advance Questions for Admiral Cecil E.D. Haney
Nominee for Commander, United States Strategic Command

Defense Reforms

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and the Special Operations reforms have strengthened the war fighting readiness of our Armed Forces. They have enhanced civilian control and the chain of command by clearly delineating the combatant commanders' responsibilities and authorities and the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These reforms have also improved cooperation between the services and the combatant commanders, among other things, in joint training and education and in the execution of military operations.

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

No. I believe that Goldwater-Nichols as it stands is effective.

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

N/A

Duties

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Commander, U. S. Strategic Command?

The Commander, USSTRATCOM is responsible for the plans and operations for U.S. forces conducting strategic deterrence and DoD space and cyberspace operations. These responsibilities include the following missions: deter attacks on U.S. vital interests, ensure U.S. freedom of action in space and cyberspace, deliver integrated kinetic and non-kinetic effects in support of U.S. Joint Force Commander operations, synchronizing planning and coordinating operations support for global missile defense, synchronize regional combating weapons of mass destruction plans, provide integrated surveillance and reconnaissance allocation recommendations to the Secretary of Defense and advocate for assigned capabilities.

What background and experience do you possess that you believe qualifies you to perform these duties?

My thirty-five year career includes assignments and responsibilities involving operational and staff assignments in the United States Navy, the Joint Staff and USSTRATCOM. I have completed various operational, leadership, and strategic deterrence assignments within the submarine force, to include assistant squadron deputy at Submarine Squadron Eight before taking command of USS Honolulu (SSN 718) and commanded Submarine Squadron One, and Submarine Group Two. I have served as the Deputy Chief of Staff of Plans, Policies and Requirements, U.S. Pacific Fleet (N5N8); and director, Submarine Warfare Division (N87);

director, Naval Warfare Integration Group (N00X) and deputy commander, U.S. Strategic Command.

As the Deputy Commander, USSTRATCOM, I gained experience in delivering effects with the broad range of strategic capabilities for Combatant Commanders engaged across the spectrum of conflict around the world. As Commander, Pacific Fleet for the past three years, I organized, trained and equipped Pacific theater operational naval assets in space, cyberspace, intelligence, missile defense, and strategic effects in support of the missions of PACOM, USSTRATCOM, North American Aerospace Defense Command and other Combatant Commands. I have also served as Commander, Joint Task Force 519 for Commander, US Pacific Command. If confirmed, I will leverage my experience to lead USSTRATCOM in fulfilling its responsibilities.

Do you believe that there are any steps that you need to take to enhance your expertise to perform the duties of the Commander, U. S. Strategic Command?

I will seek to continue to enhance my expertise in USSTRATCOM's broad range of missions. If confirmed, I look forward to working with all the Combatant Commanders and the many organizations USSTRATCOM depends on for continued success, many of whom I worked with during my tour as the Deputy Commander, USSTRATCOM. I intend to establish clear lines of communication, define relationships and become more familiar with these organizations (e.g. Department of Homeland Security, Department of Energy-National Nuclear Security Administration, Missile Defense Agency, Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the Nuclear Weapons Council) and their contributions to mission success.

Relationships

Section 162(b) of title 10, United States Code, provides that the chain of command runs from the President to the Secretary of Defense and from the Secretary of Defense to the commanders of the combatant commands. Other sections of law and traditional practice, however, establish important relationships outside the chain of command. Please describe your understanding of the relationship of the Commander, U. S. Strategic Command, to the following officials:

The Secretary of Defense

Pursuant to Title 10, U.S. Code, section 164, subject to the direction of the President, the Commander, USSTRATCOM performs duties under the authority, direction and control of the Secretary of Defense and is directly responsible to the Secretary for the preparedness of the command to carry out assigned missions.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense

In accordance with Title 10, U.S. Code, section 132, the Deputy Secretary of Defense will perform such duties and exercise powers prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The Deputy Secretary of Defense will act for and exercise the powers of the Secretary of Defense when the

Secretary is disabled or the office is vacant. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Deputy Secretary on appropriate matters.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

The Under Secretary for Policy is the principal staff assistant (PSA) and advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense for all matters on the formulation of national security and defense policy and the integration and oversight of DoD policy and plans to achieve national security objectives.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence

The Under Secretary for Intelligence is the PSA and advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense for all matters regarding intelligence, counterintelligence, security, sensitive activities and other intelligence-related matters.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics

The Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics is the PSA and advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense for all matters relating to the DoD Acquisition System; research and development; modeling and simulation; systems integration; logistics; installation management; military construction; procurement; environment; services; and nuclear, chemical and biological programs.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs (ASD/GSA) is a newly configured directorate in the Office of the Secretary of Defense that develops policy for the Secretary on countering weapons of mass destruction, nuclear forces and missile defense, cyber security and space issues. GSA is currently tasked with three major congressionally-mandated reviews: the Nuclear Posture Review, the Ballistic Missile Defense Review, and the Space Posture Review. In addition, GSA is the Defense Department's lead in developing a cyber-security strategy for the Department and for crafting the policy for the standup of the new Cyber Command. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for ASD/GSA in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on matters in the area of U.S. Strategic Command.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs under the authority, direction and control of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, serves as the principal civilian advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on homeland defense activities, Defense Support of Civil Authorities, Western Hemisphere security matters and provides overall supervision of homeland defense activities of the DoD. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for

Homeland Security and Americas' Security in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on matters in the area of U.S. Strategic Command.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Defense Programs

The Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Programs advises the Secretary of Defense on nuclear energy, nuclear weapons and chemical and biological defense; serves as the Staff Director of the Nuclear Weapons Council; and performs such additional duties as the Secretary may prescribe. If confirmed, I will work closely with this office and the Nuclear Weapons Council in support of the nuclear deterrence mission.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Title 10, U.S. Code, section 163, clearly establishes the Chairman as the principal military advisor to the President, the National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council and the Secretary of Defense. In this role, he is the most senior ranking member of the armed forces but does not exercise command over any military forces or serve in the Chain of Command between the President and Secretary of Defense and Combatant Commanders, although the President may transmit communications through him. By law and as directed by the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman consults with the Combatant Commanders, evaluates and assists in achieving their requirements and plans. The Chairman provides a vital link between the Combatant Commanders and other elements of the DoD. If confirmed, I will keep the Chairman and the Secretary of Defense promptly informed on matters for which I am personally accountable as Commander, USSTRATCOM.

The Secretaries of the Military Departments

Under Title 10, U.S. Code, Section 165, subject to the authority, direction and control of the Secretary of Defense, and subject to the authority of the Combatant Commanders, the Secretaries of the Military Departments are responsible for administration and support of forces that are assigned to unified and specified commands. The authority exercised by a Combatant Commander over Service components is quite clear but requires close coordination with each Secretary to ensure there is no infringement upon those lawful responsibilities which a Secretary alone may discharge. If confirmed, I look forward to building a strong and productive relationship with each of the Secretaries of the Military Departments.

The Chiefs of Staff of the Services

As a result of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, the Service Chiefs no longer serve in the operational chain of command. They now serve to provide organized, trained and equipped forces to be employed by Combatant Commanders in accomplishing their assigned missions. Additionally, these officers serve as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and have a lawful obligation to provide military advice. Individually and collectively, the Service Chiefs are a tremendous source of experience and judgment. If confirmed, I will work closely and confer regularly with the Service Chiefs.

The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office

The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) is a DoD organization engaged in the research and development, acquisition, launch and operation of overhead reconnaissance systems necessary to meet the needs of the Intelligence Community and of the DoD. According to the Unified Command Plan, USSTRATCOM is the responsible Combatant Command for both space operations and for planning, integrating and coordinating intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance in support of strategic and global operations, as directed. In these capacities, the Commander, USSTRATCOM must maintain a close relationship with the Director of the NRO to coordinate and represent requirements in these mission areas. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Director of the NRO on matters of shared interest and importance.

The Combatant Commanders, particularly Commander, U. S. Northern Command, and Air Force Global Strike Command and U.S. Cyber Command

The Commander, USSTRATCOM has both supported and supporting relationships with other Combatant Commanders, largely identified within the Unified Command Plan (UCP), the Forces for Unified Commands Memorandum, the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan, specific command arrangement agreements, Operations Plans and Concept Plans. Air Force Global Strike Command is an Air Force major command that provides combat ready forces to USSTRATCOM to conduct nuclear deterrence and global strike operations as directed. U.S. Cyber Command is a subordinate unified command to USSTRATCOM. U.S. Cyber Command plans, coordinates, integrates, synchronizes and conducts activities to direct the operations and defense of specified DoD information networks. USSTRATCOM supports U.S. Northern Command's mission to conduct homeland defense to secure and defend the United States and its interests. In many cases, USSTRATCOM is a supporting Combatant Commander for other UCP assigned missions. If confirmed, I look forward to working with other Combatant Commanders to broaden and enhance the level and range of these relationships.

The Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration

According to Title 50, U.S. Code, section 2402, the Department of Energy's Under Secretary for Nuclear Security serves as Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The Administrator is responsible for all Department of Energy programs and activities related to nuclear weapons, including the stockpile stewardship program. Although the Administrator serves outside the DoD's operational control, he does serve on the Nuclear Weapons Council and executes duties which closely concern and support USSTRATCOM. If confirmed, I will work closely and confer regularly with the Administrator.

The Director of the Missile Defense Agency

The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) serves as the missile defense systems engineering and development organization for the DoD. It provides the research, development, testing and evaluation of the missile defense and associated systems that would be employed by Combatant Commanders. The current Unified Command Plan charges USSTRATCOM with synchronizing

planning for global missile defense including coordinating global missile defense operations support, and developing and advocating for missile defense and warning capabilities. Given these closely aligned responsibilities, both the Commander, USSTRATCOM and its Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense must continue their close working relationship with MDA. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Director of MDA to ensure that Combatant Commanders' required ballistic missile defense and warning capabilities are appropriately and effectively represented to MDA.

The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation

Title 10, U.S. Code, section 139, provides for a Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, who serves as the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics on operational test and evaluation in the DoD and the principal operational test and evaluation official within the senior management of the DoD. The Director, as allowed by law and departmental regulations, formulates policy, provides guidance, coordinates, reviews, monitors and makes recommendations regarding test and evaluation matters under his purview. If confirmed, I will work closely with and seek the advice of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation in assessing the progress of command programs of interest.

Major Challenges and Problems

In your view, what are the major challenges that will confront the next Commander, U.S. Strategic Command?

The missions of USSTRATCOM are at the heart of U.S. national security and that of our allies and friends abroad. Today's national security environment is far more complex and diverse than ever before. Wider access to advanced technology, newly assertive states with rising aspirations regionally and globally, and still emerging vulnerabilities created by transnational linkages all fuel threats requiring synchronized efforts of many departments and agencies and other countries as well. Ensuring mission readiness and the proper policies, decision authorities and organizational relationships are in place to rapidly respond to complex and diverse threats will be a major challenge.

Assuming you are confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges?

If confirmed, I will work with other federal departments, agencies and allied partners to advance the policies and relationships needed to enhance a cooperative and collaborative approach. I will assess the USSTRATCOM organizational structure and work to streamline processes and enhance flexibility, effectiveness and efficiency.

What are your priorities for the U.S. Strategic Command?

The first priority is to provide a safe, secure and effective strategic nuclear force providing strategic deterrence for the U.S. and its allies. USSTRATCOM has a unique responsibility regarding the country's deterrent force in setting requirements and translating national guidance

into operational readiness. Second, ongoing combat operations require many of the capabilities provided by USSTRATCOM and, if confirmed, I will consult with the Commander, U.S. Central Command and the other Combatant Commanders to provide capabilities for today's conflict. Third, in line with the new National Space Policy, USSTRATCOM must preserve U.S. access to space and freedom of action in space by improving awareness and providing resilient capabilities for the joint fight. Fourth, relationships across federal agencies with cyberspace responsibilities need to be defined to enhance the Nation's cyber security and support to joint operations.

Strategic Threats

In your view, what are the most serious strategic threats facing the United States today?

As repeatedly stated by Administration leaders, the pursuit of nuclear weapons by violent extremist groups and the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology to additional states are the greatest strategic threats to the United States. Beyond this is the immense challenge of defining strategic relationships to ensure stability involving new and emerging powers. Also, the pace of technology - especially in the realms of space and cyberspace - is so rapid it could outpace our ability to maintain our strategic edge. Finally, we are faced with ever changing traditional and non-traditional threats that pose serious consequences to US global interests. Some of these threats - such as anti-access/area denial weapons and strategies - are understood and the U.S. is addressing them, others are not as well understood or acknowledged and will take time to address.

What future strategic threats should the United States prepare for?

Our potential adversaries have studied the U.S. way of warfare and are actively developing asymmetric responses. We will need flexible and adaptive capabilities to respond to these unknown abilities.

U. S. Strategic Command Missions

In an overarching sense, how do you define the U. S. Strategic Command mission?

USSTRATCOM promotes global security for the U.S. and its interests through strategic deterrence, ensuring U.S. freedom of action in space and cyberspace and through dedicated planning, advocacy and operational execution efforts to advance our warfighting priorities.

U. S. Strategic Command has absorbed multiple new missions since its creation, with the most recent addition being the establishment of the Cyber-Command, as a sub-unified command of the Strategic Command.

How successful has U. S. Strategic Command been at integrating these new missions and acquiring the expertise needed to perform them?

My sense is that USSTRATCOM is on track with integrating mature missions, like space, while emerging missions, like cyberspace and missile defense, continue to advance. There is still more

to be done among all the Services, and recruiting, training and retaining the personnel with the right expertise is very important. If confirmed, I will move quickly to assess the scope of all mission areas, integration and expertise, and take appropriate action as needed.

What organizational challenges remain at U. S. Strategic Command related to these new missions? Specifically, what additional work, if any, remains to be done and what expertise, if any, needs to be acquired for these new missions?

Cyberspace capabilities and capacity are still maturing across the DoD and the national security enterprise. If confirmed, I will assess the status of capabilities and determine the proper course of action to align personnel and resources to address the issues.

If confirmed, would you recommend or support any changes in the missions currently assigned to U. S. Strategic Command? If so, what changes would you recommend?

Not at this time. As my understanding of the missions evolved and integration matured, I would assess command mission effectiveness and recommend changes as appropriate.

Are you aware of any additional new missions that are being contemplated for the Strategic Command?

No. I am not aware of any new missions being considered for Strategic Command.

Organization

In addition to the Cyber-Command, the Command is organized into a series of joint functional component commands that correspond to the mission areas of the Strategic Command.

If confirmed, would you anticipate maintaining or modifying this structure?

I would not anticipate any immediate changes; however, as relationships across federal agencies are defined and cyberspace capabilities are matured, there may be a need to make organizational changes. It is important to keep a flexible organizational structure that is capable of responding to a constantly changing threat environment and technology advances.

Ballistic Missile Defense

How do you view the roles and responsibilities of the Commander, U. S. Strategic Command, related to ballistic missile defense?

The UCP charges USSTRATCOM with responsibilities for synchronizing planning for global missile defense, including coordinating global missile defense operations support and developing and advocating for missile defense characteristics and capabilities desired by Combatant Commanders. If confirmed, I will ensure USSTRATCOM and its Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense (JFCC-IMD) continue their close working relationship

with MDA, the Geographic Combatant Commanders, and Services to integrate capabilities across Combatant Command boundaries and to serve as the Joint Functional Manager for global force management of BMD forces.

What do you believe is the appropriate function of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense?

JFCC-IMD's mission is to synchronize missile defense planning, conduct BMD operations support, and advocate for missile defense capabilities, in support of USSTRATCOM, other Combatant Commands, the Services, and appropriate U.S. Government agencies, to deter and defend the U.S., deployed forces, and its allies against ballistic missile attacks. In addition, JFCC IMD serves as the MDA counterpart to represent Warfighter equities in the BMD development and integrates BMD test, training, and exercise activities. If confirmed, I look forward to reviewing the current activities of JFCC-IMD to ensure that this is the most appropriate function for today's national security environment.

If confirmed, would you recommend or support any changes in the authorities of Commander, U. S. Strategic Command, as they relate to ballistic missile defense?

As of today, I would not make any changes. If confirmed, I will continue the close working relationships with the Combatant Commanders and the Missile Defense Agency and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense regarding the appropriate authorities to support the defense of the U.S. and its allies.

If confirmed, what role would you anticipate playing in the assessment of the military utility of U.S. ballistic missile defenses against short-, medium-, intermediate-, and long-range ballistic missiles?

In response to UCP 05 and DoDD 5134.09 guidance, USSTRATCOM conducted and reported a Military Utility Assessment of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) from 2006 to 2010. The intent of the MUA is to conduct assess the utility of the delivered capability -- which is being replaced by the Operational Readiness & Acceptance (OR&A) process to formalize the acceptance of the delivered capability based on their operational utility. We are now working on the Global IAMD Assessment as a companion document to the OR&A to define operational risks associated with BMD operations.

If confirmed, what role would you anticipate playing in representing and advocating for the views and needs of the combatant commanders for missile defense capabilities, and how do you believe that warfighter perspective should inform our missile defense program?

The Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) Program exists to meet the limited defense of the United States and the theater defense needs of Combatant Commanders. USSTRATCOM sponsors the missile defense Warfighter Involvement Process to capture and articulate warfighter capability needs to inform the BMD program development. USSTRATCOM also manages the development of the Global Integrated Air and Missile Defense Assessment to articulate Combatant Commanders' operational risks that must be remedied in the BMD development. If

confirmed, I will consult fellow Combatant Commanders and advocate for their mission needs, always mindful of the joint warfighter.

Please describe your view of the appropriate roles for the Joint Staff and the Missile Defense Executive Board in guiding decisions on the development, acquisition, and deployment of effective missile defense capabilities.

The Joint Staff is responsible for defining required systems interoperability and operational architectures while validating joint theater missile defense capabilities through both simulation and technology demonstrations. The role of the Missile Defense Executive Board (MDEB) is to provide oversight and guidance in a collaborative mode involving all missile defense stakeholders in the DoD and other agencies and departments. Important considerations for both entities include the necessary transition of tested systems from MDA to a military Service to be organized, trained, and equipped for eventual Combatant Command employment.

Do you agree that any ballistic missile defense systems that are deployed must be operationally effective and cost-effective?

Yes. The joint warfighter requires fielded systems with military utility. I agree with the Secretary of Defense Ballistic Missile Defense Report which established metrics to measure ballistic missile defense systems cost effectiveness through comparison with available options, affordability, and comparison of incurred vice avoided costs.

Do you agree that ballistic missile defense flight tests need to be operationally realistic, and that operational testing is necessary, in order to demonstrate the capabilities of our systems and provide confidence that they will work effectively?

I agree with the Missile Defense Agency testing approach outlined in the Integrated Master Test Plan that the tests will be conducted as operationally realistically as possible, exercising Warfighter Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (TTP) against operationally realistic threats. If confirmed, I will support this approach and assess the capabilities of ballistic missile defense systems.

What are your views on the relationship between ballistic missile defenses and nuclear deterrence?

Ballistic missile defenses protect the U.S. against the threat of a limited ICBM attack by a regional actor such as North Korea or Iran. Through deployment of limited defenses, the U.S. seeks to dissuade such states from developing an ICBM, deter them from using an ICBM if they develop or acquire such a capability, and defeat an ICBM attack by such states should deterrence fail denying them the benefits of possessing or using such systems. Ballistic missile defenses will also defend U.S. deployed forces from regional missile threats while also protecting our allies and partners and enabling them to defend themselves. Present plans for missile defense do not contemplate protection of the U.S. against large scale nuclear strikes. The U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent force of ICBMs, bombers and ballistic missile submarines will remain the primary deterrent of nuclear attacks against the U.S., our allies and partners.

Do you support the policies and priorities stated in the Ballistic Missile Defense Review report of February 2010?

I support the current Ballistic Missile Defense policies and priorities.

Do you support the homeland ballistic missile defense initiatives announced by Secretary Hagel on March 15, 2013, including the planned deployment of 14 additional Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) in Alaska?

Yes, I support all initiatives. Of note, the additional 14 GBIs in Alaska will add capacity to US Homeland Defense against new and evolving adversary ICBM capabilities. Another important initiative is the deployment of an additional AN/TPY-2 radar into the USPACOM area of operations which will also improve our capabilities to defend the United States while also enhancing regional BMD.

Do you support proceeding with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process required by section 227 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 to inform future decisions about deployment of a possible additional homeland ballistic missile defense site in the United States, in case the President determines to proceed with such an additional deployment?

Yes. With the restructuring of the SM-3 Block IIB program, continuing to explore the possibility of another CONUS interceptor site is a prudent measure. The completion of the EIS will reduce the timeline to implement this option should such a decision be made.

Do you agree with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that additional analysis is needed, including analysis of the missile threat from Iran, before making a decision on whether to deploy such an additional missile defense site in the future?

Yes. We will need to carefully consider the threat to clearly understand the potential operational benefits that can be realized for the associated costs of enacting such an option. While an additional missile defense site provides operational utility, the cost should also be carefully considered, as well as the warfighter's priority to improve the sensor capability.

Do you believe that it may be possible to assess the advisability and feasibility of deploying an additional homeland ballistic missile defense site before the EIS is completed?

I believe that the Department of Defense can conduct preliminary assessments in advance of an EIS. USSTRATCOM and USNORTHCOM are assisting the Missile Defense Agency with such preliminary assessments in compliance with NDAA direction. We would be more confident in the assessments with an EIS completed.

Do you agree with the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense on the importance

of enhancing our missile defense sensor capabilities to improve discrimination and kill assessment for homeland ballistic missile defense?

Yes, I agree.

Do you agree there is no significant funding in the Fiscal Year 2014 Presidential Budget request for the foregoing activities?

There is substantial funding in Missile Defense Agency's Fiscal Year 2014 Budget request to continue to research, develop and improve sensor and discrimination capabilities, however I agree there is no significant funding contained in the budget to acquire any additional sensors. Additionally, a study has been initiated to determine how best to support future sensor requirements and Missile Defense Agency is exploring technologies to improve the capabilities of ground, air, and space sensors.

Do you support the Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense in Europe (EPAA), and do you believe this approach will provide a timely and effective capability to address existing and emerging Iranian ballistic missile threats to Europe?

Yes. The work is ongoing and, if confirmed, I will continue to assess our progress and make recommendations to the Secretary of Defense.

What capability was lost with the decision to cancel Phase IV of the EPAA, and how does it compare to the capability of deploying 14 additional GBIs in Alaska by 2017?

The cancellation of EPAA Phase IV resulted in the potential loss of early engagement opportunities (i.e. Defense in Depth) for Iranian ICBM threats to the U.S.. Deploying an additional 14 GBIs to Alaska will add capacity to U.S. Homeland Defense.

What role do you believe Strategic Command should play in the development and implementation of the Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense in Europe and other regions?

USSTRATCOM's role is to synchronize global missile defense plans, coordinate global missile defense operations support, and through the JFCC IMD, act as the Joint Functional Manager for global force management of missile defense capabilities.

Do you believe it is in our interest to cooperate with Russia on ballistic missile defense, including the possibility of sharing radar early warning data?

Yes. To quote the BMDR, "The United States will also continue in its efforts to establish a cooperative BMD relationship with Russia...The Administration is committed to substantive and sustained dialogue with the leadership of Russia on U.S. missile defenses and their roles in different regions...Our goals are to enlist Russia in an new structure of deterrence that addresses the emerging challenges to international peace and security posed by a small number of states seeking illicit capabilities."

What do you believe are the most promising opportunities to work collaboratively with Russia to address emerging ballistic missile threats?

As agreed by President Obama and President Medvedev at the July 2009 Moscow Summit, the most promising opportunity to work with Russia is in the joint assessment of the ballistic missile threat. If the Russians are willing, open and transparent bilateral or multilateral wargames or exercises, and sharing of early warning information are also options that may lead to a better relationship with Russia.

Cyber Security

What are your priorities for the U.S. Cyber Command?

Our reliance on cyber capabilities, the many and varied threats, and the rapid rate of technological change all demand we place an initial and enduring focus on defense of our information networks. Priorities beyond defense include assuring the warfighting mission, strengthening and expanding partnerships in the domain, building capacity and capability to conduct full-spectrum cyberspace operations and developing processes to integrate cyberspace capabilities into Combatant Command plans operations and across the DoD.

In your view, what are the most important unmet priorities for the development and deployment of cyber security tools and capabilities?

U.S. Strategic Command, as a Global Combatant Command, is in a unique position to favorably influence two essential priorities in this area. The first is to advance the development of a multi-service cadre of cyber professionals, with emphasis on technical and tactical competence. This includes continuous training and education and focused career path development. The second is to accelerate the fielding of shared cyber situational awareness tools, taking advantage of emerging technologies to know friendly and threat activity within the network while understanding intent; and display and disseminate that information in an operationally relevant manner.

If confirmed, what role will you play in establishing policy for U.S. Cyber Command?

If confirmed, I will exercise combatant command over U.S. Cyber Command, engage and advise senior leaders within the Department of Defense, federal agencies and with members of Congress to advocate for the appropriate policies regarding cyberspace operations.

What are your views on the issue of elevating U.S. Cyber Command to a full unified command, including the timetable for elevating the Command?

I believe the current command relationship is working. However, if a decision is made to make U.S. Cyber Command a unified command, we should not break the current dual-hatted relationship between the NSA and U.S. Cyber Command. This relationship is central to mission success.

Space

What is your view on the responsiveness of current space systems to meet warfighter needs and what are the opportunities for the Operationally Responsive Space program to meet military and other space requirements?

National Security Space systems are responsive to warfighters' needs. As the speed of warfare increases and military decision cycles decrease, space systems need to continue to evolve in their ability to deliver capability sooner. The increasingly congested, contested, and competitive nature of space will require continual improvements in the responsiveness and resilience of our space infrastructure. The Operationally Responsive Space initiative is one tool at our disposal to meet urgent Combatant Command needs or leverage developed technology to meet anticipated warfighter needs.

What is your view of the ability of the DOD to develop and deploy space systems in a cost-effective and timely manner?

The DoD has worked extensively to reverse troubling acquisition trends. Significant strides are being made with a concentration on program stability, increasing the quantity and quality of the acquisition workforce and strengthening the requirements process to allow for incremental system development and increased technology maturation. Architectural work to conceptualize the space enterprise of the future is increasingly considering factors such as resilience, affordability, and responsiveness in addition to the historical emphasis on performance and reliability. This groundwork should significantly improve our ability to field future space capabilities that are both cost-effective and timely.

What steps, if any, do you believe might be necessary to improve the responsiveness of current space systems?

Responsiveness, as measured by the speed, capacity and fusion of data to the warfighter, are important in the evolution of warfare to counter adaptive adversaries. Providing the warfighter with dynamic situational awareness, such as for tailored Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance, while optimizing stressed communications and networks, will increase the value of current space systems. Lowering the cost of space systems and launch systems is a key element for improving responsiveness. Low cost space solutions permit us to move rapidly, practice risk-management vs risk-avoidance, and consequently have the ability to respond to immediate needs.

In your view, what are the most important unmet requirements for space systems?

Guaranteeing mission assurance, which includes resilience and space protection, is critical. Central to this is developing adequate Space Situational Awareness in a domain that is increasingly competitive, congested and contested. Geographic Combatant Commanders require a sustained emphasis on meeting Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance needs and

satisfying increased military satellite communication requirements in support of global military operations.

Do you believe any urgent needs or capability gaps exist? If so, please specify in detail.

Urgent needs and capability gaps will continue to exist in a constantly changing battlespace and a fiscally constrained environment. Persistent ISR and increasing SATCOM bandwidth are continuing needs identified by the regional Combatant Commands. If confirmed, I will work through the Joint Staff and Service components to mitigate capability gaps and respond to Combatant Commanders' urgent needs.

What do you believe should be done to meet those requirements, and what space programs should be accorded highest priority?

If confirmed, I will articulate national and joint warfighter imperatives, including a judicious blend of alliances, partnerships and commercial relationships. I will also press for improved space situational awareness and ensure the highest priority is accorded to meeting continuing needs for assured communications, uninterrupted missile warning, persistent positioning, navigation, and timing and overhead Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR). Additionally, I will advocate through the Services for greater investments in scientific and technical advancement to maintain our space systems advantages well into the future.

How important, in your view, is persistent surveillance, and what programs do you believe are best able to provide this capability?

Combatant Commanders identify persistent surveillance as an enduring priority needed to detect, collect, disseminate, and characterize activity in the battlespace. Space, airborne, maritime, and terrestrial programs contribute to ISR, but where persistent surveillance can be achieved is through integration of sensors on multiple platforms, with space-based ISR providing unique contributions over deep and denied areas.

What is your view on the effectiveness of efforts to cooperate with the commercial space sector to improve space situational awareness and how could this effort be expanded and made more successful?

The Space Situational Awareness (SSA) Sharing Program at U.S. Strategic Command has been the lynchpin of international engagements with spacefaring nations and industry. In 2012, USSTRATCOM provided ten thousand satellite conjunction warnings. This high fidelity information was instrumental in ensuring spaceflight safety for over one thousand active satellites orbiting the Earth. Today, USSTRATCOM supplies SSA information through SSA Sharing agreements with 38 commercial firms. This year, USSTRATCOM negotiated and concluded the first international SSA Sharing Agreements with Japan and Australia. These agreements are the first in what will be a series of international SSA Sharing agreements with our partners and Allies

These on-going endeavors result in improved data-exchange between U.S. Strategic Command, the commercial sector and space faring nations and, as such, reduces the risk of collisions in space leading to a safer space environment.

What are your views on disaggregation of space sensors systems and has your experience with SBIRS HEO-1 and HEO 2 affected that?

Disaggregation of space systems should consider cost, schedule, performance and resiliency across a range of threat environments. We need to do a better job of leveraging the inherent resiliency embedded within our current systems. The Department is beginning early analysis to understand the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of disaggregated architectures which will provide a basis for investment decisions.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, Congress approved a national policy to support two space launch vehicles, or families of launch vehicles, capable of launching national security payloads into space. The two launch vehicles have been combined into one company to provide launch services to the U.S. Government with the expectation that this would improve both the efficiency of space launch and reduce the cost.

What are your expectations with respect to future space launch efficiencies and cost savings?

Low cost launch is an important enabler for an entire emerging class of space capabilities. In the experimental / demonstration realm (programs typically executed by DARPA, AFRL, NRL, or SMDC) low cost launch provides access to space for S&T missions requiring very tight budgets. These missions demonstrate key technologies or concepts-of-operations that lead to more effective operational capabilities in the future. In the operational realm, low-cost launch enables one-off responsive space systems (e.g. ORS-1 satellite providing ISR for USCENTCOM), emerging operational cubesats/nanosats, and perhaps even some alternate space architectures currently under consideration.

In the next several years the rate of space launches is expected to increase, what new approaches to space launch, in your view, should be implemented to handle this increased rate of launch?

Recent Service-led improvements in the range manifest and scheduling process, such as the concept of matching boosters with satellites when there is a higher confidence of being ready for launch, will maximize the probability of meeting launch demands consistent with national priorities.

What, in your view, should the United States do in the future, and what steps would you take if confirmed, to ensure continued reliable access to space?

I will continue to advocate for cooperative development of launch and range transformation initiatives by and between the Services, NRO, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Do you believe that the nation should sustain redundant space launch capabilities?

Robust access to space is a national imperative requiring flexible capability to ensure continuity of access. Additional service and commercial capabilities are emerging. If confirmed, I will continue to review the viability of these approaches and advocate appropriately assuring the nation's access to space.

What do you see as the greatest problem implementing a new entrant strategy?

I am confident the Air Force, NRO, and NASA will support their Launch System Certification agreement with new launch entrants. The certification process will ensure all launch providers and all proposed launch vehicle configurations meet rigorous standards of demonstrated flight reliability, process controls, design margins, and mission assurance in order to receive non-recurring certification.

Recent decisions, and probably future decisions, about launch capabilities made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will impact national security space launch cost and capacity.

What, in your view, should the Strategic Command do to coordinate civil and national security space launch?

Assured access to space is a national imperative that, in a fiscally constrained environment, could benefit from a whole-of-government approach.—Strategic Command should continue its participation in the development of a national space transportation policy.

In your view, what are the most significant challenges that the U.S. faces in military and national security space programs and policy?

Our challenges are rooted in the increasingly congested, contested and competitive nature of the space domain. If confirmed, I'll continue to address the following top challenges: (1) threats to U.S space capabilities, (2) threats from adversary space capabilities to U.S. military forces and (3) maintaining our national security space programs in a difficult budget environment.

Training of U.S. military personnel to understand and to incorporate space assets into all aspects of operations is critically important to future military success.

While much has been done to incorporate space assets into all aspects of military operations, in your view are there additional steps that should be taken to address this challenge?

The availability of space capabilities to Joint Force Commanders is essential towards the United States' ability to win our nation's conflicts. We are now faced with an era of fiscal uncertainty that causes us to reevaluate how we incorporate space assets into the fight. As we look to partner

with our Allies and leverage their capabilities through combined space operations, we must reassess our disclosure policies to ensure each side has the ability to capitalize on the partnership.

What role does the National Security Space Institute play in the training process, and how could their training programs be improved?

Since its establishment in 2004, the National Security Space Institute (NSSI) has been an important part of the Space Professional Development Program and the advancement of space expertise across the Department of Defense. In 2012, USSTRATCOM conducted a Joint Space Individual Training and Education Needs Assessment to analyze joint space training and education requirements of personnel performing joint space missions. This assessment identified some areas where there are shortfalls in the current space training and education programs. Recommended solutions incorporate both joint and service authorities, personnel systems, and education and training refinements. I anticipate the NSSI will be one of the key organizations responsible for implementing the training and education recommendations to meet space professional needs across the Department of Defense.

What, in your view, are the priorities for improving space situational awareness?

To improve space situational awareness, we should accomplish the following. First, the U.S. must have the ability to quickly characterize events (natural and man-made) that threaten our space assets. Second, we must ensure we have improved capabilities to detect, track, and identify space objects. Finally, we must invest in capabilities and partnerships that increase our resilience while also maintaining our leadership.

What programs and policies, in your view, should be changed or added to ensure adequate space situational awareness?

The legacy space surveillance network is nearing its maximum capacity to detect, track, and identify space objects. We must invest in new capabilities that meet the needs of today's contested and congested space environment. Furthermore, recognizing the utility in incorporating other non-U.S. systems, we must establish partnerships which allow access to space surveillance data. Finally, the systems responsible for processing this data are in dire need of modernization. Capabilities such as the Space Fence and the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System will help the U.S. meet tomorrow's challenges.

What are your views on how military and national security space should and could be better integrated?

Significant synergy exists in those common, underlying "enablers" such as the space industrial base, research and development, science and technology and the space workforce. My understanding is that we have made significant progress in integrating these enablers to include the Intelligence Community with the standup of the Space Security and Defense Program. If confirmed, I will continue advocating along these lines to best meet the needs of the nation.

In your view, what role should the National Security Space Office play in integrating military and national security space?

I understand that over the past two years, there has been a reorganization of the management and coordination of the national security space enterprise, including the establishment of the Defense Space Council, and the re-validation of the Secretary of the Air Force as the Executive Agent for Space. This reorganization has had a positive impact on government-wide coordination of space activities.

If confirmed, I will continue to foster close working relationships amongst fellow members of the Defense Space Council to facilitate unity of effort across the space enterprise.

In your view, should the role of the National Security Space Office be modified or expanded in any way?

I understand that over the past two years, there has been a reorganization of the management and coordination of the national security space enterprise, including the establishment of the Defense Space Council, and the re-validation of the Secretary of the Air Force as the Executive Agent for Space. This reorganization has had a positive impact on government-wide coordination of space activities.

If confirmed, I will continue to foster close working relationships amongst fellow members of the Defense Space Council to facilitate unity of effort across the space enterprise.

What do you see as the greatest challenges in the area of counter space?

The greatest challenge is maintaining comprehensive real-time/near-real-time space situational awareness (SSA) to assure the earliest possible detection of a threat and enable accurate attribution of actions against our space assets. Successfully meeting this challenge will enable us to take timely and effective actions to protect our assets and clearly identify the source of the threat to allow an appropriate whole-of-government response to those responsible.

Cruise Missile Defense

In your view, how serious is the vulnerability of our nation and deployed military forces to the cruise missile threat?

Cruise missiles represent a credible threat to our nation and forces abroad.

What role do you believe U. S. Strategic Command should play in the cruise missile defense of our nation and our deployed military forces?

USSTRATCOM is responsible for synchronizing planning for global missile defense to include coordinating global missile defense operations support and advocating for missile defense capabilities. Additionally, as the Air and Missile Defense Integrating Authority, USSTRATCOM should continue advocating for cruise missile defense capabilities desired by the warfighters.

Prompt Global Strike

In your view, how adequate are current efforts to establish requirements and develop a prompt global strike capability?

Current efforts are sufficient. The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) recently revalidated the prompt strike initial capabilities document and requirements. The Department continues to make progress through investments in the development and testing of prompt strike capabilities.

Do you believe that adequate analysis is being conducted to determine whether a prompt global strike capability should be launched from air, land, maritime surface or subsurface platforms, or a combination thereof?

Yes, the Air Force completed a comprehensive Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) that considered a range of prompt strike deployment options. In addition, the JROC recently directed a review of technology, operational concepts, and costs as part of an independent review or AoA update. Current development efforts are aimed at technology solutions that could be fielded in a range of operational concepts.

Nuclear Deterrence

If confirmed as Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, you would be involved in implementing the new Nuclear Posture Review and the reductions under the New Start Treaty.

Do you support the New Start Treaty?

Yes, New START provides the U.S. with insight into Russian strategic nuclear forces. The treaty has a verification regime that is effective, robust, enhances transparency, and builds confidence with Russia.

Do you support the recent revision to our nuclear employment strategy?

Yes, the objectives support deterrence of adversaries and assurance of our allies and partners.

Do you believe we need a fleet of 12 ballistic submarines to replace the Ohio class submarines?

Yes, based on current and future projected strategic environments, 12 SSBNs is the minimum required to meet deterrence mission requirements.

What in your view are the most pressing modernization requirements for the Minuteman III ICBM, following completion of the current upgrades?

The Air Force is conducting sustainment programs to take the Minuteman III ICBM through 2030 as directed by Congress. I will advocate for sustaining planned life extension programs, including arming, firing and fuzing upgrades, guidance modernization, and support equipment replacements.

Do you support the development and fielding of a follow-on program to the Minuteman III ICBM? If so, when will a decision be necessary for pursuing the development of a follow on ICBM?

Yes, land-based ICBMs are an integral and enduring part of the nuclear triad, and the Air Force is scheduled to begin an AoA this year. Following completion of the AoA, we will work closely with the Air Force to develop a resource strategy to recapitalize our ICBM force beyond 2030.

Do you support and intend to advocate for the modernization of all legs of the triad of nuclear delivery vehicles?

Yes, modernization of all legs of the Triad is essential given our aging systems. The Triad's complementary capabilities encourage restraint, deny benefits and, if deterrence fails, impose costs on adversaries. The Triad also provides the U.S. resiliency and flexibility in the event of technical or geopolitical surprise.

In your view, is there a relationship between U.S. nuclear deterrence policy and nonproliferation policy? If so, please describe the relationship.

Yes, there is a relationship. By extending our deterrent to other nations we provide them an alternative to developing their own nuclear capabilities to meet their security needs. Thus, our extended deterrent contributes to meeting our non-proliferation policy goals.

What are your views on nuclear command and control?

Today's Nuclear Command and Control systems underpin strategic deterrence and they provide an assured capability for the President to execute nuclear forces under any scenario. Current portions of our architecture are largely a product of the Cold War resulting in some obsolescent and aging elements to the infrastructure, including some elements that are passing their end of life. Despite the growing age of the infrastructure, we are fully capable in executing our nuclear mission. However, to ensure this capability remains viable in the future, continued investment and modernization of the Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications architecture is necessary. Current emphasis is required on space-based detection, conferencing, and force direction.

How will you advocate modernizing our nuclear command and control and what aspects in particular in light of the new nuclear employment strategy?

Today's NC3 systems provide assured and resilient capabilities for the President to execute nuclear forces under any scenario through all phases of conflict. To ensure this capability remains viable in the future, continued investment and modernization of the NC3 architecture is

necessary. Current emphasis is required on space-based detection, conferencing, and force direction.

Continued investment for NC3 capabilities, a robust net-centric C2 infrastructure, and insertion of new technologies (such as Internet Protocol-based solutions) will maintain senior leaders' ability to respond deliberately and appropriately to any situation.

We have set a course to modernize NC3 systems to enable secure, enduring, and continuous communications with respect to the current threat environment, as well as emerging threats we are likely to confront (where man-made or natural).

What is your view of the significance of non-strategic nuclear weapons in the nuclear balance between the United States and Russia?

I believe it is important to consider both strategic and non-strategic weapons and their associated infrastructure when examining questions of nuclear balance between the United States and Russia. Further, we must consider the geo-strategic environment in which each country exists to better understand their force composition decisions and thus the implications for force balance.

Do you believe the U.S. government understands today how to verify reductions in non-strategic nuclear weapons?

It depends on the nature of what is to be verified. The U.S. government was able to verify the eliminations of non-strategic platforms made under the INF Treaty. Procedures to verify warhead eliminations, which have not yet been part of treaty, may require further study.

Nuclear Weapons Council

If confirmed you would become a member of the Nuclear Weapons Council.

What would your priorities be for the Nuclear Weapons Council (NWC)?

My top priority is to continue to sustain and modernize the nuclear enterprise, including weapons, platforms and infrastructure. I support the NWC recently approved strategy and implementation plan for stockpile management and supporting elements.

What changes if any would you recommend to the organization, structure, or function of the NWC?

None at this time. The NWC is composed of the appropriate members and assigned responsibilities to provide effective oversight of the nuclear weapons enterprise.

What role is the NWC playing or should it play in the discussion with respect to any future nuclear arms control treaties?

NWC principals provide policy, military, and technical recommendations.

Maintaining a Safe, Secure and Reliable Stockpile

If confirmed you would play a major role, in conjunction with the National Nuclear Security Administration, to maintain the safety, security, and reliability of the U.S stockpile of nuclear weapons.

What are your priorities for implementing that responsibility?

My top priority is to ensure the stockpile remains safe, secure, and effective to support the Nation's deterrence missions. My priorities include providing an annual assessment of the stockpile's military effectiveness, establishing stockpile requirements and providing military advice on strategy and implementation plans for life extension programs and the nuclear industrial complex.

The Strategic Command is an integral part of the annual certification process for nuclear weapons.

Would you recommend any changes in the Strategic Command's role in the annual process or the process generally?

Not at this time. I will closely monitor this process and will recommend appropriate changes, if necessary.

Stockpile Stewardship Program

What is your view of how well the Stockpile Stewardship Program is proceeding towards its goal of being able to continuously assess and annually certify the U. S. enduring nuclear weapons stockpile as safe, secure, and reliable, without the need for underground nuclear testing?

The Stockpile Stewardship Program is meeting its goal of effectively and continuously assessing the nuclear weapon stockpile. It provides sufficient data and analysis to allow the annual certification of the stockpile without underground nuclear testing.

In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges for the Stockpile Stewardship Program?

The Stockpile Stewardship Program's most significant challenge is sufficient and stable funding to ensure understanding of the stockpile as it ages, confidence in that understanding in the absence of underground nuclear testing, and timely responsiveness to technical issues that arise.

Do you believe that all nuclear weapon life extension methods, refurbishment, reuse, and replacement, should be given equal consideration?

I support considering the full range of options as directed in the Nuclear Posture Review. Strong preference will be given to options for refurbishment or reuse. Replacement of nuclear

components would be undertaken only if critical Stockpile Management Program goals could not otherwise be met, and if specifically authorized by the President and approved by Congress.

The Administration is proposing overhauls of the B-61 gravity bomb, and an interoperable warhead to provide for hedging between different legs of the triad.

What are your greatest concerns with the B-61 life extension program?

My greatest concern is the weapon remains safe, secure and effective and capable of meeting its strategic and extended deterrence commitments. The current life extension program addresses the timely replacement of aging components. It is imperative that the program remains adequately funded and on schedule.

The NNSA estimates the cost of the first version of the interoperable warhead will exceed \$14 billion.

Do you support evaluation of straight life extensions of the W-78 and W-88 warheads if either the cost or technical issues with the interoperable warhead become too great?

I support studying the technical feasibility and cost of an interoperable nuclear explosive package for the W78/88-1. Further, I believe that the W78-1 and W88-1 warhead options should be examined for comparative purposes, so an informed recommendation can be brought to the NWC.

Military-to-Military Cooperation Programs

The U.S. Strategic Command has a long history of conducting military-to-military exchanges and discussions with its counterparts in Russia, but in recent years these exchanges and discussion have stopped for the most part.

If confirmed, would you seek to continue or expand this dialogue?

If confirmed, I would consult extensively with the Secretary of Defense, the State Department and the Commander, U.S. European Command to see what steps would be appropriate to engage Russia.

Would you seek to establish military-to-military programs to include other countries, such as China?

If confirmed, I would consult extensively with the Secretary of Defense, the State Department and the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command to see what steps would be appropriate to engage China.

Strategic Forces and Missions

During the Cold War, the primary mission for strategic forces was to deter the Soviet Union from using its nuclear weapons and, more broadly, to contribute to U.S. efforts to contain the Soviet Union. Strategic forces were therefore synonymous with nuclear forces. This isn't the case today, as the wide-ranging missions assigned to U.S. Strategic Command make clear.

What, in your view, is the primary mission for U.S. Strategic Forces today and in the future?

Our strategic forces include our Global Strike (nuclear and conventional), space, cyber, global Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance and ballistic missile defense capabilities. Their primary missions are to assure allies and partners, deter potential adversaries and if necessary, defend against and defeat adversary attacks on the U.S. our allies and partners.

With the decline in numbers of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons, is it now more important to take into account non-strategic nuclear weapons?

Yes. Nuclear weapons regardless of their delivery method are important to consider.

Should we think differently about the use of strategic forces today?

Yes. Strategic forces today are no longer just nuclear forces. They include our Global Strike (nuclear and conventional), space, cyber, global Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance and ballistic missile defense capabilities. Thus our thinking about their use must be different.

Given the mission for strategic forces, as you define it, what capabilities are still needed to carry out that mission?

Required strategic deterrence capabilities include warning, attribution, assured command and control, forces, weapons, and the infrastructure to sustain them. The Triad is the cornerstone of deterrence and strategic stability. Sustainment and recapitalization of strategic nuclear forces and stockpile, space, cyber, National Command and Control systems, and infrastructure are required to deter adversaries, assure allies and partners, and manage risk.

The nuclear weapons in Europe are under the command of the Commander of European Command.

How would you plan to work with that command with respect to nuclear weapons security, and policy?

If confirmed, I will consult with the Commander, U.S. European Command to understand his needs and I will work with him to advocate for safe, secure and effective nuclear weapons to meet those needs.

Nuclear Weapons Security and Handling

What in your view are the most challenging aspects of maintaining security in the handling of nuclear weapons?

Ensuring nuclear forces are secure from attack, physical damage, theft and misuse and denying unauthorized access continues to be the standard for nuclear security, and if I am confirmed, this will be one of my top priorities. Our continuing challenge is to ensure our security forces are always provided the capabilities to detect, delay and defeat any adversary while capitalizing on the lessons learned from the past decade of conflict. At the core of this challenge is maintaining a culture of instant readiness in our strategic force personnel for a mission that has a low probability of execution, but only because they are ready in the deterrence role.

What role do you think the Strategic Command should play in ensuring that nuclear weapons are securely stored, transported, and handled when in control of the military services?

As the Combatant Command responsible for all strategic nuclear forces and now accountable for the security of the US Air Force's strategic nuclear resources, United States Strategic Command has an increased role in ensuring a safe, secure and effective nuclear deterrent. If confirmed, I will ensure our security forces continue to have the resources, guidance and training required to maintain a secure environment for our nuclear weapons.

Science and Technology

In the past, USSTRATCOM had a stand-alone Science and Technology (S&T) advisor – as other COCOMS currently have, but that role has been subsumed into other staff positions.

If confirmed, what would be your views on reconstituting a USSTRATCOM Science and Technology advisor and if that is not necessary, what priorities would be assigned to that individual?

This is something I plan to review if I am confirmed as the Commander of US Strategic Command.

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.

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

Yes.

Do you agree, when asked, to give your personal views, even if those views differ from the Administration in power?

Yes.

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 Commander, U. S. Strategic Command?

Yes.

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.

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 for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Yes.