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The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:36 a.m. in Room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Jack Reed, chairman of the committee, presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND

Chairman Reed: The Committee meets this morning to consider the nominations of Dr. Celeste Wallander to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Ms. Melissa Dalton to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs, and Dr. John Plumb to be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy.

I thank the nominees for their long careers of service to the United States and a willingness to assume these important roles.

I would also like to welcome the colleagues and family members who are here with us today.

Dr. Wallander, I welcome your guest, Professor Jeffrey Anderson.

Ms. Dalton, I welcome your guest, Jason.

And Dr. Plumb, I welcome your parents, John and Marie.

Dr. Wallander, you were nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. In this role, you will be the principal advisor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Secretary of Defense on international security issues that relate to Europe, Russia, the Middle East, and Africa. I would note your qualifications and experience for this position, including
your role as president and CEO of the U.S. Russia
Foundation, Senior Director for Russian-Eurasian Affairs on
the National Security Council, and Deputy Assistant
Secretary of Defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia during
the Obama administration.

If confirmed, there are several challenges that will
require your immediate attention. Most pressing is Russia's
increasingly aggressive posture on the Ukrainian border.
Diplomatic meetings are being held as we speak, but this
relationship is likely to remain a point of contention.

I would ask that you share your assessment of U.S. and
multilateral efforts to train and equip the Ukrainian
Security Forces and what balance the Department should
pursue in near term, training and equipping needs, and the
longer-term defensive capability development.

Iran also remains a complex challenge for the
Department. Even as indirect negotiations to return to the
Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the JCPOA, take place in
Vienna this month, Iranian-linked proxies continue to mount
drone and rocket attacks in the region, including against
bases in Iraq and Syria with a U.S. military presence.

I look forward to your testimony on how the Department
of Defense should respond to Iranian and malign influence in
the region, while preserving our continuing nuclear
negotiations.
Ms. Dalton, you are nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs. This position is responsible for supervision of the Homeland Defense activities of the Department of Defense, as well as defense support of civil authorities, Arctic, and global resilience, and also western hemispheric affairs.

You have decades of experience, including your current role, performing the duties of Assistant Secretary of Defense to Strategy, Plans and Capabilities, will serve your well in this position. If confirmed, you will be responsible for integrating the Department of Defense's Homeland Defense activities to include efforts to protect critical infrastructure and assisting in Homeland Defense matters for U.S. Northern Command, other combatant commands, and the National Guard.

I would like to know what you see as the major challenges in the coming years with respect to these issues, including protection of the Defense Industrial Base.

Additionally, you will be responsible for policy issues relating to the Western Hemisphere and the Arctic; regions, that have seen increased attention from Russia, China, Iran, and other recent actors.

I look forward to your testimony on the appropriate role of the Department of Defense in competing strategically in these key regions.
Dr. Plumb, you are nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Defense to Space Policy. This is a new position that was established in the fiscal year 2020 National Defense Authorization Act to ensure dedicated policy oversight over the newly created Space Force. You are well qualified for this position, having managed Missile Defense and Space Policy issues for the Defense Department during the Obama administration, as well as holding an undergraduate degree in physics and a doctorate in aerospace engineering.

As Section 955 of the fiscal year 2020 NDAA outlines, the principal duty of the Assistant Secretary shall be overall supervision of policy of the Department of Defense for space warfighting. I would highlight the word "principal," because the Department has undertaken a major reorganization of the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and has realigned Nuclear Missile Defense, Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction, and Cybersecurity to your space portfolio.

Although similar in scope to earlier versions of this position, there are major differences for your office, including the disbanding of the Office of Nuclear Missile Defense Policy, significant changes to the former Office of Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction, and the movement of Missile Defense to the Office of Space Policy; furthermore, Cybersecurity, with all of its complexity, has been added to...
During today's hearing, I will ask for your views about this reorganization and your plan to ensure that nuclear deterrence, the bedrock of our national security, is not lost in the shuffle; especially, as a new Nuclear Posture Review is imminent and we continue to grapple with serious challenges from China and Russia.

Thank you, again, to our nominees. I look forward to your testimonies.

Now, let me recognize the ranking member, Senator Inhofe.
STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES INHOFE, U.S. SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to our witnesses for being with us for this session.

In 2021, our top military and intelligence leaders told this Committee that the world is in the most dangerous and complex position that it has been in our lifetimes and I agree with it, and looking at what is happening across the world, you have to agree.

In 2018, the National Defense Strategy, there is our book that we, it served us very well as a blueprint. It provides a roadmap to prioritize security to challenge. And I know that they are going to be re-doing this and upgrading it and all of that, and I hope that we don't lose the value that it has been to us before, because it is truly a masterpiece.

We have a lot of challenges in areas overseas. China's military modernization continues at an alarming pace and the massive growth in its arsenal of nuclear weapons and hypersonic missiles clearly shows that they are watching in an unprecedented strategy breakout.

Russia has built up well over 100,000 troops around Ukraine and is ready for, yet, another invasion if Putin gives the word. Russia also recently tested an anti-satellite missile, creating a cloud of lethal debris that
made astronauts scramble for safety. This, again, shows Putin's blatant disregard for established norms.

Meanwhile, Iran continues to fund global terrorism and target American personnel and partners, and rampant inflation is eating away at the defense budget. Not only our troops, A, and the benefits, but also funding for training, maintenance, and weapons acquisition. This administration seems unable and/or unwilling to effectively respond to the growing dangers and this paralysis damages U.S. credibility and undermines the trust of our partners and allies.

Even know, the administration seems intent on ending decades of all the security guarantees by watering down our United States nuclear policies and exposing allies. And I will have the chance to pursue this a little bit during my time for questioning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe. And now let me recognize Dr. Wallander for her testimony. Doctor?
STATEMENT OF DR. CELESTE ANN WALLANDER, NOMINEE TO BE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
AFFAIRS

Ms. Wallander: Good morning, Chairman Reed, Ranking
Member Inhofe, and distinguished members of the Committee.
Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you
today as you consider my nomination to serve as Assistant
Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

I am grateful to President Biden, Secretary Austin, and
Under Secretary Kahl for their trust in my ability to serve
in this role. It is also a privilege to appear on this
panel with colleagues who have also been nominated for
Assistant Secretary roles. If confirmed, it would be my
honor to work alongside them and ensure coordination between
the regional and functional policy offices within the
Department.

I would like to take a moment to thank my dad, who
served in the U.S. Navy, and is a retired Chicago police
officer, and my mom, who immigrated to the United States as
a little girl from Europe after World War II. They taught
me the gift of American citizenship and the duty to serve
our country. I also thank my husband Jeff and our children
Nathaniel, Joseph, and Genevieve, for their unshakeable love
and support.

I am humbled by the prospect of returning to public
service. I served at the Pentagon as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia from 2009 to 2012, and then on the National Security Council staff as the Senior Director for Russia and Central Asia from 2013 to 2017. These roles equipped me with the skills to manage critical defense relationships, navigate the interagency policy formation process, and develop national security policy in response to complex geopolitical contexts.

I have dedicated my career to both, studying and working policy on European and Eurasian security, with a focus on Russian foreign, military, and security affairs. If confirmed, I would work to utilize my scholarly and government experiences in the service of U.S. national security.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs covers a broad portfolio that includes well over 100 countries. ISA develops security policy and manages defense and military relations. It stewards Department resources to develop military capabilities, support security cooperation programs, conduct foreign military sales, and perform other key activities in those regions. I would be honored to lead the talented professionals supporting this vast portfolio should I be confirmed.
The regional portfolio presents some of the most difficult defense challenges facing the United States. I appreciate that members of this committee are closely tracking Russian threats against Ukraine. As a private citizen, I have been deeply concerned about Russian military concentrations.

If confirmed, I would develop policy and strategic options for the Secretary to deter Russia, ensure appropriate response to Russian aggression, and safeguard U.S. and Transatlantic security.

I support the Biden administration's work to unite NATO on deterrence and diplomacy, as well as provide continued defensive, lethal assistance to Ukraine. I also support the administration's close consultations with European allies and partners on options for deterrence, as well as serious consequences for Russia in the event of escalation.

If confirmed, I will be ready and able to advance the Department's preparations for all contingencies. This will be my top priority, if confirmed, and, I would immediately focus on being briefed in detail about the current state of play.

I share the goals and commitments advanced in the Global Posture Review, including an effective counterterrorism posture in the Middle East and robust deterrence against Iran. Our force protection mission is
also essential, particularly, in the face of attacks by
Iranian proxies in Iraq.

If confirmed, I will also advance our strategy in
Africa to build partner capacity, strengthen African
security institutions, and counter violent extremist
organizations.

I share Secretary Austin's view that China is the
pacing challenge for the Department. I also share his view
that the strength of our alliances and partnerships is one
of our greatest assets in that challenge, and all others.

If confirmed, I will prioritize these critical defense
partnerships in order to strengthen our security and deter
our adversaries.

The responsibilities of International Security Affairs
require thoughtful and sustained military diplomacy with our
allies and partners across the globe. I know that members
of this committee recognize the importance of this mission,
and I am personally invested in working with Congress to
address these shared challenges and opportunities. I
appreciate your longstanding bipartisan approach to national
security issues and would look forward to working in
partnership with this committee and consulting regularly
with Congress, if confirmed.

Thank you for considering my nomination, and I look
forward to your questions.
[The statement of Ms. Wallander follows:]
Chairman Reed: Thank you very much.

Ms. Dalton, please?
STATEMENT OF MELISSA G. DALTON, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR HOMELAND DEFENSE AND HEMISPHERIC AFFAIRS

Ms. Dalton: Chairman Reed, Ranking Member Inhofe, and members of the Committee, it is an honor to be considered as President Biden's nominee for Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs.

I am grateful to President Biden, Secretary Austin, Deputy Secretary Hicks, and Under Secretary Kahl for their trust and confidence in me.

I wish to thank my family, friends, and mentors for their encouragement, particularly, my husband and true north, Jason, who is here today; my two amazing children, Jacob and Isabelle; and my parents, Ann and Ravi.

My father chose to make this country his own as an immigrant from India. He and my mother imbued within me a deep respect for the foundational values of our great nation. I come from a family committed to public service and have been drawn to it since I was 22 years old. I am honored by the prospect of serving in this new capacity.

I began my career at the Defense Department as a civil servant during the Bush administration and served for a decade in several policy and intelligence roles. I then spent 6 years at the bipartisan think tank, the Center for Strategic and International Studies. I was honored to
return to OSD Policy last January as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities as a member of the Biden-Harris administration.

If confirmed, I would bring my experience as a defense leader, thinker, and practitioner to the position.

As Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs, I would look forward to advancing enduring Department priorities and new focus areas, such as Arctic security and climate policy, if confirmed. My office would prioritize issues that impact our homeland defense as the Department's number one priority.

If confirmed, my priority would be defeating the COVID-19 pandemic, which remains the most immediate threat to U.S. national security and to the health, safety, and readiness of our servicemembers; in addition, if confirmed, I would ensure DOD maintains resilience to execute our most critical national security functions, and to provide continuity to other parts of Government, in the face of all hazard threats. The resilience of our critical infrastructure and capabilities at home strengthens deterrence of potential adversary aggression and enables a robust foreign policy abroad.

If confirmed, I would ensure DOD's unparalleled and flexible capacity is leveraged effectively and appropriately in support of Federal, State, and local leadership, law
enforcement, public health, and emergency management.

Under the updated OSD-Policy organization, Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs will also focus on Arctic security and global resilience. The Arctic is a complex theater of growing strategic importance. I appreciate this committee's leadership in prioritizing this region.

In addition, as Secretary Austin has stated, to keep the nation secure, we must tackle the existential threat of climate change. Climate change already touches most of what the Department does, and this threat will continue to have implications for U.S. national security.

Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs is also the office from which DOD supports civil authorities responding to extreme weather events, including wildfires and hurricanes.

If confirmed, I would provide oversight of these distinct, but also interrelated issues, as part of a whole-of-government approach.

If confirmed, my office would unite policymaking on both sides of the Southwest Border, bringing our defense relationships with Central and South American neighbors under the same policy oversight umbrella as our support to the Department of Homeland Security and local partners on the border. This organization will help us make better and more holistic policy across these issues to address the
drivers of migration and effects in the homeland as part of a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach.

More broadly, if confirmed, I would seek to forge even deeper bonds with our Western Hemisphere neighbors, based on principles of mutual respect and equality and a commitment to economic prosperity, security, human rights, and dignity.

On the many issues in this portfolio, DOD plays a critical supporting role to other departments and agencies. If confirmed, I am committed to making sure that DOD supports civil authorities to the best of our ability, without compromising DOD's core missions and warfighting readiness. I would also focus on building relationships and trust across Government and reinforcing the strong tradition of healthy civil-military relations in the Department and in our democracy, to do this job as effectively as possible, if confirmed.

I have deep appreciation for this Committee and its role in the formation and oversight of our national security policy.

If confirmed, I commit to consulting with you regularly to advance our nation's priorities in an active, bipartisan, and cooperative spirit together.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to your questions.

[The statement of Ms. Dalton follows:]
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Chairman Reed: Thank you very much.

Dr. Plumb, please?
STATEMENT OF DR. JOHN F. PLUMB, NOMINEE TO BE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SPACE POLICY

Mr. Plumb: Thank you, Senator.

Chairman Reed, Ranking Member Inhofe, members of the committee, thank you. I am both, proud and humbled, to be testifying before you today. I have always admired and respected the thoughtful, bipartisan work of this committee.

I would like to thank President Biden, Secretary Austin, and Deputy Secretary Hicks for their trust in me and in my ability to continue to serve the nation, if confirmed as the first Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy.

I would like to thank, also, my parents, who are here today, and my brother and sisters, and my wife and kids for their love and support, that allows me to be here before you today, and being here is, indeed, an honor.

I grew up in rural, Western New York, in a family for whom service to country is a proud tradition. Both my grandparents were in the Army Air Corps during World War 2.

My father was in the Army for the first 4 years of my life, at Fort Richardson in Alaska. I have a brother and a sister who serve in the Air Force, and as for me, I joined the Navy and became a submarine officer.

Since leaving active duty, I have remained active in the Navy Reserves for two decades. As a civilian, I have
served in these very halls as the military advisor to Senator Ken Salazar. I have served in the Pentagon, and I have served on the National Security Council staff.

If confirmed, I believe my lifetime of service has prepared me to better advance and defend U.S. national security interests, and to work with this committee while doing so.

The ASD for Space Policy position appropriately elevates the space portfolio within the Policy organization.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with this committee to ensure space receives the attention, the prioritization, and the resources this critical domain demands. Space, nuclear weapons, missile defenses, cyber, and the ability to detect and stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are all key to U.S. national security, and the integration of these capabilities is essential for the era of strategic competition the U.S. must now rise to meet.

As members of this committee are well aware, the security environment facing the United States at this moment in history is a challenging one. Secretary Austin has articulated that China is the pacing challenge for the Department, and China's behavior with its own strategic capabilities is a matter of grave concern. From its kinetic anti-satellite weapon test in 2007 that created a persistent
debris cloud, to the uncontrolled reentry of a rocket stage last May, China has yet to demonstrate that it is a responsible spacefaring nation.

In the cyber domain, the growing pace and scale of cyberattacks from China far exceeds the bounds of traditional statecraft. The Commander of U.S. Strategic Command has expressed concern that China's nuclear forces are in the midst of a strategic breakout. Reports of a hypersonic glide vehicle test in August, via a fractional orbit bombardment system, if true, are deeply troubling, and maybe most troublesome of all is China's near, total lack of transparency regarding its strategic capabilities, and its demonstrated unwillingness to discuss them.

Russia also continues to present a challenge on multiple fronts. Russian activities in space, including its destructive ASAT test just this November, are an ongoing concern. And Russia's reliance on, and integration of, nuclear weapons throughout its forces, from the tactical to strategic, is troubling. Russian cyber activity includes State tolerance of cyber criminals and State-sponsored weaponization of social media.

And amid all these problems, North Korea continues to expand its nuclear arsenal and delivery systems, while Iran's uranium enrichment presents both, a nuclear proliferation and a security challenge.
I understand the Department is diligently working to strengthen our deterrence posture: modernizing our nuclear deterrent, modernizing our infrastructure, improving our cyber defenses and capabilities, and working to protect and defend our interests, not just on Earth, but in space.

If confirmed, I will work to continue these efforts, while seeking to incorporate our allies as fully as possible.

I firmly believe our allies provide a mutual, strategic advantage that neither China, nor Russia could ever hope to match.

I believe the U.S. is at its strongest and best when national security is a bipartisan effort, and that is, the old adage goes: Politics really should stop at the water's edge.

If confirmed, that is how I intend to approach the position and its attendant responsibilities, and if confirmed, I commit to working closely with this committee to ensure U.S. national security interests are advanced and defended.

Thank you once more for inviting me to testify. I look forward to your questions.

[The statement of Mr. Plumb follows:]
Chairman Reed: Thank you very much.

I have a series of standard questions, which survey nominees must respond to. You may answer together.

Have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

[All three witnesses answered in the affirmative.]

Chairman Levin: Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

[All three witnesses answered in the negative.]

Chairman Reed: Exercising our legislative and oversight responsibilities makes it important that this Committee, its Subcommittees and other appropriate Committees of Congress receive testimony, briefings, reports, records, and other information from the Executive Branch on a timely basis.

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify before this Committee when requested?

[All three witnesses answered in the affirmative.]

Chairman Reed: Do you agree to provide records, documents, and electronic communications in a timely manner when requested by this Committee, its Subcommittees, or other appropriate Committees of Congress, and to consult with the requestor regarding a basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such records?
Chairman Reed: Will you ensure that your staff complies with deadlines established by this Committee for the production of reports, records, and other information, including timely responding to hearing questions for the record?

Chairman Reed: Will you cooperate and provide any witnesses and briefers in response to a congressional request?

Chairman Reed: Will those witnesses and briefers be protected from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

Chairman Reed: Thank you very much.

Ms. Dalton, it was just announced this morning that the President and Secretary Austin have directed the deployment of approximately 1,000 military medical personnel to several states, including the state of Rhode Island, to provide support with the Omicron variant proliferation.

One of your responsibilities, as you have indicated, is to cooperate the support, such as this, to states, to localities, to the Northern Command, et cetera.

Are you concerned about the strain that the Defense Support of Civil Authorities is placing on our active forces
and also our National Guard?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for the question.

This terrible pandemic, unfortunately, has taken countless lives over the last 2 years and it is the most immediate threat to the United States and Americans. And so, I believe that the National Guard has played a really important role in supporting local medical authorities and in the development and production of vaccines.

If confirmed, I would look forward to building upon these efforts to support civil authorities, as appropriate, but as you indicated, Senator, an important element of determining the appropriate use of the DSCA authority is looking towards warfighting readiness. And the Secretary has made clear that the number one pacing challenge for the Department is China.

So, I would look forward to applying that framework, if confirmed.

Chairman Reed: Well, thank you very much.

Dr. Wallander, you are being nominated for a very critical position at the moment because of the situation on the Ukrainian border. But you were, I believe, in the White House on the National Security Council in 2014 when Russia moved into the Crimea and Donbas.

Can you reflect about how those experiences will shape or help your response in your analysis of these issues?
Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for your focus on this critical issue for American and allied national security at this time.

Russia has proven itself to be willing and able to use multiple instruments in pursuit of its national security goals, including preventing Ukraine from continuing the path of its Euro-Atlantic aspirations. I believe that the lessons of 2014 were that the United States needs to be, first and foremost, unified with our allies and partners, not only in Europe, but globally, in order to provoke a unified front to the Kremlin and make them understand that they cannot divide us. And the second lesson would be to rapidly develop ways to impose costs on the Russian leadership and to support Ukraine in defense of its territorial integrity and sovereignty.

Chairman Reed: Thank you.

Dr. Plumb, the office you are nominated to lead is nearly identical to the Office of Global Strategic Affairs, which was abolished in 2014, except that the Office of Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy has now been abolished with the nuclear policy mission being merged into an Office of Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction, now renamed: Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Policy.

If confirmed, and given our circumstances with Russia and China, can you use this new arrangement to maintain our
critical strategic deterrence policy, and in that response, why did we need such a reorganization?

Mr. Plumb: Thank you very much, Senator.

Just from the top, let me just say our nuclear deterrence mission is absolutely critical. Secretary Austin has called it the Department of Defense's number one priority. I fully agree with that assessment.

And if confirmed, I will work to ensure that our nuclear deterrent is safe, strong, effective, and credible. As for the ability to maintain the offices, so inside this office, the Secretary transferred policy, in my experience, there are individual offices. The offices move as a unit.

So, the Nuclear Weapons Policy Office remains intact; it is now merged with the Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction Office. I think there is actually some advantage to having those two offices in the same, underneath the same DESI-ship because it requires them to coordinate with each other and be aware of each other at a level that, perhaps, they weren't in previous organizations.

The logic to the reorg, I guess, I would say I think there is a good logic to it. I think the functional aspects of Department of Defense need to be integrated as we approach the adversaries. And, you know, our near-peer adversaries are the same in all domains: China and Russia.

And so, for that, I think there is good logic in making
Chairman Reed: Thank you very much.

Senator Inhofe, please?

Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do have a question for each one of the witnesses, and so I am going to ask for real fast responses and try to get to all three of them, in fact, we will get to all three of them.

Dr. Plumb, five of my colleagues and I recently sent a letter to senior administration officials expressing concern that President Biden might pursue changes to a longstanding U.S. nuclear declaratory policy, despite increasingly give moves by China and Russia and the clear objectives, objections that we have had from our allies.

Deputy Secretary Hicks agreed with our conclusion at her confirmation hearing, stating, I don't believe that a no-first-use policy is in the best interests of the United States.

Do you agree?

Mr. Plumb: Senator, thank you.

I agree with Deputy Secretary Hicks. I personally, do not believe no-first-use is a good idea at this time, and I would say taking the allies into consideration is absolutely essential. My caveat here, of course, is declaratory policy
is the purview of the President.

Senator Inhofe: Well, and, yeah, because I think it was pretty specific when she said, I don't believe no-first-use policy is in the best interests of the United States.

Thank you very much.

Dr. Wallander, China is aggressively modernizing its military and expanding its presence around the world and particularly true in Africa. I can remember it wasn't too long ago we didn't even have an AFRICOM and the continent was divided into three different commands. That was not workable; we didn't correct that, and so we have gotten a lot more attention.

However, China is becoming a lot more aggressive in Djibouti and other areas in there. General Townsend called it the number one global power competition concern.

This has been a concern of mine for a long period of time. Even at the time that we started its own dedicated command, but nonetheless, the problem is still there. And know that AFRICOM does not have the capabilities and resources to actually address this, and I think that is a problem.

Do you agree that it is a problem that we lack resources in taking care of the needs that we have in our allies in that continent?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for your focus on
the issue of Chinese and Russian strategic competition, active in Africa. I share your concern.

I, if confirmed, look forward to building on the existing defense and security partnerships we have with our, with countries in Africa, and I believe and agree with you that we need to look at the resources, especially as China has pivoted towards seeking military access and presence.

Senator Inhofe: All the way down through, and that is true. I may come back if I have a minute, but, regardless, I look forward to visiting with you with regularity on this subject.

Ms. Dalton, the year 2021 witnessed the surge in illegal Southwest Border crossings and the Border Patrol recorded 174,000 encounters with illegal immigrants in November. That is a record for that month.

President Biden and his spokesperson have both referred to this as a crisis and I believe. I agree that it is a crisis.

I would like to ask if you agree that it is a crisis that we are facing right now on our Southwest Border?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting this challenge. And I agree with you that it is a serious situation on the Southwest Border.

And if confirmed, I would look forward to working as part of an interagency effort both, in the homeland context,
working closely with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to address the challenge, and then also working very closely with our Central and South American partners upstream to address some of the drivers of migration, I think.

Senator Inhofe: That is fine.
So, you agree that it is a crisis?
Ms. Dalton: Yes, Senator.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you very much.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Shaheen: Presiding.] Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Let me begin by congratulating each of our nominees and thanking for your willingness to serve.

I would like to begin with you, Dr. Plumb. I chair the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations Subcommittee and I have supported the effort to transition the civil space situation of awareness from the Space Force's 30th Space Wing to the Department of Commerce. Unfortunately, I have to say that the transition has been challenged by a lack of clarity on the cost of that mission. There has not been a willingness on the part of the agency to be forthcoming on the cost and that puts us in a really difficult position, with respect to how much money we need to try and appropriate for the Department of Commerce.
So, if confirmed, will you commit to working with me to improve the Department of Defense's transparency on this issue so that we can better make that transition and ensure that the funding is there that is going to be needed?

Mr. Plumb: Senator, thank you for that question.

I think space-traffic management is absolutely essential and I do agree that it should be conducted by a civil agency and not the Department of Defense. And I will commit to you to help discover the right amount of resources and training and opportunities needed to make that shift.

It is a difficult shift, but I think it is needed.

Senator Shaheen: Thank you very much.

Dr. Wallander, in your article "NATO's Enemies Within," you stated that NATO actually faces new vulnerabilities as we see some of its recent members that are drifting towards authoritarianism; Hungary the one that comes most to mind.

But that gives Russia more insights into what is happening at NATO at a very critical time.

So, can you talk about what your role might be and what the appropriate role of the Department of Defense ought to be as we look at what is happening with some of those countries in NATO.

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you. Thank you for reading my article and thank you for highlighting the importance of NATO as a military alliance, but a military
alliance of democratic countries. The strength of NATO lies in the defense and military capabilities of its members, but also the quality of its democratic governance of its members.

And it is in that regard, if confirmed, I would focus on, as the Defense Department does in its security and defense partnerships with allies and partners, issues of democratic governance, civilian control of the military.

And the strong bond of NATO allies, that is part of what keeps it strong, and as you note, limits the influence of Russian corrupt political and business relationships.

Senator Shaheen: And would you agree that right now, given Russia's threat to Ukraine, that that is particularly critical. It was disappointing to hear the readout from the meeting yesterday that Russia was suggesting that because we are not willing to give them a veto threat over who joins NATO that it is going to, it sounded like it encourages them to think about invading Ukraine.

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I very much share your concern at Russian threats and statements. And I think we see the efforts of Russia to prevent another aspirant country, Ukraine, which seeks that democratic, Euro-Atlantic future and Russia leverages, not just military capabilities, but political and economic influence, to try to prevent that from happening.
And, if confirmed, I will focus on, again, not just defense relationships and capabilities, but the quality of the democratic transitions and governance.

Senator Shaheen: Thank you very much.

This question is really both for you and Ms. Dalton. As you know, the Syrian democratic forces have stated that they are not able to take long-term responsibility for ISIS detainees and for the camps that currently house so many of the families of those ISIS detainees. And the one in Syria, Al-Hol, comes most to mind with 60,000 women and children, who are family members of ISIS fighters. And most assessments of what is happening there suggests that that camp is a hotbed for radicalization of the family members who are there.

So, do you believe that addressing the plight of those detainees in Syria should be included in strategic planning processes as we are looking at how we continue to address potential threats from terrorism?

Ms. Dalton, I will ask you to respond first.

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting this concern. It is an issue that I focused on in my prior affiliation with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Certainly, in my present position, I do believe that we need to be looking at both, the security and the
humanitarian facets of this challenge set, and I am sure that that is the approach that my colleagues working counterterrorism and humanitarian affairs in the Department in the interagency are taking. Thank you.

    Senator Shaheen: And do you agree with that, Dr. Wallander?

    Ms. Wallander: Senator, I fully agree with what Ms. Dalton said. I agree it is a combined security challenge and humanitarian problem that we have to take seriously and work through a whole-of-government approach to resolve.

    Senator Shaheen: Thank you. Hopefully, we will see an ISIS detainee coordinator appointed as this Committee and the NDAA in 2020 requested.

    Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

    Chairman Reed: [Presiding.] Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

    Senator Wicker, please?

    Senator Wicker: Thank you very much.

    To our first witness, Doctor, how should we pronounce your last name?

    Ms. Wallander: Senator, however you like, but Wallander.

    Senator Wicker: All right. Okay.

    Well, Dr. Wallander, you were, you served in the administration as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Russia,
Ukraine, and Eurasia Policy from 2009 to 2012; a very hot issue. And then you moved over as Senior Director for Russia and Central Asia from 2013 to 2017, which means you were right there when Russia invaded the sovereign nation of Ukraine.

Do you think our policy, in response to that invasion, at the time, was correct?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for highlighting this extremely important question. And I share your concern about this long track record of Russian aggression against its neighbors, including Ukraine.

I believe that our response in 2014 was too slow and too incremental.

And, if confirmed, I would apply the lessons that I learned, and I believe others in the U.S. national security community, learned to better address Russia's ongoing and heightened aggression against its neighbors.

Senator Wicker: I would go farther than you. You said it was too slow and too incremental.

We really didn't provide them with any lethal weapons for quite a period of time; is that correct?

Ms. Wallander: That is correct, Senator.

Senator Wicker: And I noticed in answer to an earlier question, you talk about a unified approach with Europe and imposing costs. I do think I understand you to say that
providing lethal weapons to Ukraine would also be part of your approach, your recommended approach to the President; is that correct?

Ms. Wallander: Yes, Senator; that is correct.

Senator Wicker: And let me ask you, I appreciate the question that the distinguished senator from Oklahoma asked about no-first-use.

Do you think Russia would have invaded Ukraine in 2014 if they had retained their nuclear capability, rather than giving it up after the breakdown of the Soviet, the breakup of the Soviet Union?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I think a full answer to your question would depend on the trajectory of how Ukrainian security and defense forces maintain control and modernization of those forces. And I think we have to count concerns about proliferation in our assessment of that trajectory.

But I believe that, that was the correct course of action to support non-proliferation at the time. And the focus, if confirmed, of our security and defense cooperation that I would support would be Ukraine's conventional defense capabilities and the enablers it needs to be able to counter the enormous Russian threat.

Senator Wicker: You know, Dr. Wallander, I think we all thought that at the time.
President Zelensky, the overwhelmingly elected President of the sovereign nation of Ukraine, is in support of a cruise initiative that the Senate may vote on today, which would impose sanctions on Russian entities associated with the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline.

It is a fact that Vladimir Putin has amassed some 100,000, plus or minus, Russian troops on the border of the sovereign Ukrainian nation; is that correct?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, that is correct. And I would add --

Senator Wicker: So, they have taken a very aggressive action.

And does it seem to you, advisable, to take the advice of the person who is in the hottest of hot seats, and that is the President of the sovereign nation, and say, let's go ahead and respond to this very aggressive action?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I am not fully aware of the proposal that you are referring to, but I agree that the United States needs multiple elements in its toolkit to include sanctions, to include continued and probably enhanced defensive, legal assistance to Ukraine, and to look at NATO posture in Eastern Europe in order to defend and deter against Russian aggression.

Senator Wicker: Well, we could do that.

Briefly, do you think adding two destroyers based in
Rota, to the four that we already have, would also be an effective deterrent to Russia's aggressive ambitions?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I am not briefed on intelligence assessments, but I will say from my understanding of publicly available information, that the Russian presence and activities in the Black Sea, in particular, are of significant concern.

And if confirmed, I would want to look at the U.S. naval presence and posture, along the lines of what you suggest.

Senator Wicker: If you could supplement that answer on the record, I would appreciate it.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Wicker.

Senator Blumenthal, please?

Senator Blumenthal: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I join in thanking all of you for your service, your previous service, and your willingness to serve in the future.

Ms. Wallander, I would like to continue the conversation that you were having with Senator Wicker. Have there been indications, so far as you are aware in, let's say the last week, of increasing mobilization at various points, by the Russian military in possible preparation for an engagement?
Ms. Wallander: Senator, I will repeat. As a private citizen, I don't have access to classified assessments; however, I have been tracking the public information available on the matters that you raise and it is my understanding that there are some signs of continuing Russian redeployment of forces from east in the country, further west, and that is a matter of considerable concern. Not just forces, but heavy, armored forces.

Senator Blumenthal: So, there are some indications that this situation may be coming to a head?

Ms. Wallander: There is plenty of reason to assess, Senator, that it is certainly not de-escalating and it may be escalating.

Senator Blumenthal: Do you think that the United States has sent sufficient arms, particularly, Javelin anti-armor weaponry, Stinger anti-aircraft weaponry? Do you think that we can make clearer, not only our strong support for Ukraine, but also provide the very specific weaponry needed by Ukraine to defend itself?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I thank you for focusing on Ukraine's defense needs to counter the Russian aggression. And I would like to thank this Committee and the Senate, actually, in a bipartisan manner over many years, to support Ukraine's defensive capabilities, because Ukraine is in a much stronger position to be able to resist and fight
against a Russian invasion, should it happen.

To answer your question specifically, I think those are the kinds of capabilities in it heightened threat environment that, if confirmed, I would want to look at in order to enable Ukraine to deal with this escalation of Russian capability that we have discussed.

Senator Blumenthal: I assume that you want to do more than look at it, because time is not on our side here. I would hope that you would urge, as imminently as possible, in fact, even before your confirmation, perhaps, that the United States take more aggressive and strong action to bolster Ukrainian systems with radar systems, with the Javelin anti-armor missiles, with Stinger and other anti-aircraft missiles, and other capability that will show Vladimir Putin that we mean business, because in my view, that is the only sign that he will respect, other than strong economic sanctions.

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I agree with you; those are core requirements that Ukraine needs in the face of the force that Russia has amassed.

Senator Blumenthal: Let me ask you on a different topic, Ms. Wallander. The United States, in its withdrawal from Afghanistan promised, in fact, the President, himself, promised that we would not leave behind our at-risk, Afghan allies, who have stood by us over the 20 years of war and
now have targets on their back. Many of them are in hiding. They are in desperate and dire straits, particularly, during the approaching winter.

Has the United States done enough to enable those at-risk, Afghan allies to evacuate? Shouldn't we be doing more?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I share your concern deeply with what we have seen, and the fact that the United States was not able, along with our partners who stepped up and really supported the effort to evacuate and provide safe haven for those individuals.

If confirmed, I commit to you that I will participate with my interagency colleagues and with colleagues at the Defense Department to ensure that we are doing everything possible to assist those individuals and to find them safe haven and exit from Afghanistan, if they desire.

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you for that answer. I will look forward to submitting some additional questions for the record on this topic.

My time has expired. But I welcome your commitment to do everything possible. Right now, our country is doing far less than everything possible and I hope that we will step up our efforts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thanks, Senator Blumenthal.
Senator Fischer, please?

Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before turning to my questions, I would like to speak to some of my colleague's concerns about changes to our declaratory policy that this administration is reportedly considering.

I think it is important to remember that the Obama administration rejected these changes in a far more benign security environment than what we are currently seeing today. With China's nuclear breakout and Russia amassing forces on Ukraine's border, adopting a no-first-use, or sole-purpose policy, would be irresponsible and it would strain relations with our allies at the worst possible moment. As Senator Blumenthal just said, we must show that we mean business; that is what President Putin respects, and that applies in this area, as well.

Dr. Plumb, in your response to the Committee's advanced policy questions about establishing norms of behavior in space, you acknowledge that Russian and Chinese behavior clearly demonstrates that the prospect of establishing an effective agreement is not realistic at this time.

Do you support a dual-track approach that involves deploying the capabilities necessary to send credible, deterrent messages to our adversaries, while continuing to work with allies and partners to lay the foundation for
future discussion about responsible behavior in space?

Mr. Plumb: Thank you, Senator, for that question.

I think, just as the first ASD for Space Policy nominee, it is a really essential piece of the work I hope to be able to do, if confirmed.

There are two totally different facets there and I would just say I agree with you on both. One is, I do think there is a need for rules and for norms in space behavior. And I hold some deep kernel of hope that we could come to an agreement with Russia and China on that in some not-too-distant future.

At the same time, nothing there would, in my mind, prevent us, or preclude us, from pursuing both, offensive and defensive capabilities to ensure that we can defend our own assets and prevail in a conflict.

Senator Fischer: Thank you. Also, can you talk about how you view the relationship between nuclear modernization and arms control? Sometimes you see these as competing priorities and I view them, instead, as complementary, because without modernization, our forces will become obsolete and our adversaries will have no incentive to negotiate for any kind of reductions.

So, what is your view on that?

Mr. Plumb: Thanks, again, Senator.

As we discussed on our phone call, I am fully onboard
with modernizing the nuclear triad. I think it is absolutely essential, that our nuclear deterrent, which is the bedrock of our deterrence, is safe, effective, and I want to say credible, and I think modernization is part of that credibility.

As far as the relationship with arms control, arms control is important. It is not, you don't do arms control to its own end; arms control is to advance the national security of both, or as many parties are involved in the talks, and I agree with your assessment that if you have nothing to trade, there is no incentive to be at the table.

Senator Fischer: Thank you.

Dr. Wallander, over the weekend, several reports suggested the administration was considering cutting U.S. presence in Europe as a bargaining chip in the upcoming negotiations with Russia, and in response, the White House issued a statement, explicitly rejecting this, stating, quote, the administration is not weighing cuts to troops in Europe, end quote.

I assume you agree with this and would recommend against cutting U.S. presence in Europe; is that accurate?

Ms. Wallander: Yes, Senator; I do agree and would so recommend, if confirmed.

Senator Fischer: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Fischer.

Senator Hirono, please?

Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I welcome the nominees. I ask the following two initial questions of all nominees before any of the committees on which I sit. So, I would like to ask you these questions en masse.

Since you became a legal adult, have you ever made unwanted requests for sexual behaviors or committed any verbal or physical harassment or assault of a sexual nature?

[All three witnesses answered in the negative.]

Senator Hirono: No.

Have you ever faced discipline or entered into a settlement related to this kind of conduct?

[All three witnesses answered in the negative.]

Senator Hirono: I have a question for Dr. Wallander.

Last year, the U.S., Australia, and the U.K. entered into an historic security alliance, the AUUKUS, which includes plans to provide Australia with technology and support to build nuclear-powered submarines, within the next few decades.

Additionally, this alliance will facilitate the sharing of many more technologies, including artificial intelligence, underwater systems, long-range strikes, cyber, and many others. These types of agreements lead to enhance interoperability and deepen cooperation among allies within
the region.

From your perspective, how important are security alliances like AUUKUS to U.S. national defense and how will this alliance benefit U.S. security interests in the INDOPACOM AOR?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I admire and fully support the development of AUUKUS as a multilateral alliance for coping with the challenge of China in the Indo-Pacific, specifically. I would note that because the U.K. is one of the members of that alliance, it is a great example of how Europe can join with the United States and a regional country, Australia, to cope with Indo-Pacific challenges, including China. And I hope it is the first, only the first instance of Europe taking seriously and contributing to coping with the China challenge.

Senator Hirono: I agree with you that the cooperation or the inclusion of U.K. in this kind of alliance that is much more focused, I suppose, on China as a near-peer competitor to us is very significant, because we are all in this together. And it is not just what is going on in Europe and what Russia is doing with regard to Ukraine and whatever intentions Russia has. These two countries are definitely our near-peer competitors.

Now, you will oversee security-cooperation programs and defense strategies impacting many regions across the globe.
Can you tell me how you would approach these tasks?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for focusing on this important question.

If confirmed, I would focus first on building on already existing, strong alliances and allied partnerships, allied relations and partnerships, which I want to highlight, we enjoy not only in Europe, but in Eurasia with countries, such as Georgia and in Africa and in the Middle East. So, there is plenty of opportunity to build upon and expand as we cope with multiple challenges, not just Russia and China, but ongoing needs in the region, such as Iran, and countering violent extremism in many regions.

Senator Hirono: And not to mention, North Korea.

So, I do have a question for Ms. Dalton. In the last week, North Korea has tested two ballistic missiles off their east coast. If confirmed, a key part of your responsibilities will include developing policy and planning for Homeland Defense.

In 2019, Missile Defense Review identified the Homeland Defense Radar Hawaii as a requirement for detecting and discriminating against inbound missile threats from an increasingly capable North Korea. In successive budget requests, funding was zeroed out for HDRH-H Hawaii without any capability to replace it.

If confirmed, how will you support policy to ensure
Hawaii is protected from missile threats from North Korea and elsewhere going forward?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting this concern. Insofar as Missile Defense of the homeland, it is a central area of focus for the ongoing Missile Defense Review that Secretary Austin and senior defense officials are currently conducting.

If confirmed, I would look forward to implementing the findings of the MDR to ensure that the entirety of the U.S. homeland and its territories are protected from threats, such as from North Korea.

Senator Hirono: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

It is a continuing concern that the administration zeroes out Homeland Defense Hawaii without any alternative. I am totally open to any other ways that Hawaii can be protected, and until then, you will know that I will continue to push for HDR-H.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Hirono.

Senator Cotton, please?

Senator Cotton: Ms. Wallander, you testified that you think President Obama's administration made mistakes in 2014 with the invasion of Crimea and its annexation. You also say in both, your opening statement and in question 97 of the advanced questions for the record, that you support the
continued provision of defensive weapons systems to Ukraine.

But that, do you mean to rule out the possibility of providing Ukraine with offensive weapons systems?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you.

That is a very good question because defense assistance needs to be properly focused on the requirements of the partner or ally. I am not read into classified assessments about the balance of offensive and defensive capabilities that would be appropriate for Ukrainian defense needs.

But I will say that I would not rule them out. I would want to, if confirmed, be fully briefed on Russia's capabilities and the threat it poses and Ukraine's requirements and take a comprehensive look at what is necessary for Ukraine to be able to defend its territory and its sovereignty.

Senator Cotton: Okay. So, you don't want to rule out the potential forever providing Ukraine offensive weapons. You just don't want to make a definitive statement on it, until confirmed and read into the intelligence and the situation on the ground?

Ms. Wallander: I think it would be, Senator, irresponsible, to speculate without having full access to the classified information and assessments.

Senator Cotton: I understand and appreciate that.

Would you consider Air Defense Artillery systems the
kind of systems that could protect Ukraine against all of
those Russian helicopters that are on its border, to be
offensive or a defensive weapon?

Ms. Wallander: I believe Air Defense systems to be
fundamentally defensive in nature, Senator.

Senator Cotton: Okay. If Russia decides to go for the
jugular and you have got Russian tanks and armed personnel
carriers rolling across Ukraine's borders, it would be nice
for Ukraine to have artillery systems to strike those forces
while they are still on Russian soil, wouldn't it?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I agree with you.

Senator Cotton: Okay. Artillery, that kind of
artillery, you would characterize as an offensive weapon,
correct?

Ms. Wallander: I, Senator, I would --

Senator Cotton: I would.

Ms. Wallander: No, I am not disagreeing with you.

I think that what becomes important is how such
capabilities are deployed. They can be deployed in a more
defensive posture and a more offensive posture, which is
always one of the challenges.

I need not offer this to you, given your public service
and experience, so it could go either way, depending on the
posture and the operational utilization.

Senator Cotton: So, in 2014, we did not provide any
kind of lethal aid to Ukraine. It was reported at the time, and since then, that President Obama thought it would be too provocative, that he even said that we are not going to risk a nuclear war, or World War III, over Ukraine.

In retrospect, do you think one of the specific mistakes made in 2014 was not providing systems like Javelin anti-tank weapons to Ukraine?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I believe that one of the lessons I have learned is that it would have been appropriate and necessary to provide Ukraine with what it needed to defend its territory, including the weapons you suggest.

Senator Cotton: Because the last administration provided Ukraine with Javelins and we didn't have World War III, or nuclear war, yet.

Ms. Wallander: Senator, you are correct.

Senator Cotton: Okay. Mr. Plumb, I have a question for you about potential negotiations with Russia.

There have been some reports about the prospect of trading away the Aegis Ashore system in Romania; either removing it or reducing its presence as a bargaining chip with Russia. Some arguments that those systems could destabilize more than stabilize.

Would you support removing or reducing the Aegis Ashore system in Romania?
Mr. Plumb: Thanks for that question, Senator.

I am unaware of that particular line of concern. I was actually instrumental in the Obama administration in establishing Aegis Ashore in Romania, and I guess I would say I would be very hesitant to try to use it as a bargaining chip, without understanding the full security context.

Senator Cotton: I understand. Not exactly in the Space Policy domain, but it is complementary to a lot of those efforts. Thank you.

Ms. Dalton, you will have responsibility, in part, for our Southwest Border. Do you think it is a greater danger to the American people's prosperity and security that there are a hundred thousand Russians on Ukraine's border or two million illegal migrants having crossed our Southwestern Border in the last year?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting both of these challenges and the scope of the security environment that we find ourselves in at present.

If confirmed, I would look forward to alleging the challenges specifically on the Southwest Border, working very closely with the Department of Homeland Security and other interagency counterparts and local authorities. And as in discussing with Senator Inhofe earlier, I do believe it is a serious challenge.
Senator Cotton: Okay. Thank you.

Well, I hope you get some bright ideas for how to solve that problem, since it seems like most other parts of the administration so far have failed in that challenge.

Thank you all.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Cotton.

Now, via Webex, let me recognize Senator Gillibrand.

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Dalton, the recent Log4J, SolarWinds, and Treasury Department hacks show how challenging cyber intrusions can be on our national security and we will continue to see these threats continue and elevate into 2022.

The office you are nominated for has, in the past, overseen the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program, DCIP. Do you think DCIP is up to date in its ability to provide solutions in the event of cyber or technological harm done to our critical infrastructure; further, do you see ways where DCIP can improve its work with the private sector and civilian institutions?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting this challenge, and this would be among the top priorities that I would plan to tackle, if confirmed, in this portfolio, because I do believe that we need to look at the appropriate frameworks, policies, approaches, and tool sets to be able to address state-based threats to our critical
infrastructure that, unfortunately, have been manifesting over the last number of years.

So, if confirmed, I would certainly look forward to working with the Department of Homeland Security, CYBERCOM, with, if confirmed, Dr. Plumb's office, overseeing the DESI cyber policy to ensure that we have the right approaches, to understand the threat, and to be able to provide the appropriate level of protection and resilience necessary to address that challenge. Thank you.

Senator Gillibrand: As a follow-up, can you speak to how you view the staffing and personnel challenges that the Government faces when it comes to cybersecurity and tech expertise. I repeatedly heard about cybersecurity and tech staffing deficiencies across Government agencies, including at the DOD.

What plans do you have for improving the recruitment, training, and retention of high-quality cyber and tech expertise at the Department and will you work with my office on issues regarding cyber and tech personnel?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting this. I know there have been a number of external studies looking at this challenge, as well, the last number of years. And I do agree that we need to remain focused on bringing in talent from academia, from the tech sector, more broadly, from the private sector, to really build within our
ranks. I think there is also considerable capacity within the National Guard, given their career day jobs, as well, that we could be better harnessing. And so, absolutely, if confirmed, I would look forward to working with you and your team to advance those goals.

Senator Gillibrand: Mr. Plumb, as ASD for Space Policy, part of your duties will include coordinating our Space Policy and other agencies. What is your strategy for coordinating with our other agencies, like the State Department's Office of Space Affairs, to ensure that we are maintaining our leadership and promoting our values in space?

Mr. Plumb: Thank you for that question, Senator.

I absolutely think that promoting values in space, including norms and rules of behavior, and helping lead the international community towards that is important.

The State Department, in my view, they should be the lead on these issues at the U.N., DOD, in support, and I have worked closely with my State counterparts and across the interagency to coordinate that type of messaging efforts.

Senator Gillibrand: I am concerned that our lack of international agreements barring conventional weapons in space has led to a space arms race that threaten our civil and commercial space systems in space.
Will you play a role in developing international norms about the use of weapons in space and add here to them while developing this policy?

Mr. Plumb: Senator, thank you.

I do agree that the need for norms and rules of behavior in space is absolutely essential. I think one of the issues that make space unique is that destructive tests, like the Russians have recently conducted, challenges access to all spacefaring nations and we need to find ways to prevent that type of problem.

Senator Gillibrand: And how will your organization work across the Department to effectively manage the threat of anti-satellite capabilities demonstrated by our adversaries, as you mentioned?

Mr. Plumb: Senator, I think that anti-satellite capabilities, obviously, are on the tip of our minds right now, based on the Russian tests recently. It is absolutely essential to find a way through that.

I think one of the best ways the Department can pursue to nullify that type of behavior is an architecture that is resilient enough to withstand a blow to one or several satellites. And so, I think being able to reconstitute quickly and having a resilient architecture makes the attractiveness of a target much less, and I think that is a really important place and I don't think we are moving fast
enough, and we need to get going.

Senator Gillibrand: Dr. Wallander, my last few moments. We have heard reports of Russia conducting numerous cyberattacks against Ukrainian citizens to include directly threatening Ukrainian soldiers and their families through text messages.

What role can your office play in supporting the Ukrainian Government in countering those malicious activities?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for highlighting that Russian activities are not merely the apparent ones of conventional military-force concentrations, but actually, cover a spectrum of attacks and efforts to disable Ukrainian resistance and resilience, itself.

If confirmed, I would look forward to working with Dr. Plumb’s team, if confirmed, and focusing on countering Russian cyber operations, in which public reporting is, we have had some success in the last few years, and we need to build on the capabilities and the experience that DOD has already implemented, in order to effectively help Ukraine resist those kinds of attacks.

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Gillibrand.

Now, let me recognize, via Webex, Senator Blackburn.
Senator Blackburn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Wallander, I want to come to you. You were the Russian Director at NSC at the time when things were happening in Eastern Europe, much like they are right now, including Russia's invasion of Crimea and the separatists that were there, the formatting of the separatists in the Donbas.

So, what parallels, very quickly, do you see between that time and currently what we are seeing with the Russian buildup on the Ukrainian border?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for that question. I think it is an extremely important question.

And very briefly, in 2014, the Russians tried to pretend it wasn't Russian forces invading Crimea or infiltrating or operating in the Donbas. They sought a form of implausible deniability in order to invade Ukraine.

The difference is, right now, that facade of covert and covert operation has been pulled away and what we are seeing is direct threats and a direct amassing of Russian forces.

Senator Blackburn: Now, let me ask you this, following on with that, when you look at Russian leadership and Russian society, what parallels are you seeing between then and now?

Because, to us, it looks as if they are following much of the same pattern.
Ms. Wallander: Senator, I agree with you, and it is very concerning, because the Kremlin used its operations and its falsehoods about Ukraine to ramp up Russian domestic anger at Ukraine, at the United States, and NATO. And we are exactly seeing the same kind of efforts and operations to create that kind of false narrative that Russia is defending itself against American and NATO influence in Ukraine, when what Russia is doing is assaulting Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Senator Blackburn: Well, I agree with you that what Putin is trying to do is to test that resolve with NATO and with the U.S.

So, do you support a continued, robust EUCOM exercise schedule to really support our allies and deter this aggression?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I do. A robust exercise calendar not only enhances interoperability and capabilities, and that is important for deterrence and defense, but it signals that --

Senator Blackburn: But what about increasing our lethal assistance, our cyber, our intel support, where are you there?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I believe that the heightened Russian threat and its willingness to deploy those forces and to saber-rattle requires a re-evaluation of Ukraine's
defense and military needs. And if confirmed, I would focus
on that and take appropriate lessons.

Senator Blackburn: All right. And the EFPs, I had the
opportunity to visit some of our Tennessee troops that were
there on an EFP mission in Poland.

And so, where, as the NSC Director for Russia at the
time, did you support the EFPs? Do you believe they should
be supported today? Should we continue this participation?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I do support that framework
for enhancing American presence and contributions to the
security and operations of our partners and allies,
especially our allies in the instance that you cite in
Poland.

Senator Blackburn: Well, if Russia invades Ukraine,
should we establish more of the EFP battle groups and push
further south?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I agree with you that if
Russia further invades Ukraine, we need to reevaluate NATO
posture, including U.S. contributions to NATO posture, and I
would look at exactly the issues that you highlighted in
your question, because I think they are key.

And in principle, I would support an increased
American, at least rotational presence in the region.

Senator Blackburn: Okay. I am going to run out of
time, but I did want to ask you about the parallels that you
see between Russian and Chinese interests in Ukraine, if you could speak to that.

Ms. Wallander: Well, I believe, Senator, that Russia and China share a priority goal of undermining the U.S.-led network of norms and rules that govern global security and ensure the security of so many countries.

And so, while China may not have a direct stake in Russia's aggression against Ukraine, I believe China watches carefully when the United States and the international community do not stand up to the principles of the U.N. charter and do not defend the rights of countries to choose their own futures, including their alliances.

Senator Blackburn: I will submit some questions to you and Dr. Plumb, dealing with nuclear presence and Nuclear Posture Review.

And thank you so much for your time today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Blackburn.

Senator Kaine, please?

Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Inhofe.

And congratulations to the nominees for your nominations; you are all highly qualified for these positions.

A couple of items, Ms. Dalton; first, congrats on being
a UVA grad. There have been reports in the last day or so about more instances of Havana Syndrome regarding American diplomats who are currently in Geneva and Paris. The syndrome was first reported in Havana. It has been reported as affecting diplomats and other U.S. governmental personnel around the globe and in the DMV in Virginia.

The Secretary of State has spoken about this. Their law enforcement agencies are involved, but I also know the DOD is involved in trying, (A), to determine causes and solutions and consequences. I think the, I would summarize the feelings of the committee members on both, the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, I sit on both, not being happy with the degree of information we have received about this or progress we have made on it in the couple of years that we have been talking about it.

And I would hope that should you be confirmed with the responsibility over both, Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs that you would be diligent in working with the interagency process to determine what is going on and provide options, certainly, within your line of command, but including to Congress about what appropriate responses should be.

Do I have your commitment on that?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, yes, you do.

Senator Kaine: Thank you for that.
Dr. Plumb, I want to ask you a question about, just growing pangs with the Space Force and how we can manage those growing pangs effectively.

In 2006, this Committee did a significant overhaul of much of the Department's acquisition policies and we structured new entities. There had been an Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, ATL, and we, instead, created new Under Secretaries for Research and Engineering and then Acquisition and Sustainment. And that split of the responsibilities has led to some challenges, so lessons learned, some growing pangs.

I think the Pentagon and others have tried to work through those, but when you are making a structural change of that kind, growing pangs are not unusual. The speed with which the Department established Space Force could likely lead to similar challenges.

Should you be confirmed, how will you try to ensure that this important new component of our defense, especially as we see peers engaging in activity that is threatening like the Russian anti-satellite test, how can you work to try to minimize growing pangs and maximize the quick effectiveness of this new component of our military?

Mr. Plumb: So, thank you, Senator, for that question. And I will just commend the Committee on its creation of the Space Force. I think the time is appropriate for a
separate service for space. Really, in the past several years, the importance and value of space has increased substantially and the threat to our assets in space has also increased exponentially.

I think this issue of growing pangs, you can never get rid of them, Senator, but I think helping ensure from a civilian oversight piece that the laser focuses are on both, speed of acquisition and making sure that we can counter threats as they emerge and get past this problem of -- this is a non-trivial thing to say -- the speed of the Pentagon and the speed of the Pentagon processes does not match the speed of the threat right now, and we need to work to fix that and that is a hard problem.

As far as warfighting, it is a new domain and there are going to be some growing pangs there. It has some similarities to cyber operations, as well. It is new and it needs to mature, and my goal is to help usher that along.

Senator Kaine: Thank you, Dr. Plumb.

And then, Dr. Wallander, Senator Hirono asked you a question about AUUKUS and I share her enthusiasm for closer cooperation between the U.S., Australia, and the U.K. in the Indo-Pacific. Great allies and I think there are great things we can do together.

But I will say, I was very disappointed in the rollout of AUUKUS and the bizarre exclusion and, really, almost
humiliation of the French, who are a great security partner in the United States and are also a significant Indo-Pacific nation with a lot of equities in the Indo-Pacific.

And you are not yet confirmed and not yet, sort of, in the family on this, but I will say, I have made efforts to get to the bottom of why AUUKUS was done in such a way that alienated an ally and why couldn't it have been conceived in such a way that would have included an ally and, thereby, made it more effective. And I have yet to get a good answer from the administration about the breakdown that led to, in my view, taking a great achievement and sort of souring it right out of the gate.

So, I hope, should you be confirmed, you will, you know, be mindful of the challenges that are created and look for opportunities to work together, not just with Australia and the U.K., but to include France in efforts in the Indo-Pacific, because I think they have a lot of equity there and a lot of value to add.

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I share your concern and you have my commitment that, if confirmed, I will focus on all of our important allied relationships, especially that of France, because I agree with you about the value of that extraordinary alliance.

Senator Kaine: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Kaine.

Senator Hawley, please?

Senator Hawley: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And thanks to all the nominees for being here.

Congratulations on your nominations.

Dr. Wallander, I enjoyed our conversation yesterday.

Thanks for your time.

And let me start with you and let me start with the situation in Ukraine. You said when we spoke yesterday that you could imagine advocating sending more United States forces to Europe to reinforce NATO's eastern flank. I think you said the same today in the hearing.

My question is, wouldn't this perpetuate a sense among Europeans that they don't have to invest in their own militaries, but can rely on us in a time of exigency, as this may well soon be, in order to bail them out, for lack of a better word, in their security commitments?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for that question.

With all of our focus on what the United States would do, sometimes we don't elevate enough what we expect and need our allies to do. And as part of a package of looking at American force posture and possible reinforcements to Europe, it would absolutely have to come totally integrated with European NATO member contributions in order to ensure we have the proper and deterrence capabilities.
Senator Hawley: You can tell, I am sure, from what we talked about yesterday and from my questions this morning that I am skeptical of sending additional United States troops to Europe for these reasons, but I appreciate your answer.

Let me ask you about NATO a little bit more broadly. Given the challenges that we are facing globally, and most notably, China's efforts to dominate Asia, do you think that this is the time when it is prudent or advisable for the U.S. to allow Ukraine to join NATO?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I share your larger concern about the Chinese challenge and agree with you that we can't lose focus on that. And any NSTA decisions we have to make about European security has to be mindful to that.

I fully support NATO's open-door policy. NATO is stronger if it is the alliance of strong, democratic countries with capabilities and the democratic governance; that is the hallmark of NATO.

And if confirmed, I would support NATO's future membership, Ukraine's future membership in NATO if it meets the conditions and I would look forward to working with Ukrainian partners in order to make sure they meet those standards.

Senator Hawley: Let me ask you about the NATO allies and their spending commitments. We talked about this
yesterday on the phone.

A U.S. Ambassador to NATO, Julie Smith, sent me a letter prior to her confirmation in which she agreed that our NATO allies should spend more, I emphasize "more" than 2 percent of GDP on defense. The current Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Grady, did the same. He agreed, for the record, in response to my questions, that our NATO allies need to spend more than 2 percent on defense.

When you and I spoke yesterday, we talked about this. I asked you this question and you said that in your opinion, that our allies should be spending more than 2 percent on defense. I would just like to get you on the record on that, if I could.

In your view, can you confirm for us that you think, in your opinion, it is time for our NATO allies to move beyond the Wales Pledge and commit to increase defense spending above 2 percent.

Ms. Wallander: Yes, Senator, I do.

Senator Hawley: Thank you for that.

Let me ask you about the situation with burden-sharing, again, back with in Europe. As I mentioned just a second ago, I think one of the reasons our European allies, especially Germany, have been slow to increase their spending is that they think the United States will bail them out in difficult situations.
Would you agree that our European allies are more likely to increase their spending if the United States reduces its overall force levels in the European theater?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I believe that our European allies do key their contributions to an assessment of American contributions. I think it is an interesting idea that a reduction in American contributions would lead to an increase in European contributions. I would want to ask the intelligence community for past, sort of, evidence about the rise and fall of contributions to give you a better answer.

My instinct is that persuasion and high expectations and clear requirements are the motivator for European contributions in common defense in NATO.

Senator Hawley: Just as thinking about it as a matter of incentives, Dr. Wallander, do you think that we should at least consider putting on the table, reducing our overall force posture in Europe so that our allies feel incentivized to defend themselves?

And you and I talked about this on the phone, I mean, where I am coming from on this is, that we can't, the United States of America simply can't do it all at the same time.

We are facing a very acute challenge in the Indo-Pacific theater from China. We can't maintain, in my own view, we can't do what we need to do in that theater and maintain our current posture in Europe. We are going to
have to make some hard choices somewhere, and they are hard choices, unless we are going to spend $2 trillion a year on defense, which we are not going to do and we shouldn't do.

So, with that backdrop, I mean, what is your view on putting on the table with our European allies and say, listen, we may need to consider an overall force-posture reduction in Europe in order to meet our pressing security commitments elsewhere, I mean, what do you think about that?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I believe that as they face the heightened threat from Russia, this would not be the moment to put a reduction in American commitment to NATO on the table.

But what I would favor, if confirmed, is looking at how the United States can provide some of its advantages in enablers, in weapons system, in security cooperation with allies to ensure that we are properly resourcing the requirements in the Indo-Pacific, as you rightly point to, and yet sustaining defense and deterrence against Russia.

Senator Hawley: Thank you very much.

I will have some questions for the record for the rest of you. Thanks again.

Thank you, Dr. Wallander.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Hawley.

Let me now recognize, via Webex, Senator King.
Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Wallander, you heard earlier in this hearing, Dr. Plumb testified that he thought that the adoption of a no-first-use policy in the current Nuclear Posture Review would not be in the national security interest of the United States.

Do you agree with that conclusion?

Ms. Wallander: Yes, I do, Senator.

Senator King: Second question. How would the allies react to the adoption of a no-first-use policy, particularly, Japan, and some of the Asia-Pacific allies?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for the important question. That is a fundamental reason why I do not support a no-first-use declaratory policy because I believe it would create concerns about the credibility of American defense commitments to our allies, in addition to possibly undermining the credibility in the eyes of our adversaries.

Senator King: And it could provoke some of those countries to develop their own nuclear weapons, which is going in exactly the opposite direction that we want in terms of nonproliferation; isn't that correct?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, yes, I agree; that is another reason.

Senator King: Second question on Ukraine. It seems to me that everybody is trying to guess what is in Vladimir
Putin's mind, but by making these very public high-level demands about membership in NATO and all the other things, he is setting up these negotiations to fail and leaving himself very little option, other than, either a humiliating retreat or invasion.

What do you make of this unusual negotiating strategy, where you make demands that you know aren't going to be met, and this is just a pretext for an invasion?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I share your analytical assessment of the possible courses of action and the reasons for the demands that Russia has made publicly, and it concerns me greatly for Ukraine's security and, indeed, for European and Euro-Atlantic security.

Senator King: Let me turn to Ms. Dalton for a question. Ms. Dalton, this question is under attack and two people a day in my home state of Maine are dying. The attack is transnational drug shipments coming into this country that are literally killing Americans at a record rate over the last couple of years. It is an absolute tragedy.

Every year we have testimony [Audio malfunction.] We know of shipments coming by sea to North America from Latin America, but because of limitations on our capacity to react, we can only interdict 25 percent of the shipments we know about. And it strikes me that this is one these things
where it is falling in the cracks between the Coast Guard
and the Navy.

Would you commit to me to really take a serious look at
the allocation of resources so that we can do something
about this, what I consider an outrageous failure of the
United States Government, to interdict shipments of drugs
into this country that we know about?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting this
challenge. And it is why I think it was really important
that President Biden's Interim National Security Strategic
Guidance highlighted the threat of transnational criminal
organizations both, to U.S. national security interests, as
well as to allies and partners in our greater hemispheric
region, which is why, if confirmed, I would look forward to
working closely with the Department of Homeland Security,
Department of Justice, and other interagency counterparts to
address this challenge.

I do believe that it is primarily a law enforcement
function to address this challenge, but I do believe that
there is an important role for the Department of Defense to
play in support of those operations.

Senator King: Well, if these were invaders headed for
our borders to kill people, we wouldn't view it as a law
enforcement function; we would view it as an invasion, as an
attack. And people are dying as a result of this.
So, I hope you rethink -- you mentioned law enforcement. Somewhere, we have got to find the ships to stop these shipments. And to say it is law enforcement and, you know, the Coast Guard doesn't have enough ships, that is not a satisfactory answer. As long as I keep having this testimony that we are only able to interdict 25 percent of the shipments that we know about, I am not going to be satisfied, and I hope you will rethink your answer and there will be an interagency discussion about an adequate response to this.

Dr. Plumb, just in a few seconds left, I am very worried that we are behind the curve on hypersonics. We are way behind the curve on hypersonics.

Do you agree that this should be an urgent matter both, in terms of the development of an offensive deterrent capacity, but also a defensive capacity, because I don't think any of our Missile Defense systems can cope with a 7,000-mile-an-hour maneuverable missile.

Mr. Plumb: Senator, thanks for that question.

I agree, we are challenged by hypersonics defensively and from an offensive standpoint, at least from public reporting, it certainly appears that we are behind and need to focus on this challenge.

Senator King: Well, I hope this is a "hair on fire" challenge about guarding our space.
Dr. Plumb, I really appreciate your answer.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator King.

Now, let me recognize, via Webex, Senator Manchin, please.

Senator Manchin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; I appreciate it very much.

Dr. Wallander, do you foresee any positive or negative impacts to our relations with the new German Government in the event of sanctions imposed on companies involved with the planning and construction of the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for the question. My understanding of the composition of the new German Government is that there is a renewed skepticism of Russia and its role in Europe and of, in particular, Russia's use of energy as a coercive tool against Europe and Russia's other neighbors.

And if confirmed, I intend to fully explore the possibility, the opportunity for a closer alignment of U.S. assessment of Russia's use of energy and, in particular, as a tool of coercion for our national security policy.

Senator Manchin: Do you believe or have any knowledge that the German, the new German Government would honor its pledge to halt the Nord Stream 2 certification in event of a Russian invasion of Ukraine?
Ms. Wallander: Senator, I think we should take the German Government at its word and hold it to its commitments.

And if confirmed, that would be, I believe, one of my supporting roles in a whole-of-Government, diplomatic approach to our allies in coping with this crisis that Russia has created.

Senator Manchin: Thank you.

Dr. Plumb, since the institution of the Space Force, I have been concerned that we are going to leave our Space National Guard forces behind as we are standing up this new force and West Virginia has a very active National Guard that we are very proud of.

Are you supportive of a Space National Guard?

Mr. Plumb: Senator, thanks for that we.

I, myself, have been in the Reserves for 20 years and I am both, proud of and fully aware of the capabilities that Reserve and Guard functions can bring. I know that the Guard issue is before the Congress. My own personal view is there is value in Guard and Reserve support for the Space Policy.

Senator Manchin: How do you believe, sir that we could keep that, the continuing to expand capabilities in space and also keep equity between the active and the Reserve component resources, and we are not seeing much movement on
that, and that is what we are concerned about.

Mr. Plumb: Senator, I would need to, if confirmed, I would like to look into this issue.

I do have friends that are in the Air National Guard that do Space Force missions, so I do know that those units exist. As far as the resource and balance, I would be happy to work with the Committee and you to look into that for you.

Senator Manchin: Dr. Wallander, back to you, again.

I have long had concerns, I oppose the JCPOA, known as the Iran Deal. And I opposed that because I thought that any country that we are submitting back in should earn the rewards, other than, basically, and making them demonstrate their goodwill before we give it to them on the front end.

So, my question would be, do you believe that, generally, we should relax sanctions on Iran in the future before they demonstrate if we are back in negotiations again?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I am not fully briefed on the details of the negotiations, but to answer your question, I believe that the importance of those kinds of negotiations and agreements or if the parties meet the letter, strictly speaking, of the agreement, so I would not be in favor of relief on sanctions without full compliance of the terms of the agreement.
Senator Manchin: Okay. And Dr. Plumb, I think you might have talked about this earlier, but the Russians and Chinese have a need in demonstrating their capability of their anti-satellite weapons. And given our military reliance upon satellites for navigation, communication, this capability can severely weaken, I believe, very, very much so, our military's ability to respond effectively in the opening hours of a conflict.

So, how prepared do you assess that we are to protect against these threats so that we won't be immobile?

Mr. Plumb: Thanks, Senator.

The anti-satellite, kinetic, debris-cloud-causing tests both, to China and Russia, are deeply disturbing and a concern to me. I don't have the advantage of the classified briefings on our ability to fight through a threat today.

What I will commit to you is that, if confirmed, I will work to make sure that our architecture is more resilient so that this type of attack is less attractive to an adversary.

Senator Manchin: Do you have any opinions on, basically, what the Department of Defense could do to defend against China, if they demonstrate their anti-satellite capabilities?

Mr. Plumb: Senator, there are a number of possibilities; obviously, one possibility that I fully agree with, Deputy Secretary of Defense Hicks said at the first
National Space Council meeting for the Biden administration, that the Department of Defense is in favor of banning kinetic, anti-satellite tests by all nations, so I think that would help.

I also think that making sure that we have constellations that are resilient so that we are not entirely dependent on one particular asset, would also be helpful. And I imagine there are any number of other operations at classified levels that I would be happy to discuss with you, if confirmed.

Senator Manchin: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

And thanks to all of you, I appreciate your service to our country.

Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Manchin.

Now, let me recognize, via Webex, Senator Peters.

Senator Peters: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is good to be here at the Committee, and congratulations to each of the folks that are here testifying.

Dr. Wallander, you are assuming this position in the midst of an incredibly tense situation in Eastern Europe and I would kind of like to get your sense on how you believe our European allies will respond to any kinetic actions by Russia. You know, certainly, Europe is in the midst of a cold winter and reliance on Russian Energy Resources make
some European nations vulnerable to Putin's aggression. So, my question for you is, what role will access to Russian energy play in determinations by key European allies, such as Germany, France, and Italy, and others on whether or not to directly or vigorously defend Ukrainian sovereignty?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for that question. I think it is a very important one and it points to the vulnerability created by depending on Russian energy supplies, because Russia has proven itself to be very willing to use cutoffs of supplies or cutbacks in supplies, which it is currently doing, in order to send coercive messages.

That said, I have great confidence that our European allies are confronting the scope and seriousness of Russian aspirations, aggressive aspirations against Ukraine and Ukraine and European and, therefore, global security. And, if confirmed, I will press hard with them to face the reality that dependence on Russian energy is a vulnerability that needs to be mitigated so that all NATO members are able to stand up effectively for our common defense and deterrence.

Senator Peters: Very good.

Ms. Dalton, over the last few years, I have had the opportunity to learn more about how the Department of
Defense plans to performing counter, unmanned aircraft system operations, including a visit that I had to the Proving Ground in Yuma, Arizona, to witness some demonstrations of new technology that is coming onboard.

This is an area of great concern to me, as Chairman of Homeland Security Committee, and working with the Department of Homeland Security and other assets, such as the Border Patrol, the Coast Guard, and other parts of Homeland Security that is facing this threat, and would need to work, in my mind, in a cooperative way with the Department of Defense to fully utilize such technologies and protect us here at home.

My question to you is, how can the Department of Defense best position itself to assist the federal partners, such as the Department of Homeland Security, to combat this very real UAS threat?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for your leadership on this important issue. I do believe that it is a growing challenge, here in the homelands.

And if confirmed, I do believe that there is an opportunity for some best practices and information-sharing, because the Department is, frankly, facing some of these similar challenges abroad from counter UAS threats from both, state and non-state actors. So, I think it is an important opportunity to share lessons and best practices
and tool sets; obviously, a different context here at home, but I would look forward to working on that together.

Senator Peters: Thank you.

And Dr. Plumb, last year, a study commissioned by the U.S. Space Force, the Defense Innovation Unit, and the Air Force Research Laboratory found that the U.S. is, and I am going to quote them, is, quote, woefully inadequate to compete for global market share because China has cornered and dominated the global space market, end of quote.

Now, that report goes on to say and, quote, again, the United States must develop new market enhancing tools to increase U.S. commercial space activities, grow viable U.S. space companies, and finance their growth, end of quote.

The Department of Defense would obviously play a vital role in developing these tools. And my question for you is, if confirmed, what tools would you advise the Secretary of Defense to create to promote a much more dynamic, domestic space marketplace?

Mr. Plumb: Thank you, Senator, for that question.

I think that the growth of the commercial sector for space in the United States is actually a driving economic engine for the U.S. and the Department of Defense should be part of ensuring that that continues. I do think the Department has a problem when it comes to recognizing and then adopting into their programs, innovative new technology
from small businesses, in particular. I am aware of a few efforts underway inside the Space Force to fix that and I look forward to the opportunity to try to enhance that and bring it along, if confirmed.

    Senator Peters: Well, we would hope then we would look forward to working with you on that very important mission.

    Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

    Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Peters.

    Senator Tillis, please?

    Senator Tillis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

    Congratulations to all of you on your nominations. And I hope, time provided, I get to ask you all questions, but I have to start where we left off yesterday.

    Dr. Wallander, thank you so much for your time. I thought it was a very productive discussion. I intend to support all of your nominations, unless you mess up here, but I don't think that is going to happen.

    Dr. Wallander, I want to go back to Russia and the discussion that we had yesterday. With their current posture and their focus on Ukraine. I am particularly interested with the negotiations, which, to me, seem that they have drawn up an untenable position for us to move towards. But there is some discussion right now that maybe we should think about our activities, maybe our operations' tempo, in terms of work we are doing with some of our NATO
partners and allies in that area.

Do you think that that is productive to say that we would actually, potentially reduce the current levels of activity or why should that be on the table as a discussion for negotiation?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I share your concern about the messaging surrounding that reporting. I would highlight that were Russia to cease its dangerous, destabilizing, and problematic activities and exercises that, you know, right now we are looking at the headlines, but this is a constant problem of Russian activities in the Black Sea, the Baltic region, and now the focus on Ukraine's borders. That would be a desirable end state. If a negotiation were focused on Russia coming back into compliance with its already existing commitments under the conventional forces in Europe agreement, that could be a positive for European security and Ukraine.

But I share your concern that starting from now, kind of seeds what Russia, the dangerous activities that Russia has already been engaged with, and I wouldn't support starting from that base.

Senator Tillis: We also talked a little bit about Nord Stream. We are going to have a vote later on sanctions. We have a couple of proposals here. One is that sanctions would be imposed once, if Russia invades Ukraine. The other
one is to go ahead and put them in place now.

What are the merits of either of those two proposals or concerns that you would have where them?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I first want to make clear that I fully support the availability of really serious sanctions in a toolkit for dealing with Russia --

Senator Tillis: Do you think they work?

Ms. Wallander: -- in the course of abilities.

Senator Tillis: There are some people here who think that they don't work.

So, I mean, go ahead and continue with your answer with that --

Ms. Wallander: So, it is a complicated question: what do they work to achieve?

And they don't, always. I think skepticism is well-merited and behave to be modest in our understanding. And that is why I would emphasize sanctions as part of a toolkit. Sanctions, also, can be used to reduce Russian capabilities to be able to coerce and deploy coercive and aggressive threats against neighbors and allies.

So, I am not fully read into the various proposals in which the sequencing of them, but as a matter of policy, I support the judiciousness of sanctions both, for ongoing erosion of Russian capabilities and leverage, and as a deterrent, an element of an effective deterrent.
Senator Tillis: And I am not sure if you can answer this, but just based on public reports from experts, do you believe that if Ukraine decided to, or if Russia decided to invade Ukraine, that their objectives would be swift and decisive?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I have a long career of studying the Soviet and then the Russian military and it is my assessment that the Ukrainians would fight admirably and well and be quite effective in imposing enormous costs on Russian military forces. But the signals we are hearing from the Kremlin suggest exactly what you point to, which is a potential for a decisive and swift military strike, and it is very concerning.

Senator Tillis: Thank you.

Dr. Plumb, I am going to submit some questions for the record, but in my capacity as Ranking Member on Personnel Subcommittee, I look forward to working on things that we can do to fill the gap.

You are going to have a, we have a resource problem in terms of being able to compete with the private sector on the best and brightest for cyberthreats. So, I look forward to working with everyone in DOD that is focused on the issue.

And, Ms. Dalton, I am just going to submit a couple of questions for the record on, particularly, China and Latin
America. I just got off of a conference call with a
business here that is trying to focus on rare earth mineral
extractions and a number of other things. There is a
disturbing trend in South America and Latin America with
Chinese investment threatening, actually even making what
were already fragile supply chains more fragile, but I will
submit those for the record.

I look forward to supporting all of your nominations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Tillis.

Let me recognize Senator Rosen, please.

Senator Rosen: There we go. Thank you.

Thank you, Chairman Reed. Thank you for holding this
important hearing.

And I want to thank the nominees for being here today,
your willingness to serve.

So, we will just get right into it about cybersecurity,
of course, our utmost, top of everybody's mind, and I would
like to focus particularly on NATO and cybersecurity, an
issue I raised with Admiral Graved during his confirmation
hearing, and one that came up consistently when I had a
chance to visit NATO headquarters on a congressional
delegation in November.

So, Dr. Wallander, as you know, cybersecurity is part
of NATO's core task of collective defense. Given rising
threats of cyberattacks, of course, we know from Russia and China, NATO's efforts to protect allied networks and enhance resilience across the alliance through information-sharing and joint exercises, of course, has become more critical than ever.

So, again, Dr. Wallander, if confirmed, how would the Department of Defense collaborate with our NATO allies to prevent, mitigate, and recover from cyberattacks targeting our critical infrastructure, our energy grids, our water grids, our pipelines?

We know that we have seen cyberattacks in the past. What would you be doing to collaborate with NATO, please?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, thank you for your question highlighting this important aspect of NATO common defense and the challenge to NATO security.

Many of our NATO allies were in the forefront and recognizing Russia's use of a cyber domain for assault, and so the partnership with those allies has proven very helpful in the last couple of years as Russia has upped its activities in this domain.

If confirmed, I would work with Dr. Plumb's office, if confirmed, to make sure that we have both, the functional and regional expertise to effectively engage with NATO allies in order to make sure that we coordinate, not just government resources, but one of the challenges that you
know is that much of the cyber infrastructure is private, is commercial.

And Europe faces that challenge, just as the United States does, so I think our best common practices are not just from the Defense Department, but also it would require a whole-of-government approach and coordination with the Department of Homeland Security.

Senator Rosen: Yeah, I couldn't agree more. I sit on the Homeland Security Committee. We just had a hearing just recently with CISSA talking about how we would, how they are planning to try to take care of some of these issues. So, I hope you continue to work with them.

But I would like to move on, Dr. Wallander, to issues about Iranian aggression, because they are still out there.

And I have noted in previous hearings, Iranian-backed militias, while they are increasingly targeting U.S. installations and servicemembers in both, Iraq and Syria, via rocket and drone attacks.

Iran, we don't have to, I can't say this enough, it is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. It continues to be a threat to the United States and allied interests, via its ballistic missile program and support for Hezbollah and other terrorist proxies.

So, can you discuss the threat of Iranian-backed militias in the Middle East, the threat they pose to our
U.S. troops and allies, and if confirmed, how would you use your existing DOD authorities to target these malign groups and proactively protect our personnel?

Ms. Wallander: Senator, I very much share your concern, and a lot of our focus in public tends to be on Iran's nuclear weapons program and that is, you know, concerning, but we can't lose sight of the fact that Iran is actively supporting groups that strike at American personnel installations and capabilities in the region and undermine our ability to responsibly implement counterterrorism missions in the region.

If confirmed, I will focus on the partner relations in the region to work with them, to make sure that we are doing everything necessary to counter Iran's activities, and to undermine them, but also to do an evaluation within DOD to make sure that we are properly resourced and postured. And I would cooperate with some of the other offices, in particular, those involving Special Operations, the functional offices, and the Department of Defense.

Senator Rosen: Thank you.

I would like to move on to you, Ms. Dalton, about the DOD cyber strategy. I understand, if confirmed, you will serve as the Chief Civilian Supervisor to the Secretary of Defense on cybersecurity.

And so, given the large number of federal agencies
responsible for protecting the homeland from cyberthreats, what would you define is the Department of Defense's appropriate role in addressing our nation's cybersecurity, and, separately, if confirmed, how would you strengthen that interagency collaboration to ensure coordinated approach is going forward?

Ms. Dalton: Senator, thank you for highlighting the critical challenge of cybersecurity and the Department's role. The Department is the sector risk and management agency for the Defense Industrial Base.

And so, if confirmed, I would look forward to stewarding those authorities, those responsibilities in close coordination with the Department of Homeland Security, the intelligence community, U.S. Cyber Command, and other components to protect our critical infrastructure.

Our relationships with the private sector, critical supply chains, all of these are, unfortunately, experiencing threats and so ensuring we have the requisite protections and resilience going forward will be a priority of mine.

Senator Rosen: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Rosen.

Senator Kelly, please?

Senator Kelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, everybody, for participating here today.
Dr. Plumb, I want to talk to you a little bit more about the anti-satellite missile tests that have been conducted by the Chinese and the Russians. The test in 2007, you were asked about it earlier. That kinetic kill vehicle put a debris field from about a hundred miles, you know, probably all the way up to a couple thousand miles.

On one of my space shuttle flights, I had to maneuver out of the way of some of that debris and that was well over a decade ago. And just this past November, the space station had to move out of the way of that debris field. And this is going to become a continuing, you know, problem; thousands, I think, 2,000 pieces of debris.

The Russians launched a test themselves, but I want to focus a little bit on the Chinese capability. So, DOD had a report that detailed China's emerging counter-space capabilities, including satellite jammers, directed-energy weapons, and these ground-based anti-satellite missiles, like we saw in 2007 with the test.

So, what is your current assessment of China's emerging counter-space capabilities, and, if confirmed, how is your office going to address this emerging threat?

Mr. Plumb: Thank you for that question, Senator.

And I will just say, I think you are spot-on; the Chinese threat to our space assets is growing and it is troubling, and it is in many different vectors. And I think
being able to counter that, there is no one solution.

I think one of the advantages of integrating the different policy offices that are functional under this ASD-ship, if confirmed, would be the ability to more tightly interweave cyber operations and counter-space operations, for example.

I would say the Chinese threat is possibly, in order to successfully prevail in a campaign in a warfare campaign, we need to have a resilient architecture that can handle some of those attacks, because some of those attacks are sure to come. I think calling out kinetic, destructive tests, in particular, because those impose a long-term, enduring problem to all spacefaring nations, including astronauts, would be helpful, as well.

And I think that there are, in the spectrum of warfare, we need to be ready for kinetic attacks against these assets, as well. We can't, it is a cross-domain problem, I guess, is what I am trying to say. If we just think about space versus space, it doesn't deal with the ground problem in a way that is sufficient in my opinion.

Senator Kelly: Yeah, it is, in any conflict with a near-peer adversary, it is clearly the high ground. And we know the importance of being able to maintain the high ground and this is a place that we need to be present and capable and continue to innovate.
So, thank you, I look forward to working with you after your confirmation.

I want to just transition on a totally different subject to Ms. Dalton for a second. As you may know, being from Arizona, I represent over 370 miles of U.S.-Mexico border and, in fact, I think I am the only member of this Committee that is in a Southwest Border state. I have repeatedly called on the administration to better resource DHS and the National Guard's border mission to address the crisis at the border, and it is a crisis.

We currently have over 2,400 National Guard troops deployed to the U.S.-Mexico border by the Department of Defense and another 1,300 by governors, including the Arizona governor. But this isn't enough; clearly, it is not.

I mean, I have spent time at the border. I continue to hear from law enforcement, especially sheriffs, but also mayors in border communities, and my constituents on this issue. And the challenges should not fall on local communities; it is a crisis and it is hard for them to manage.

The National Guard play a critical security role here, well, in a lot of ways, right: responding to national disasters, helping communities tackle COVID, supporting security at our border. It is imperative that we give them
the tools that they need to do this work. The National
Guard needs to have those tools.

So, Ms. Dalton, do I have your commitment, and I think
this is an easy question, do I have your commitment to work
with us to ensure that those troops are well-resourced as
they conduct these missions at the U.S.-Mexico border?

Ms. Dalton: Yes, Senator, you do.

And if confirmed, I would look forward to visiting
Arizona and the Southwest Border to better understand the
challenge. Thank you.

Senator Kelly: Thank you.

And Ms. Wallander, I have, I am going to submit the
question for the record. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Kelly.

And I want to thank the witnesses for their very
thoughtful testimony today and also for their willingness to
serve, as they served before.

With that, let me adjourn this hearing. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 11:36 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]