

**Advance Policy Questions for General Robert B. Abrams, USA**  
**Nominee to be Commander, United Nations Command,**  
**Commander, Republic of Korea-United States Combined Forces Command,**  
**and Commander, United States Forces Korea**

**Defense Reforms**

**The Senate Armed Services Committee has initiated an intensive review of the organization of the Department of Defense—both military and civilian, including the elements created by the Goldwater Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, in order to enhance the effectiveness of the Department of Defense to execute the National Military Strategy in the 21st Century.**

**Based on your experiences as a senior officer, what challenges have you observed with the current organizational structure, with particular focus on warfighting capabilities, and what modifications, if any, do you think are necessary to the current organizational structure including any Goldwater Nichols Act provisions?**

In my experience, the professional military education and acquisition certification requirements have been effective in establishing a common understanding of joint operations and military acquisition. From that baseline, we should continue looking ahead to future joint education needs and to what constitutes joint credit. Many operations happen today in a joint and multinational context, while others in interagency and intergovernmental contexts. Consequently, the experiences and exposures of today's military professionals far exceed what was originally contemplated, and that progress is good. However, current restrictions on what comprises official qualification disregard large portions of the experience. This is worth reviewing to ensure we are developing the right kinds of leaders for the future.

**In your view, what modifications to the Unified Command Plan, if any, would enhance the warfighting effectiveness of the Department of Defense?**

The Unified Command Plan has served us well and placed the United States in a unique position of being able to simultaneously control military operations around the globe. Recent changes in the Unified Command Plan include the elevation of U.S. Cyber Command as a Combatant Command and minor, necessary changes to the geographic boundaries of extant Combatant Commands. This type of revision – keeping our plan adjusted to global realities based on changing relationships with countries and within sub-regions – is prudent. Such adjustments should be viewed as not only streamlining or reorganizing, but also as a statement of future interest. Accordingly, a thoughtful review and an equally thoughtful strategic narrative should accompany one another.

## **Duties and Qualifications**

### **What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, and what is your understanding of how these different command responsibilities interrelate?**

United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, and United States Forces Korea provide mutual support to each other and require constant and close interaction, but they are distinct organizations with different missions, reporting chains, and authorities. Traditionally, these three commands' missions and staffs have been intertwined. I am aware of the efforts undertaken over the last two years to separate both the tasks and the staffs of these three commands.

Below the Commander, the vast majority of each command's staff is now responsible for work in only one command. As of July 2018, for the first time, the Deputy Commanders for United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, and United States Forces Korea are separate General Officers.

United States Forces Korea is the living proof of the U.S. commitment to Korea. It trains and supports U.S. service members in Korea, as America's contribution to the U.S.-South Korea Mutual Defense Treaty of 1953. The United States Forces Korea Commander operates under the authority granted under Title 10, Unified Command Plan, and INDOPACOM Instruction 0530.1 and is responsible to administer the U.S.-Republic of Korea Defense Treaty; to conduct reception, staging, on-ward movement, and integration of U.S. forces (as necessary during Armistice and war); to conduct Non-Combatant Evacuation Operations if necessary; and to coordinate all U.S. military support to the Republic of Korea.

Combined Forces Command is the heart of the Korea-U.S. Alliance. This is the bilateral warfighting command that has been in place since 1978 to defend South Korea and deter North Korea. The Combined Forces Command Commander operates under the authority specified in the Republic of Korea-U.S. Bilateral Terms of Reference and Strategic Directive #2 and is responsible to lead the deterrence of aggression, the combined defense of the Republic of Korea, and, if necessary, operations to militarily defeat the Democratic People's Republic of Korea during war.

United Nations Command is the home of international commitments to peace and security on the Korean Peninsula. It implements United Nations Security Council Resolution 84 by maintaining the 1953 Armistice Agreement and serving as a platform for international contributions to Korea's defense in conflict. The United Nations Command Commander operates under the authority derived from the Terms of Reference from the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and is responsible for enforcing the Armistice Agreement, leading multinational force support to and participation in operations during Armistice and war, and providing on-going international legitimacy to Armistice-associated activities and presence.

Not one of the three commands can be successful in the overall mission of advancing security on the Korean Peninsula without the other two. But, increasingly, each of the three commands is focused on delivering its unique contribution to the overall mission.

**What background and experience, including joint duty assignments, do you possess that you believe qualifies you to perform these duties?**

My career has included varied assignments in a number of operational theaters and in multiple joint commands. During 36 years of service I have commanded at multiple levels, from Company to Division, in combat and stability operations abroad. This includes a yearlong command of a 14,000 member Combined and Joint Command, with 10 partner-nations comprising the force. During this time, I had routine, side-by-side interaction with a U.S. Ambassador serving as the Department of State Senior Civilian Representative, together integrating the work of several interagency partners in order to achieve campaign objectives. I have extensive joint experience, having served on the Joint Staff and as the Senior Military Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for two years. While serving as the Senior Military Assistant, I had the privilege to witness policy making at the strategic level on a daily basis. In that role, I solidified my appreciation for strategic decision-making within the Executive Branch. I also learned, firsthand, the importance of communications between the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Members of Congress. I travelled extensively with the Secretary and assisted him with engagements in over 50 countries and during numerous bi-lateral and multi-lateral forums, gaining a deep appreciation for the close coordination required between the Country Team and both uniformed and civilian leadership of the Department of Defense. I gained an intimate knowledge of the Office of the Secretary of Defense staff and worked every day with all the Under Secretaries of Defense and their staffs, as well as Service Secretaries and Service Chiefs. I also worked closely with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and each of the Combatant Commanders. Most recently, for the past three years, I have had the privilege of serving as the Commanding General of U.S. Army Forces Command – the largest command in our Army – and focused on delivering ready and lethal forces to our Combatant Commanders. My career has afforded me many opportunities to train, lead, and fight alongside allies and partners around the world. For over 36 years I have executed national policy and been witness to its formation. I serve with the confidence that I can offer my best military advice, informed by over three decades of service in the most challenging environments.

**Do you believe that there are any steps that you need to take to enhance your expertise to perform the duties of the Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea**

Yes. In preparation for this confirmation hearing I have been consulting with others with more experience and deeper regional perspectives to enhance my capacity to perform the duties required. If confirmed, I am committed to furthering this type of consultation. I look forward to the opportunity to learn more about the nuances of the situation in Korea so that I may best provide sound military advice and options.

**Relationships**

**Section 162(b) of title 10, United States Code, provides that the chain of command runs from the President to the Secretary of Defense and from the Secretary of Defense to the commanders of the combatant commands. Other sections of law and traditional**

**practice, however, establish important relationships outside the chain of command. Please describe your understanding of the relationship of the Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea with the following officials:**

### **The Secretary of Defense**

The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, performs his United States Forces Korea duties under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, both in Armistice and, if necessary, at war. During Armistice, the Commander reports to the Secretary of Defense through his chain of command as a sub-unified commander under the Commander, U.S. INDOPACOM. During war, the commander reports directly to the Secretary as the wartime commander operating within the Korean Theater of Operations.

The Commander performs his Combined Forces Command duties under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense and in close coordination with the South Korean Minister of National Defense. During Armistice, as the Senior U.S. Military Officer Assigned to Korea, the Commander represents the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the U.S. in all matters concerning U.S. interests in Alliance military affairs. During times of war and following a bilateral decision by U.S. national authority and Republic of Korea National Command Military Authority, the Combined Forces Command Commander serves as the wartime commander in the Korean Theater of Operation and is directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense.

The Commander performs his United Nations Command duties under the authority derived from the Terms of Reference from the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and under the direction and control of Secretary of Defense in both Armistice and war. The United Nations Command Commander keeps the Secretary of Defense informed on all United Nations Command activities and engagements and receives direction to ensure U.S. national interests are represented.

### **The Deputy Secretary of Defense**

The Deputy Secretary of Defense performs duties as directed by the Secretary and performs the duties of the Secretary in his absence. The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, ensures the Deputy has the information necessary to perform these duties and coordinates with the Deputy Secretary on matters delegated by the Secretary, while keeping the U.S. INDOPACOM Commander informed. I anticipate that, if confirmed, most of my interaction with the Deputy Secretary of Defense will be in the area of resourcing critical warfighting capabilities and mitigating risk.

### **The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy**

Under Secretaries are key advocates for Combatant Commanders and their requirements. The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea

regularly coordinates and exchanges information with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on strategic and policy issues involving the Korean Peninsula.

### **The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence**

The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea regularly coordinates and exchanges information with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence as needed to set and meet the Command's intelligence requirements.

### **The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff**

The Chairman functions under the authority, direction, and control of the National Command Authority. The Chairman transmits communications between the National Command Authority and United States Forces Korea through the U.S. INDOPACOM and oversees the activities of United States Forces Korea as directed by the Secretary of Defense. As the principal military advisor to the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman is a key conduit among the Combatant Commanders, the U.S. interagency, and the Service Chiefs.

Under United Nations Security Resolution 84, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the "executive agent" for military activities to restore peace and security, and so he also oversees the activities of United Nations Command.

As agreed by the United States and the Republic of Korea, the Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Republic of Korea Joint Chiefs of Staff oversees the activities of the Combined Forces Command through the Military Committee Meeting process.

The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, keeps the Chairman informed on significant issues regarding the Commander's Area of Responsibility. The Commander communicates directly with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a regular basis, while keeping Commander U.S. INDOPACOM informed.

### **The Secretaries of the Military Departments**

The Service Secretaries provide for the administration and materiel support of forces assigned to service components, both on the Korean Peninsula and in the broader INDOPACOM Theater of Operations. The Commander, United States Forces Korea, coordinates with the Secretaries through a variety of standardized, procedural channels (e.g. Global Force Management process, Integrated Priority List, Joint Emergent Operational Needs statement, and Program Objectives Memorandum) to ensure requirements to organize, train, and equip United States forces in Korea are communicated and met.

### **The Chiefs of Staff of the Services**

The successful execution of United States Forces Korea's mission responsibilities requires coordination with the Service Chiefs. The Chiefs of Staff of the Services are responsible for the organization, training, and equipping of the Services under Title 10, United States Code. Their

support is critical to meet readiness needs. As members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Service Chiefs of Staff also provide military advice to the President of the United States, the National Security Council, the Homeland Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The United States Forces Korea Commander coordinates through the U.S. INDOPACOM Commander to the Chiefs of Staff of the Services on matters related to manning, training, and equipping forces necessary to perform their roles and missions.

### **Commander, United States INDOPACOM**

The United States Forces Korea Commander, as commander of a sub-unified command of U.S. INDOPACOM, reports directly to the U.S. INDOPACOM Commander on matters directly pertaining to United States Forces Korea responsibilities and on any transition to and from crisis. The United Nations Command/Combined Forces Korea Commander keeps the U.S. INDOPACOM Commander informed of any communications with U.S. national authorities. During times of war, the Commander, United States Forces Korea is the supported Commander and will closely coordinate with the Commander, U.S. INDOPACOM on all required support as well as operations, actions, and activities which impact the INDOPACOM Theater of Operations.

The Commander, United States Forces Korea will also maintain a close and coordinating relationship with INDOPACOM Service Components concerning all matters relating to operations, logistics, and personnel impacting forces assigned to the Korean Peninsula and the INDOPACOM Theater of Operations.

### **Other Combatant Commanders**

The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, requires close relationships with the other combatant commanders. These relationships are critical to the execution of the U.S. National Military Strategy and are characterized by mutual support, frequent contact, and productive exchanges of information on key issues.

In particular, United States Forces Korea maintains close coordination and exchange of information with those Combatant Commanders exercising authority over global missions and those who have a direct supported/supporting relationship to the Korean Theater of Operations during both Armistice and times of war. These Combatant Commands are U.S. SOCOM, U.S. STRATCOM, U.S. NORTHCOM, U.S. CYBERCOM, and U.S. TRANSCOM.

The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea maintains lateral communications for the exchange of technical information, emerging doctrine, threat intelligence, and Global Force Management coordination with Geographic Combatant Commands outside of U.S. INDOPACOM.

**Additionally, please describe your understanding of the relationship of the Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea, with the following officials:**

## **The Secretary of State**

The Commander, United States Forces Korea, directly supports and coordinates with the Secretary of State anytime the Secretary is visiting the Korean Peninsula. All other times, all required support is coordinated through the U.S. Ambassador and Chief of Mission. The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea serves an enabling entity for the U.S. diplomatic mission in the Republic of Korea. In my view, it is critical to maintain unity of effort across the United States Government, achieved in part through timely and relevant exchange of information between United States Forces Korea and the Department of State.

Through this same relationship, the Commander, United Nations Command, regularly provides information to the Secretary of State and the Department of State on efforts to advance the United Nations Command mandate in United Nations Security Council Resolution 84.

## **The United States Special Representative for North Korea**

The Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea supports the United States Special Representative for North Korea to pursue U.S. national interests on the Korean Peninsula. In this effort, it is critical to maintain unity of effort across the United States Government, including direct, frequent coordination and active information-sharing.

## **The United States Ambassador to South Korea**

The U.S. Ambassador and Chief of Mission is the President's representative and the senior U.S. official in the Republic of Korea. A strong relationship between the Ambassador and the Senior U.S. Military Officer Assigned to Korea has proven critical in advancing America's diplomatic and military missions in Korea. Efforts by both United States Forces Korea and U.S. Embassy Seoul to advance U.S. interests in Korea and deepen the Alliance between the United States and South Korea are strengthened through strong partnership, persistent contact, and regular consultation between the Ambassador and the Commander.

## **Major Challenges and Problems**

### **In your view, what are the major challenges that will confront the next Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea?**

I believe that the next Commander of United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea will be faced with unique challenges that include maintaining a credible warfighting force while simultaneously supporting ongoing negotiations and the enduring work of Commander U.S. INDOPACOM. In this dynamic environment, U.S. and Alliance forces must be ready to execute a broader range of missions than ever before – providing military support to diplomacy, while also deterring North Korea and preparing to defeat it, if necessary.

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

If confirmed, I will meet challenges by creating opportunities that reinforce the enduring, central elements of success on the peninsula. First, the strength of the Republic of Korea-U.S. Alliance is proven and will remain ironclad. Combined planning and training, interoperability, and progress toward the conditions-based transfer of operational control in wartime are essential elements to the current and future strength of the Alliance. Second, the Command will focus on maintaining the credible combat power and the appropriate theater posture necessary to deter aggression, defend South Korea, and, if necessary, “Fight Tonight.” Additionally, the Command will continue to fully support the State Department-led diplomatic effort to achieve North Korea’s denuclearization. If confirmed, one of my top priorities will be conducting an assessment of the readiness of the Command and our forces, with an eye for any tension between readiness and support to our ongoing diplomatic efforts.

**United States Forces Korea Priorities**

**In your assessment, what capability and/or capacity shortfalls in the current Joint Force present the most significant challenge to executing United States Forces Korea’s operational plans?**

United States Forces Korea has made significant gains toward closing capability and capacity gaps related to operational plan execution. Of note, the Department of Defense and the Services have been instrumental in making progress in the areas of preferred munitions stocks, rotary-wing offensive capability, and network hardening. Additionally, Congress has provided significant support for resourcing the development of an integrated ballistic missile defense network. Despite these gains, challenges remain due to enduring capability gaps in Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance; Ballistic Missile Defense; Command and Control, Computers, Communications, and Information; Cyber Defense; Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction; amphibious shipping, and, if necessary, the prepositioning of wartime supplies. These capability gaps have been communicated to U.S. INDOPACOM and the Joint Staff through the normal and routine readiness reporting systems.

If confirmed, I will continue to assess the capability and capacity shortfalls of United States Forces Korea and work with U.S. INDOPACOM, the Services, and the Joint Staff to address these shortfalls through a combination of partnerships, Dynamic Force Employment, and innovative solutions.

**As diplomatic efforts continue, what military options should the United States explore to improve deterrence against North Korean aggression?**

The recent diplomatic efforts among the United States, South Korea, and North Korea, while nascent, have the potential to bring forth a positive change to the Korean Peninsula. In that regard, it is essential that our military actions support continued diplomacy. The United States, in



close coordination with South Korea and our other allies and partners in the INDOPACOM region, must continue to support our diplomatic efforts with credible military capabilities.

With regard to deterrence of North Korean aggression, I believe we must continue operations, actions, and activities along three lines of effort. First, I believe the improvements in our force posture over the last several years - including the introduction of a Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense system and more rotational units - has strengthened our deterrence and enabled diplomatic efforts and the opening for negotiations. Continuing to set the theater and improve our military posture from a position of strength requires maximizing the forward deployment of necessary forces and stocks, while simultaneously improving our footprints and ensuring all necessary agreements supporting contingency actions are appropriately planned and coordinated. Second, we should continue to improve training and readiness of those forces that would come from U.S. INDOPACOM and the continental United States during crisis, including such activities as Emergency Deployment Readiness Exercises and Dynamic Force Employment of key capabilities as outlined in the National Defense Strategy. Third, we should simultaneously explore active partnering with the Republic of Korea military, combining confidence building measures and demilitarization steps in ways that help reduce tensions with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

**In your assessment, what changes to U.S. force posture and activity in the Indo-Pacific region would improve U.S. deterrence against North Korea?**

The strategic and operational environments outlined in the National Defense Strategy clearly identify the importance of posturing a force capable of deterring potential adversaries, including North Korea. U.S. INDOPACOM has indicated an unambiguous intention to continue support to United States Forces Korea and the deterrence of North Korea through the use of a robust blunt force layer on the Korean Peninsula backed by timely and responsive surge forces.

If confirmed, I will assess the readiness and capabilities of the United States Forces Korea blunt layer, currently constituted as a mix of assigned and rotational forces, and communicate to both U.S. INDOPACOM and the Joint Staff any concerns I have over capability gaps and their impact on my ability to conduct effective deterrence operations, actions, and activities.

While United States Forces Korea already coordinates closely with United States Forces Japan and U.S. INDOPACOM, if confirmed, I will work to further strengthen those relationships, and through them, the relations between South Korea and Japan. Additionally, deterrence is improved by not only maintaining ready and capable forces across the Korean and Japanese theaters, but by continuing to set the theater. Strong, multilateral cooperation also has deterrent effects, so I will also continue to strengthen United Nations Command.

**If diplomacy should fail, what military options should the United States explore to effectuate a long-term strategy to deter North Korean aggression against the United States or our allies?**

The specific military options to be recommended in this hypothetical case will depend on the strategic and operational environment at the time. However, three efforts can position United States Forces Korea today for this possible scenario:

First, maintaining a robust deterrent will be paramount. Our most potent deterrent is not any one weapons system, but the enduring commitment of the United States and South Korea to each other. A strong Alliance is critical to deterring North Korean aggression and reassuring U.S. partners and allies in the region. The Alliance is the bedrock and foundation of security arrangements in the region and has proven key to deterring North Korean hostile action for nearly seven decades. The Combined Forces Command is a clear manifestation of the Alliance's long-term commitment to defend South Korea and ensure regional stability. If confirmed, I will continue to make as potent and ready as possible the full range of military capabilities to deter North Korean aggression.

Second, investments by the Alliance in new capabilities must continue. New systems from intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms to missile defenses are critical for the Alliance to defend against advances in North Korea's weapons and missile systems. U.S. and South Korean scientific and technological innovation can further strengthen the Alliance's advantage against North Korea.

Third, international consensus strengthens deterrence. The United Nations Command is a meaningful symbol of international solidarity, and for decades has served as the enforcer of the 1953 Armistice, the enabler of dialogue with North Korea, and the home for international contributions to security on the Korean Peninsula. If confirmed, I will continue the work of fully realizing the opportunities created by international commitment to this important command. Working closely with U.S. INDOPACOM and the Department of State, United Nations Command will continue to seek out and integrate United Nations Command Sending State contributions, and demonstrate international resolve to deter North Korean aggression.

**In your view, what are the highest priority missile defense needs of U.S. Forces Korea and Combined Forces Command?**

United States Forces Korea and Combined Forces Command faces a large inventory of missile systems capable of complex attacks and the delivery of weapons of mass destruction. The Alliance's missile defense forces must defend the ability to: project combat power, receive additional forces from beyond the Korean Peninsula, secure Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation sites in Korea and Japan, defend U.S. and South Korean forces, and protect major Korean population areas. To do so, the Alliance must have the ability to neutralize North Korean missile threats before launch, and present a layered, effective defense of upper and lower-tier anti-missile capabilities during an attack.

**What missile defense capabilities do you believe are needed in the near term to meet the operational needs of these commands, and what systems are available to provide such capabilities?**

In order to defend additional assets, the Army stands ready to quickly deploy additional Patriot battalions in a crisis. The United States must also improve our ability to integrate existing upper and lower-tier systems to optimally use our interceptor inventory. United States Forces Korea has requested this capability through the Joint Emergent Operational Need process, and anticipates delivery beginning next summer and through FY 2021.

The activation of an Army air defense brigade headquarters in Japan next month will also improve our ability to defend Non-Combatant Evacuation Operation and United Nations Command sites in Japan.

Finally, ongoing development of additional means to find and fix systems prior to launch show promise. If successful, such innovation could improve our ability to target North Korean missiles before launch.

**In addition to the deployment of Patriot, THAAD, and Aegis BMD capable ships to the Pacific, what other steps, if any, do you think are necessary to provide adequate protection for U.S., partner, and allied assets?**

United States Forces Korea made significant strides in BMD capability throughout 2018 by completing the employment of a Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense system and Patriot system modernization. Increasing interoperability with Republic of Korea systems is a key part of improving Alliance missile defense, including program upgrades to the Republic of Korea Patriot system and procurement of PAC-3 interceptors. As North Korea continues to improve its missile forces, the Republic of Korea-U.S. Alliance must also continue to expand its BMD capabilities. United States Forces Korea has requested necessary improved capabilities through the Joint Emergent Operational Need process, and we anticipate delivery of necessary and improved capabilities beginning next summer and through FY 2021. I acknowledge the Committee's continuing support in this effort and appreciate the resources received during FY17 and FY18.

The funded systems described in the JEONS significantly improve BMD capabilities, however, additional measures in the defense against cruise missiles, rockets, and mortar volleys targeting the Greater Seoul Metropolitan Area are needed.

**In your opinion, how should the U. S. employ its forces in Republic of Korea to provide for regional presence and engagement, and to best respond to regional threats, provide support for out-of-area contingencies, and maintain readiness?**

Today, the Republic of Korea-U.S. Alliance is – and should remain - squarely focused on the immediate threat from North Korea; the Alliance constantly updates its posture and plans as the security environment evolves. Given the global role of the U.S. military and, increasingly, the international reach of the South Korean military, opportunities are emerging for Alliance cooperation beyond the Korean Peninsula. United States Forces Korea forces are uniquely positioned to provide the Commander U.S. INDOPACOM a range of capabilities that creates options for supporting out-of-area contingencies and responses to regional threats. In my

opinion, United States Forces Korea should remain vigilant for the emergence of new threats and continue to play an invaluable role in Northeast Asian stability and prosperity.

## **North Korea**

**North Korea represents one of the greatest near term threats to regional security and stability. Even as intensive diplomatic efforts are underway to address North Korea's nuclear and missile programs, North Korea has taken no concrete steps towards complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization. Moreover, North Korea's conventional military forces coupled with its history of aggressive and unpredictable behavior underscore the danger of the situation.**

### **What is your assessment of the current security situation on the Korean peninsula?**

North Korea's restraint in launching missiles and conducting nuclear tests (since late 2017) has led to a noticeable reduction in tensions. Pyongyang has also recently demonstrated self-control in its inflammatory and threatening rhetoric, in stark contrast to the norm of the last seven years. Kim Jong Un has held three summits with President Moon Jae-in and one with President Trump. This all has led to a period of welcomed, if not unprecedented, détente on the Korean Peninsula. Still, weapons of mass destruction, asymmetric forces, and the sizeable conventional force capability of North Korea – that has proven to be so destabilizing over decades - remains. This is why, even as diplomacy seeks a peaceful solution to these standing tensions, credible deterrence and a strong Alliance remain as important as ever to ensure sustained peace and stability on the Peninsula in the face of a dangerous, and at times unpredictable, North Korea.

### **What is your assessment of the threat posed to South Korea, Japan, and the United States by North Korea's ballistic missile and weapons of mass destruction capabilities?**

North Korea's pursuit of capabilities to hold key Alliance targets at risk goes back decades. The threats to Korea and Japan by the North's short- and medium-range missiles are real and have long been a concern. Between 2016 and 2017 the North expended great resources and effort to advance the full range of its ballistic missiles with the intent of eventually being able to target the U.S. mainland, conducting three nuclear tests to develop and demonstrate such a capability.

I take this threat very seriously and strongly support developing and deploying critical capabilities such as missile defense as we work closely with allies to defend, disrupt, and destroy North Korean missiles as early in the kill-chain as possible. If confirmed, I will continue to strengthen Alliance deterrence, as well as the defense of our close allies in Japan and South Korea.

### **What is your assessment of North Korea's conventional capabilities and readiness?**

While technologically inferior, North Korea's conventional forces remain formidable. Over recent years North Korea has improved the range and precision of certain systems that provide significantly enhanced lethality. This is a military where quantity has a quality of its own; North Korea maintains one of the world's largest conventional forces with over 1 million personnel.

Roughly 70% of its forces are deployed forward, and, coupled with increasingly lethal asymmetric capabilities, its ability to inflict significant casualties against the Alliance in the opening days of a conflict is formidable. While much of its equipment is considered obsolete by modern standards, North Korea continues to invest in improving its arsenal.

The past decade has seen improvements in North Korean armor, artillery, and anti-tank guided missile technology. A significant amount of long-range artillery is positioned to range the Greater Seoul Metropolitan Area with its population of 25 million. North Korea boasts one of the numerically largest submarine forces in the world, and it has a wide variety of air defense weapons in its arsenal. North Korea's universal conscription system requires men to serve ten years. Many of these soldiers spend their entire service in the same unit. Unlike armies with higher turnover rates, this continuity lessens the burden to constantly retrain its forces. Concurrent with these conventional force investments, Kim Jung Un has made significant investments in Special Operations Forces; he has manned, trained, and equipped a sizable Special Operations capability.

North Korea's conventional forces do have some key vulnerabilities. They face the same shortages in food, fuel, and supplies as the civilian sector likely limiting their ability to sustain conventional combat operations. Much of the military-age population is still suffering the effects of the famine years of the late 1990s. Its navy mostly consists of small, lightly armed patrol craft designed more for coastal defense than for large, offensive operations. The North Korean Air Force consists of mostly obsolete aircraft which lag far behind the standards of a modern air force. In spite of these vulnerabilities, North Korea's training and investments across the conventional, asymmetric, and weapons of mass destruction forces leave little doubt that its conventional forces are ready for war should its leadership choose.

### **What is your assessment of Kim Jong-un as a leader?**

Kim Jong Un is a dictator in a country where he retains absolute power. His people live in abject poverty, lack basic human rights, and are constantly subjected to fear and intimidation. Purges and executions are the key to ensuring a band of elites remain loyal to the Kim regime. Kim Jong-un is not irrational – there is rationality and reason within his decisions, even if they are so clearly detrimental to the livelihood and basic survival of the 24 million North Koreans not considered elite. The survival of the Kim regime is his paramount concern.

### **How stable is the current North Korean regime?**

Predictions of North Korea's collapse accelerated with the end of the Cold War. Kim Jong-un's North Korea is one of the world's few remaining dictatorial regimes from the Cold War era. There are elements of stability and elements of fragility in this regime, but the elements of stability, such as the strength of the intelligence and security services and their ability to monitor, root out, and decisively squash any potential challenges to the Kim regime, are also characteristics that history has shown eventually lead regimes toward failure.

Experts do not have a very successful record of predicting the endurance of systems like that of North Korea. Sudden transformations such as the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the Arab Spring come quickly, sometimes with little warning. That said, if confirmed, we might have to

deal with the stability question as an important factor in our planning in any number of scenarios we could potentially face. Yet, at the same time, the fundamentals of maintaining readiness, developing and advancing capabilities, and in the process ensuring deterrence are not dependent on the precise state of North Korea's internal stability.

### **North Korean Nuclear Program and Extended Deterrence**

**The North Korean regime is building nuclear weapons primarily to deter American attack and ensure regime survival. But some experts warn that the regime may also seek to use its nuclear weapons to engage in coercive diplomacy to force eventual reunification on its own terms.**

**As far as you are aware, has North Korea taken any concrete steps toward complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization since the Singapore summit?**

The Department of State is the lead for the ongoing negotiations and the outcomes of the discussions on denuclearization. As an observer, I have seen small steps at dismantlement of test facilities, but I am not aware of any concrete steps toward complete or irreversible denuclearization.

**What is your understanding of the motivations for North Korea's pursuit of nuclear weapons? And what implications do those motivations have for how the regime may seek to use its nuclear arsenal?**

Regime survival is often cited as the Kim regime's overarching motivation, which speaks more to the vulnerabilities the Kim dictatorship feels than to any actual external threats. As to scenarios in which Kim might use his weapons, although it would be very speculative, it would likely be a situation in which Kim felt his regime's existence threatened. Regardless of Kim's calculus, a strong Korea-U.S. Alliance, demonstrated resolve, and the strength of our own extended deterrent are crucial to shaping Kim's views toward the possession and potential use of these capabilities.

**The United States currently deters nuclear attack and/or nuclear coercion by Russia and China, countries with far greater nuclear capabilities than North Korea is ever likely to achieve.**

**Are there unique challenges to deterring nuclear attack and/or nuclear coercion by North Korea that make deterrence a less effective policy option for the United States?**

There are unique challenges to all countries that the U.S. would like to deter nuclear usage. Deterring nuclear usage from North Korea is best summarized as written in the 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, "There is no scenario in which the Kim regime could employ nuclear weapons and survive." If the Kim regime believes that it could coerce the U.S. or a U.S. ally or partner by using nuclear weapons, they would be mistaken. The U.S. is fully prepared to respond to nuclear threats and coercion from North Korea by using any of the U.S. nuclear capabilities. Our nuclear deterrence policy for North Korea is the most effective one possible.

**Are there additional steps that DOD could take to reassure allies and counter North Korean nuclear provocations by improving the readiness, training, and effectiveness of U.S. nuclear forces assigned to support the nuclear deterrence mission in the Pacific?**

To ensure the effectiveness of our deterrent is maintained, I believe we should continue and increase combined training and deterrence operations throughout the region. To bolster all of our combined capabilities, layered and effective integrated ballistic missile defense capabilities are also critical. With respect to improving effectiveness, the United States should continue to pursue multilateral interoperability with allies and partners in the region to maintain superiority and stay the preferred partner for security in the Pacific.

**North Korea has a history of proliferating missile and nuclear technology. The Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) is a means to interdict suspect shipments, including shipments of nuclear or missile items to and from North Korea.**

**In your view, are there additional steps that DOD could take, including with our allies and partners, to ensure that North Korea does not proliferate missile and nuclear technology to countries such as Syria, Iran, and others?**

The Department of Defense plays a supporting role in a whole-of-government approach to preventing the proliferation of missile and nuclear technology. United States Forces Korea works with South Korea on this and other major security interests. If confirmed, I will continue this cooperation across the entire spectrum of threats facing the Alliance and ensure our alliance remains ironclad and effective. I defer to the U.S. INDOPACOM, Joint Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide more thoughts on specific policy proposals.

**Would you recommend any improvements to the organization or capability of the PSI member nations to improve the ability to interdict prohibited shipments to and from North Korea?**

Countries in the region should maintain and strengthen the political will to conduct interdictions if opportunities arise. The Proliferation Security Initiative helps to do that in the region through a series of annual events called the Asia-Pacific Exercise Rotation. Japan hosted the most recent such event in July 2018, and South Korea will host Exercise EASTERN ENDEAVOR next year. Although the events are not focused specifically on North Korea, they are intended to ensure countries have the political will and whole-of-government approach that enables interdictions. More broadly, it is imperative that all countries collaborate through information sharing and aligning domestic authorities to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, related materials, or missile components. If confirmed, I will continue to work toward the international security goals that the Proliferation Security Initiative represents, and work with allies and partners to enable it.

## **Role of Other Regional Countries**

### **What is your understanding of China's policy objectives when it comes to the Korean Peninsula? How would you describe China's strategy to achieve those objectives?**

In general, my view is that China's policy in the region is to challenge the U.S. role and undermine its influence in Asia. China's strategy on the Peninsula is similar to its efforts elsewhere, where China uses all elements of national power and coercion to advance its aims. Ultimately, I believe they seek unsuccessfully to diminish and undermine the Alliance by applying pressure to the South Korean economy and seeking to undermine public support in Korea for the Alliance.

### **In your assessment, is breaking the alliance between South Korea and the United States a major policy objective for China?**

I believe China has attempted and will continue to try to weaken the Republic of Korea-U.S. Alliance and ultimately dissolve the current form of the Alliance. I believe that China will attempt this through coercion and threats to the South Korean domestic economy, government, and people using all elements of Chinese national power. However, the Korea-U.S. Alliance was forged in battle and has matured and strengthened through decades of close cooperation. American and Korean leaders have consistently stated that the two nations' commitment to mutual defense is ironclad.

### **How would you assess the current state of China-North Korea relations?**

China-North Korea relations under Kim Jong Un were quite frigid up to the beginning of 2018, with Xi Jinping having had repeated summit meetings with South Korea and no meetings with Kim Jong Un until this year. Three separate visits by Kim Jong Un to China have been accompanied by much pomp and circumstance, and certainly Beijing appears committed to trying to rebuild the relationship in part so that it can expand its influence over Pyongyang. That said, Beijing says that it remains committed to a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons. China does not support North Korea's possession of nuclear weapons, and sees North Korea's unpredictable and provocative behavior as a major destabilizing element in Northeast Asia security.

Kim, for his part, no doubt resents China's unwillingness to accept its nuclear program, Beijing's valuing of its relationship with Seoul more than that with Pyongyang, and perhaps most of all China's cooperation with the United States on pressure and sanctions. I, like many, am concerned that China's commitment to sustained pressure on North Korea may waver as diplomacy seeks to resolve the nuclear issue. This is why I believe the United States must constantly remind China of the role it must play in leading North Korea down the road of complete and verified denuclearization.



### **How would you assess the current state of China-South Korea relations?**

Both China and South Korea greatly value their economic and trade relationship, with Beijing seeing its relationship with Seoul as much more important to its interests as its cooperation with Pyongyang. China remains South Korea's top trade partner in both exports and imports. Summits and day-to-day diplomatic interactions between Beijing and Seoul far exceed engagements between Beijing and Pyongyang.

Still, China has acted aggressively toward South Korea on security issues it perceives as touching on its interests, as seen in the economic coercion toward South Korean companies in response to the deployment of the Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense system. More recently, China has repeatedly made incursions into the Korea Air Defense Identification Zone, leading to a number of South Korean demarches.

### **What are Russia's policy objectives when it comes to the Korean Peninsula? How would you describe Russia's strategy to achieve those objectives?**

Russia remains opposed to North Korea's persistent provocations and has implemented some sanctions against Pyongyang. However, as it observes international cooperation, it also adopts the opportunist role in the INDOPACOM region that it takes elsewhere in the world. Russia's actions are best described as based on self-interest and the international community must always remain alert to Russia's inclination to spoil progress being made in the region.

### **Chemical and Biological Weapons**

#### **What is your assessment of North Korea's Chemical Weapons capability and are you familiar with DOD's response to that capability?**

This question cannot be fully answered at the unclassified level.

According to the Department of Defense's report to Congress in 2017, in February 2017, North Korea likely assassinated Kim Jong Un's older half-brother Kim Jong Nam in a crowded Malaysian airport by using VX nerve agent, a Class I weapon under the Chemical Weapons Convention. This use supports the argument that North Korea has a chemical weapons stockpile from a longstanding chemical weapons program and the capability to produce nerve, blister, blood, and choking agents. North Korea likely could employ chemical weapons agents by modifying a variety of conventional munitions, including artillery and ballistic missiles. In addition, North Korean forces are prepared to operate in a contaminated environment; training regularly in chemical defense operations. North Korea is not party to the Chemical Weapons Convention. I am familiar with the Department of Defense's response to such a capability.

**What is your assessment of North Korea's Biological Weapons capability and are you familiar with DOD's response to that capability?**

This question cannot be fully answered at the unclassified level.

According to the Department of Defense's report to Congress in 2017, North Korea may consider the use of biological weapons as an option, contrary to its obligations under the Biological and Toxins Weapons Convention. Most aspects of biological weapons research are inherently dual-use and North Korea continues to develop its biological research and development capabilities that would enable a biological weapons program. Pyongyang has never declared any relevant developments and has failed to provide a Biological and Toxins Weapons Convention Confidence-Building Measure declaration since 1990.

**General Brooks has stated one of his top priorities is having the capability to remotely sense and network threats from chemical or biological weapons. Do you agree with that statement?**

Yes. The capability to conduct remote chemical and biological threat detection and cueing of command and control and early warning systems will save the lives of U.S. and Alliance service members in any conflict with North Korea. This technology should be pursued during Armistice conditions in order to fully develop a reliable, interoperable network capable of fusing available information and attaining early warning and threat detection. Such early identification will aid with optimized targeting, help limit collateral effects, and decrease potential civilian casualties.

**Addressing the threat from weapons of mass destruction will require capabilities across the entire U.S. Government.**

**Are you familiar with the magnitude of this response effort?**

The magnitude of the Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction response requires a coordinated whole-of-government effort from the United States, South Korea, and partners from United Nations Command Sending States. Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction activities and tasks would occur during all phases of a conflict with North Korea and would require detailed coordination and synchronization INDOPACOM, the Joint Staff, and the Office of Secretary of Defense. Developing Counter Weapons of Mass Destruction strategy, policies, and campaign plans that cover the scale of the North Korean weapons of mass destruction program is a complex undertaking involving many stakeholders, so it is critical to build relationships now so that the Alliance is prepared with the right capabilities in conflict.

**Are you familiar with the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program efforts to assist the government of South Korea develop capabilities to assess the threat from chemical and biological weapons and do you support this effort?**

Yes, I am familiar and supportive. The Cooperative Threat Reduction Program is prepared to assist our South Korean partners so they can be better prepared to address a wide range of chemical, biological, and nuclear threats. As the Department of Defense's most comprehensive

tool for working cooperatively with partners to detect, secure, eliminate, and prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and related materials, I think this program provides the United States with unique authorities to engage with South Korea to plan and prepare for missions that address the WMD emanating from North Korea.

### **United States - Republic of Korea (Republic of Korea) Alliance**

#### **What is your impression of the current U. S. security relationship with the Republic of Korea?**

Our current relationship is truly ironclad and as close as it has ever been. The combined staff mechanisms the Alliance has in place help ensure on-going cooperation, coordination, and interoperability. Whether it is combined strategy, plans, operations, or intelligence fusion, the standing Korea-U.S. Alliance and its Combined Forces Command are an outstanding example for the world of what two nations can accomplish together under the umbrella of a Mutual Defense Treaty.

#### **If confirmed, what measures, if any, would you take to improve the U.S.-Republic of Korea security relationship?**

If confirmed, I intend to continue the focus demonstrated by my predecessors in prioritizing the Alliance by leveraging the combination of formal and informal mechanisms already in place. Strong Korea-U.S. relations are built through regular engagement with Korean military and civilian leaders, participation in Alliance training opportunities, Military Committee Meetings, support to the Security Consultative Meetings, and the Korean Integrated Defense Dialogue.

#### **What is your assessment of Republic of Korea warfighting capability trends with regard to the modernization and capability improvements in Republic of Korea equipment and training?**

South Korea's military is focused on modernization, including through its Defense Reform 2.0, that has included this year an increase in the South Korean defense budget by 8.2% to \$42 billion, the largest increase since 2008. Particularly important investments include work to modernize South Korea's ballistic missile defense, an important contribution to the effective, layered Alliance missile defense. South Korean conventional weapons are improving, with new anti-tank munitions and artillery systems. South Korea also is fully committed to developing its cyber capabilities by improving interoperability among its cyber stakeholders and expanding information-sharing. Purchases from U.S. manufactures are also robust. In addition, Alliance and unilateral training also consistently expands the capability of the South Korean military.

#### **What is your understanding of the command relationships between U.S. and Republic of Korea forces?**

Combined Forces Command was created in 1978 through an agreement between the United States and South Korea, as the theater-level warfighting Command, with the dual mission of deterring North Korea and defending South Korea. As a bilateral warfighting command, the

Combined Forces Command receives its direction and guidance from ministerial and general officer level forums, but does not assume operational control of South Korean military forces until a state of crisis has been declared. Though it does not have operational control of South Korea forces before a conflict, the Commander, Combined Forces Command, does have the authority to prepare both South Korean and U.S. forces through planning, training, and development of combined doctrine within the Alliance to include formalized and mutually agreed crisis action procedures for transitioning from Armistice to war including the associated shifting of command and control.

In addition to the formal relationships described above, informal relationships are central to the success of the Combined Forces Command, as the “heart of the Korea-U.S. Alliance.” Within this Command, the Alliance relationships are ironclad and American commanders and staff constantly engage and interact with their Korean counterparts. This can be seen through daily meetings, regular exercises, and ongoing cooperative work that has strengthened significantly in recent years the ability of this Command to act with unity and shared purpose.

**As far as you are aware, has President Moon made a commitment to China to adhere to the so-called “three no’s” – no additional THAAD deployment, no participation in the U.S. missile defense network, and no establishment of a trilateral military cooperation with the U.S. and Japan? If so, what is your assessment of the impact of such a commitment on alliance efforts to deter and respond to North Korean aggression?**

I am not aware of any such commitment by President Moon. My assessment is that the “three no’s” is China’s characterization of meetings between the Chinese and South Korean leadership and should be interpreted in that light. United States Forces Korea assesses that South Korea maintains the following policies, all consistent with previous communications with and commitments to the United States: First, it is not seeking additional deployments of the Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense system at this time, and neither is the United States. Second, the Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense system protects Korean and American citizens as well as critical Korean and U.S. assets in the defended area, but not the U.S. homeland and there is no plan for South Korea to participate in international or regional missile defense. Third, while South Korea may not seek a military alliance with Japan, the two countries do, at times, coordinate military matters and have shown the willingness to conduct trilateral military activity with the United States when appropriate.

### **Transfer of Wartime Operational Control**

**In a recent press conference, General Brooks said, “the time is not right” to transfer operational control of forces in wartime to the Republic of Korea.**

**Do you agree with the assessment of General Brooks?**

I agree with GEN Brooks’ assessment. The Alliance has agreed to bilaterally developed conditions that must be met in order to transition operational control of forces in wartime to South Korea in a way that would preserve and improve the strength and readiness of the Alliance. The Alliance is still in the process of reaching those conditions. Until it has fully met

those conditions, which include an assessment of the security environment, the time will not be right for transition.

**Do you believe the transfer of operational control should be conditions-based? If confirmed, would you caution against setting arbitrary timelines for transfer?**

I do believe the transition of operational control of forces in wartime to a South Korea-led wartime command must be conditions-based and the Alliance must avoid setting expectations based on timelines. A conditions-based approach gives the Alliance the most flexibility from military, diplomatic, and political perspectives. Setting an arbitrary future date leaves the Alliance open to external influences that may cause the Alliance to rush to transition at the wrong time. Timelines also telegraph our intent and give opponents an advantage.

The Alliance agreed bilaterally to pursue a conditions-based approach because previous timeline-based approaches for OPCON transition lacked the flexibility to adapt to the changes in the security environment. A conditions-based approach is the best way that we can smoothly transition wartime operational control in a manner that strengthens combined capabilities as well as the overall Korea-U.S. Alliance.

**What is your understanding of the Republic of Korea's current and projected military capabilities and the ability of Republic of Korea forces to assume a greater role in the defense of their homeland including responsibility for command and control of the readiness, operations, and war fighting of their own forces in wartime?**

While Republic of Korea commanders are currently responsible and capable to lead their own forces in wartime, numerous capability gaps exist with respect to the Republic of Korea military's ability to conduct specified or implied tasks, or to lead the combined defense. The Republic of Korea military must satisfy conditions and criteria during Initial Operational Capability, Full Operational Capability, and Final Mission Capability certification events. Since certification events have not yet occurred, United States Forces Korea remains cautious about projected capability levels. The Republic of Korea military continues progress to assume a greater role in the defense of their homeland. Republic of Korea continues efforts in acquiring military capabilities necessary to meeting critical combined defense leadership roles and correcting current capability shortfalls to conduct specified and implied tasks.

**How can U.S. Forces Korea assist the Republic of Korea to develop these capabilities in the near-to-medium term?**

United States Forces Korea is postured to assist the Combined Forces Command and South Korea with the continuous development of capabilities required for operational plans and wartime command and control. As the Alliance warfighting headquarters, Combined Forces Command develops combined operational plans, and therefore has the primary responsibility for identifying combined capability requirements. These requirements inform respective South Korean and U.S. national authorities to pursue the acquisition, training, and logistics support necessary to meet those capability requirements, and it is imperative that the solutions are interoperable and effective in combined defense.

Ensuring that Alliance capabilities are interoperable is all the more challenging as those capabilities may be U.S.-origin, domestically developed in South Korea, or acquired from other nations. To this end, United States Forces Korea also works very closely with the Joint Military Affairs Group-Korea, an INDOPACOM organization serving as the primary Security Cooperation Office under the U.S. Embassy Country Team. Security cooperation activities range from the acquisition of specific weapons platforms through Foreign Military Sales, to the execution of combined training that is critical to maintaining the combat readiness of our Alliance forces. United States Forces Korea can assist South Korea with the identification of required capabilities and encourage South Korea to work with Joint Military Affairs Group-Korea and the security assistance enterprise to recommend a path to the acquisition of those capabilities, whether they be a hardware solution for a piece of equipment, or a training package for a required skillset, that improves the strength of our alliance. Once a capability has been acquired and training has been conducted, United States Forces Korea can assist with the assessment of that capability to determine its effectiveness within the Alliance.

### **Host Nation Burden-Sharing Programs**

**The United States and Republic of Korea currently operate under a “Special Measures Agreement” (SMA) in which the Republic of Korea contributes toward U.S. costs associated with maintaining U.S. forces in the country.**

#### **What is your assessment of the current level and quality of the burden-sharing arrangement?**

As part of President Moon Jae-in’s Korea Defense Reform 2.0, South Korea has shown commendable efforts to boost their defense budget by 8.2% to \$42 billion, the largest increase since 2008. South Korea provides considerable resources to support the Alliance, including but certainly not limited to its contribution towards the cost of maintaining the presence of U.S. forces in South Korea through the Special Measures Agreement.

Since 1991, the Republic of Korea has helped offset the costs of stationing U.S. forces through the Special Measures Agreement mechanism. The current level is \$830 million annually and the quality has improved over time. While the Republic of Korea commitment is evident, unanticipated limitations in the last agreement (the ninth) have not provided an opportunity for contributions to increase in conjunction with actual cost. I understand that the team negotiating the follow-on tenth agreement plans to ensure an appropriate burden-sharing arrangement that meets U.S. requirements and everything that necessitates the readiness of U.S. forces to defend the Korean Peninsula if called upon.

#### **In general, do you believe the Republic of Korea has equitably shared the burden of defense and deterrence on the Korean Peninsula in recent years?**

The equity of U.S.-South Korea burden-sharing is best determined by policy-makers. It is unquestionable, however, that the South Korean contribution to the Alliance is substantial and their investment in defense leads U.S. Allies as measured by percent of Gross Domestic Product.

Unanticipated limitations in the 9th Special Measures Agreement have not provided an opportunity for contributions to increase in conjunction with actual cost, and I understand policy-makers negotiating the follow-on 10th agreement plan to ensure an appropriate burden-sharing arrangement that meets U.S. requirements and everything that necessitates the readiness of U.S. forces to defend the Korean Peninsula if called upon.

In recent years, South Korea's financial contributions under various arrangements have supported the successful relocation and consolidation of U.S. forces across the Korean Peninsula. Considering the future of the U.S.-Republic of Korea Alliance, I have every expectation that the Republic of Korea will provide a fair share of the burden under the new Special Measures Agreement being negotiated.

### **Republic of Korea-Japan Relationship**

**The Republic of Korea and Japan are two of our most important bilateral alliances, but historical issues have sometimes prevented cooperation and integration between the two countries.**

#### **What is your assessment of the Republic of Korea-Japan relationship?**

The South Korea-Japan relationship has deepened in recent years, though it remains encumbered by historical sensitivities. Many nations around the world view Japan's decision to take a more active posture in its defense positively. Still, some in the Republic of Korea have been critical as historical issues continue to influence views on Japan's international role. However, the provocations by North Korea in 2017 helped advance the commitments and shared values between South Korea and Japan.

I'm encouraged by recent initiatives between the countries to cooperate both bilaterally and multilaterally. The United States should strive to continue to encourage and assist where able the positive gains so that the relations among the three countries provide a foundation for strength and stability in the region that will ensure regional prosperity and security.

#### **What opportunities for cooperation do you foresee for the bilateral (Republic of Korea-Japan) and trilateral (Republic of Korea-Japan-U.S.) relationships?**

Multilateral cooperation is key to the security and prosperity of the region. If confirmed as Commander, United States Forces Korea, I will continue to pursue areas of mutual interest that promote interoperability and enhance security for our allies and partners. Some examples include combined humanitarian and disaster relief efforts, search and rescue, ballistic missile defense in-depth, planning to counter unconventional attacks, and anti-submarine warfare. I will also seek out opportunities to involve other partners in the region in multilateral cooperation.

## **Consolidation of U.S. Forces**

**The Land Partnership Plan (LPP) is consolidating the combat brigade and supporting elements of the 2nd Infantry Division in and around Camp Humphreys, south of Seoul. The Yongsan Relocation Plan (YRP) proposes to move most of the U.S. forces currently stationed at Yongsan compound in Seoul to Camp Humphreys as well. The YRP relocation is to be largely funded by the Republic of Korea Government, but the United States will face potentially significant costs as well.**

**Initial estimates for costs were \$3.2 billion, but that did not include the transition costs for sustaining facilities until completion. What is the current estimate including those sustainment costs?**

U.S. costs for construction and relocation associated with the Land Partnership Plan are currently estimated at \$3.3 billion. Costs associated with the Land Partnership Plan are funded by the United States. The U.S. funding strategy includes using Republic of Korea Funded Construction from the Special Measures Agreement to pay for most construction costs. The Republic of Korea funded \$2.4 billion out of \$3.3 billion of the cost associated with the Land Partnership Program.

**What is the cost estimate for the YRP relocation, and what portion of that will be funded by the Republic of Korea?**

The cost estimate for the Yongsan Relocation Plan is currently still \$7.4 billion. The Yongsan Relocation Plan was implemented at South Korea's request and all of its associated costs are funded by South Korea.

**What is the current status of the two consolidation plans and the timeline for completion?**

Currently 85% of the construction and relocations associated with these two plans are complete. Construction will conclude in the summer of 2022 with the completion of the last MILCON Army Family Housing Towers at Camp Humphreys.

The relocation of 210<sup>th</sup> Fires Brigade from Camp Casey to Camp Humphreys is tied to conditions-based transfer of operational control in wartime. As a result, its relocation is not currently scheduled.

The end state of the Yongsan Relocation Plan and the Land Partnership Plan includes returning to South Korea land previously granted to the United States under the Status of Forces Agreement. United States Forces Korea will work closely with its South Korean counterparts to expedite land returns using established Status of Forces Agreement processes.

**In your opinion, does the consolidation better support the warfighting mission? If so, how?**



The two plans relocate and consolidate U.S. forces from north of Seoul and from the Seoul metropolitan area to locations south of Seoul, primarily to the U.S. Army Garrison at Camp Humphreys. The movement of units and facilities to areas south of the Han River improves force protection and survivability, placing the majority of personnel and equipment outside of the effective tactical range of North Korean artillery. In addition, the move to a central location outside of Seoul contributes to the political sustainability of our forward presence and improves military readiness on the Korean Peninsula.

**According to the Army, as of February 2018, the remaining units for Eighth Army Headquarters were slated to be completed by the end of 2018. Is that timeline still accurate?**

Yes, this is still accurate. Eighth Army Headquarters relocation is currently 99% complete and will be 100% complete by end of CY 2018.

**What do you anticipate to be the total costs, including transition costs, to be incurred by the U.S. Government to carry out the two consolidations? What savings, if any, will be realized once complete?**

Total relocation costs are \$10.7 billion. These costs include construction; command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence-related costs; moving services; land acquisition; program management; and furniture, fixtures, and equipment. Yongsan Relocation Plan costs are funded by South Korea and Land Partnership Plan costs are funded by the United States. The U.S. funding strategy includes using Republic of Korea Funded Construction to pay for a significant amount of Land Partnership Plan construction costs. As a result, 8% of total relocation costs are directly funded by the United States. I believe that the cost savings analysis being conducted by United States Forces Korea is nearing completion.

**Given that the U.S.-Republic of Korea Status of Forces Agreement states that the U.S. is not obligated to restore facilities and areas to their original condition when they are returned to the Republic of Korea, to what extent do you believe the United States should compensate the Republic of Korea for the costs related to environmental clean-up at bases being vacated as a result of the LPP?**

I believe the United States should not compensate South Korea for costs related to environmental cleanup at vacated Land Partnership Plan or Yongsan Relocation Plan camps.

Under the Status of Forces Agreement Article IV (Facilities and Areas – Return of Facilities), the United States is not obligated to restore the facilities and areas to the condition in which they were at the time they became available to the U.S. armed forces, or to compensate the South Korean government in lieu of such restoration. Under Department of Defense Instruction 4715.08 (Remediation of Environmental Contamination Outside the United States), “[n]o remediation of environmental contamination is performed at a DoD installation that has been determined by OSD to have DoD operations terminated and returned to the host nation, except such measures as required to prevent immediate exposure of U.S. forces and personnel to environmental contamination that poses a substantial impact to human health and safety. Such

measures will not extend beyond the date when DoD operations are terminated at the installation. For the purposes of this instruction, DoD operations are terminated when the missions for which the installation was maintained are no longer performed at the installation.

### **Training of U.S. Forces in the Republic of Korea**

**Earlier this year, Secretary Mattis indefinitely suspended select exercises, including FREEDOM GUARDIAN and two Korean Marine Exchange Program training exercises.**

**In your assessment, what is the value of the FREEDOM GUARDIAN exercise for U.S. and Republic of Korea forces?**

FREEDOM GUARDIAN is a full-spectrum command post exercise designed to train, educate, and challenge Combined Forces Command and components' staffs in the wake of seasonally high turnover by simultaneously developing and sustaining joint and Alliance knowledge and familiarity with the Korean Peninsula problem set through a series of complex scenarios. FREEDOM GUARDIAN also provides the environment for continuous improvement to and enhancement of interoperability between Republic of Korea and U.S. forces. FREEDOM GUARDIAN has historically shown great value in its contribution to staff proficiency and readiness of the Combined Forces Command to be ready to respond to provocations and crisis.

**What is the status of planning for the KEY RESOLVE and FOAL EAGLE exercises? In your assessment, what is the value of these exercises?**

The status of KEY RESOLVE and FOAL EAGLE is a future decision for Alliance leaders. Combined Forces Command is responsible to continue to plan all future exercises until tasked otherwise. KEY RESOLVE sustains component, staff and Alliance warfighting readiness over a one-year cycle and has proven over time to be very valuable. FOAL EAGLE enables U.S. service components to conduct field training with Alliance counterparts to remain ready to deter North Korean and defend South Korea, if necessary. Like KEY RESOLVE, FOAL EAGLE has proven to be a valuable training event over time.

**As far as you are aware, will the KEY RESOLVE and FOAL EAGLE exercises take place as originally scheduled?**

The status of KEY RESOLVE and FOAL EAGLE is a future decision for Alliance leaders. As far as I am aware, at this time, both exercises are expected to occur as originally scheduled.

**In your assessment, has United States Forces Korea participated in any exercises in recent years that were provocative?**

Exercises and training are the routine activities of militaries around the world. The U.S. military conducts exercises and training at multiple echelons, at home and in every geographic Combatant Command region of the globe. Each exercise on the Korean Peninsula is agreed upon by both the United States and South Korea as an integral part of maintaining warfighting readiness of combined forces. Moreover, international participation in Alliance exercises has

been growing. The characterization of military training often has as much, or more, to do with the publicity and emphasis of reporting surrounding training activities than with the activities themselves.

**In your assessment, has United States Forces Korea participated in any exercises in recent years that were too costly in relation to the benefits for U.S. and Republic of Korea forces?**

United States Forces Korea participation in exercises over the years has sustained a high level of readiness required to deal with the full range of challenges that coalition forces might face. Participation in these exercises has signaled our resolve and demonstrated to the world our ironclad alliance with the Republic of Korea. If confirmed, I will ensure United States Forces Korea remains a trusted steward of national resources by executing necessary and impactful joint and combined exercises focused on the Command's core mission and I will provide my candid assessment to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense regarding the readiness of the force.

**Secretary Mattis recently told reporters that "we have no plans at this time to suspend any more exercises" and that "there is no discussion about further suspensions."**

**As far as you are aware, are there any plans to suspend or otherwise modify any future exercises in which United States Forces Korea participates?**

The status of all future Alliance exercises are future decisions for Alliance leaders. As far as I am aware, all exercises previously envisioned are expected to occur as originally scheduled.

**The suspension of select exercises was justified as supporting the implementation of the outcomes of the Singapore Summit. The administration noted that additional decisions would depend upon the DPRK continuing to have productive negotiations in good faith.**

**In your assessment, has the suspension of select exercises had a discernable impact on North Korean behavior?**

I believe that it is too early to tell. Often confidence-building measures that seek to build trust and modify behavior take time to have their full impact, and are difficult to measure in isolation from other causes. What we do know is there has not been a provocation by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in over 300 days.

**Given the diplomatic process related to denuclearization, including negotiation and implementation, could take years, are you concerned about the potential impacts related to readiness and interoperability of indefinitely suspending military exercises involving United States Forces Korea?**

Military exercises build and maintain warfighting proficiency, improve interoperability, and allow realistic evaluations that identify capability, personnel, and strategic gaps. An indefinite suspension of theater exercises will have an impact on warfighting proficiency and the

Command's ability to objectively assess capability gaps, which causes me concern. Efforts to expand the number of smaller training and exercise events can mitigate this effect to some extent, but not fully achieve the same training objectives of a major exercise. If confirmed, this will be a top assessment priority of mine.

**Given the status of the negotiations up until this point, would you recommend the suspension or modification of any future exercises in which United States Forces Korea participates?**

If confirmed, this will be a top priority for me to assess and develop recommendations on suspension or modification of future exercises. Exercises could potentially be modified to still achieve limited Alliance readiness objectives while concurrently contributing to the reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula. This will be part of my initial assessment, if confirmed. If modifications to any given annual exercise are significant enough to truncate the list of required exercise or training objectives, or if the rigor is insufficient, the risk to force and risk to mission may increase. If confirmed, I will explore the full range of options to mitigate such risks to ensure that the Combined Forces Command and United States Forces Korea sustain a high level of warfighting readiness.

**One of the challenges for the U.S. troops on the Korean Peninsula is training, particularly the access to training ranges for large ground unit maneuver and fires and for close air support missions.**

**What is your understanding of the training challenges for U.S. forces in the Republic of Korea, including the availability and access to training ranges for large ground unit maneuver and fires, close air support, and other Air Force training requirements?**

The threats within the Korean Theater of Operation necessitate challenging training to ensure United States Force Korea is ready and able to "Fight Tonight." Robust range capabilities that realistically replicate North Korean air defense and electronic warfare capabilities are essential to maintaining readiness for air and ground forces. Despite being among the best training areas in Asia, challenges stemming from Korea's significantly increased population and urbanization do exist. These challenges are being addressed through existing military and civil-military channels. If confirmed, I will continue to assess these challenges and seek a mix of engagement, innovation, and investments in future training opportunities aligned with force relocation and urbanization trends as a means of ensuring range-related issues do not compromise readiness.

**In your view, are the ranges in Korea adequate to meet the training requirements of U.S. forces?**

Historically, the ranges available to United States Forces Korea forces for training and exercises have been adequate to both the needs of forces assigned to the Korean Peninsula and supportive of U.S. forces beyond Korea using these areas to demonstrate power projection into the INDOPACOM Theater of Operations (e.g. Bomber Assurance missions deploying from the Continental United States) and to execute regional training and demonstrations of capability (e.g. strategic air assets based in Guam). However, as the new capabilities are integrated into the

forward-postured force mix of the United States Forces Korea, the Command must continue to assess our ability to realistically replicate North Korean air defense and electronic warfare capabilities in order to ensure it maintains necessary readiness for air and ground forces. Additionally, challenges not unlike those associated with some U.S.-based training facilities (e.g. environmental restrictions, local population encroachment, and airspace restrictions) exist and must be contended with and, if necessary, accommodated. If confirmed, I will work with the United States Forces Korea component commanders to assess the range situation and, if necessary, pursue a mix of engagement, innovations, and investments to upgrade or expand ranges in order to accommodate the Command's current and future training requirements.

### **Quality of Life Investments at Camp Humphreys**

**Through U.S. and Republic of Korea investments in quality of life amenities in South Korea, to include modern housing, new health care facilities, a large commissary and exchange complex, and MWR facilities at Camp Humphreys, the Department has worked to make South Korea an "assignment of choice" for U.S. Forces.**

**In light of the national security threat posed by North Korea, do you believe the Department should continue to encourage accompanied tours in South Korea?**

United States Forces Korea continually assesses risk to the 7,600 Department of Defense dependents on the Korean Peninsula. I believe the enduring strategic benefit of command sponsored tours outweighs the currently assessed risk of having dependents on the Peninsula. The Command Sponsorship Program enables 24-36 months accompanied tours for service members. These tour lengths are greatly superior to the 12 months unaccompanied tour in terms of promoting continuity, heightened levels of experience and proficiency, mission readiness, stability, and conveyed commitment to South Korea. Risks associated with suspending command-sponsored tours include greater speculation regarding the likelihood of military operations and potential premature signaling to other groups that they should depart South Korea.

The Republic of Korea has been historically, and continues to be one of the safest overseas locations for families of service members and DoD civilians. United States Forces Korea offers a superior mix of facilities for dependents support while the Republic of Korea government has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to the safety and security of service members, dependents, and other U.S. non-combatants. The present situation supports continued encouragement of accompanied tours.

### **Medical Care for U. S. Forces in Korea**

**One of the most important quality of life issues in Korea is ensuring access to high quality medical care for service members of all military branches and their families. Separate medical chains of command responsible for providing health care, and the presence of non-command-sponsored family members who need health services, among other factors, have presented challenges.**

**If confirmed, how would you assess the management and delivery of health care services in South Korea for both command and non-command sponsored family members?**

I take the delivery of health to our Service Members and Families very seriously and it is a top priority of mine. If confirmed, I intend to conduct a full assessment of health care delivery across the peninsula. The healthcare provided by our military healthcare system is intended to ensure a “Medically Ready Force,” a “Ready Medical Force,” and access to high-quality, safe healthcare for all beneficiaries. Military medical leaders in South Korea monitor the state of our healthcare system through contact with our beneficiaries and unit leadership, measure trends and metrics to ensure proper utilization of resources, and take appropriate action to address concerns and improve our system. TRICARE beneficiaries in South Korea have access to the entire spectrum of healthcare services through Department of Defense Clinics, Department of Defense Hospitals, and the TRICARE Network. TRICARE manages a network of 30 Korean Host Nation Hospitals actively assessing quality, safety, and customer service. Many TRICARE Network Hospitals have established liaison services in their facilities specifically designed to assist our beneficiaries. If confirmed, and pending the outcome of my assessment, I will require quarterly updates from Component Commands and medical leaders on the trends, metrics, and actions taken to improve the delivery of healthcare to all beneficiaries

**Hospital construction at Camp Humphreys has experienced significant delays due to construction problems. In your view, has the Army developed a responsible plan to provide specialty health care services for service members and their families at Camp Humphreys?**

Construction, validation, and certification of the new Brian Allgood Army Community Hospital at Camp Humphreys is scheduled for completion by November 2019 and has been brought into alignment with U.S. requirements. In the interim, specialty care is available at Department of Defense Clinics, Department of Defense Hospitals, and TRICARE Network Hospitals throughout the Republic of Korea. I understand that Camp Humphreys has routine access to specialty care clinic doctors and staff who rotate from the Brian Allgood Community Hospital in Yongsan to Camp Humphreys, the use of telemedicine for some specialists, and dedicated transportation to move beneficiaries to other specialty clinics in the local network. This type of mitigation and partnerships with host nation hospitals in Pyongtaek and Suwon help ensure Soldiers and family members at Camp Humphreys are well cared for. Department of Defense medical leadership in South Korea continues to support, communicate, synchronize, and address our patients’ needs and concerns to ensure that they receive the high-quality, safe healthcare they need in a timely and service-oriented manner. To do so, leaders must maintain excellent, open, and collaborative relationships with TRICARE Network Hospital leadership and staff. If confirmed, I intend to include an assessment of access to specialty health care services in my overall review of health care delivery.

## **Prevention of and Response to Sexual Assaults**

### **What is your assessment of the problem of sexual assaults at United States Forces Korea?**

Sexual assault is unacceptable in our military and in United States Forces Korea. Reportedly, there has been a decrease in the number of incidents in United States Forces Korea in past years. That said, we have much work to do to eliminate this scourge from our military and United States Forces Korea. Aside from the permanent and horrific damage it does to victims, sexual assault erodes the trust that is essential to unit readiness and cohesion. Going forward, if confirmed, I will demand great focus by commanders and subordinates to address the issue of sexual assault and require a deep commitment toward the prevention of incidents and the proper, immediate response to reported incidents. I will expect an equal level of commitment to prevent reprisals and provide all necessary support to victims. This is Commanders' business. Commanders must monitor their command climate as it relates to sexual assault and remain proactive in taking steps towards ensuring a climate free of sexual assault and reprisals against victims.

### **What is your assessment of United States Forces Korea's sexual assault prevention and response program?**

United States Forces Korea and its components are in compliance with all Secretary of Defense and Service Chief requirements. United States Forces Korea is committed to eliminating sexual assault and fostering a culture of dignity and respect across the Command. The approach of United States Forces Korea is prevention-focused with an uncompromising commitment to victim assistance. United States Forces Korea applies a strategic approach to combatting sexual assault. Actions are typically guided by five critical focus areas: Prevention, Victim Assistance, Investigation, Accountability and Assessment.

### **What is your view of the provision for restricted and unrestricted reporting of sexual assaults?**

Restricted reporting allows victim care to be a top priority. Victims of this crime can come forward and receive needed medical and support services while maintaining confidentiality. Survey data shows that confidentiality is a key driver to accurately assessing the extent of sexual assault. Without restricted reporting, many of these victims would not have an avenue to access needed services. Survey data suggests that these victims would simply forgo reporting. Based on my experience over the last three years spent commanding the largest command in the Department of Defense, I see evidence that we may want to consider adding additional positions that would fall under the protections and provisions of restricted reporting.

### **What is your view about the role of the chain of command in providing necessary support to victims of sexual assault?**

I strongly believe that support from the chain of command is critical. As a military, we are getting better, but we still have much work to do. We are morally obligated to create and

maintain such trust with our subordinates that any victims among them can - and will - report crimes without fear of blame or retaliation from peers of anybody else. Furthermore, we must ensure victims receive all necessary support, that such support is timely, and that in all cases we treat victims with dignity and respect. Department of Defense survey data shows that one of three military victims report the crime to military authority, a significant increase from one of 10 reporting in 2012.

I believe proactive and positively engaged commanders are vital when providing a professional response and comprehensive services necessary to support the victims. If confirmed, I will hold leaders and commanders accountable to set the proper tone within their organization. They must provide a climate wherein victims retain their dignity and where any form of retaliation or reprisal is unacceptable – anything less will not be tolerated.

**What is your view of the adequacy of resources and programs in United States Forces Korea to provide victims of sexual assault the medical, psychological, and legal help they need?**

Service components within United States Forces Korea have appropriate resources and programs in place to offer victims of sexual assault medical, psychological, investigative, and legal support. Service components have enhanced victim support services through certified Sexual Assault Prevention and Response personnel and healthcare providers. Judge Advocates protect a victim's rights through the investigative and adjudicative stages of the military justice process. Component Commanders work with Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, legal offices, and investigate organizations to establish Case Management Groups to track unrestricted sexual assaults and the care of victims.

The training and resources required to investigate and respond to allegations of sexual assault are appropriate. The Command's criminal investigators are highly trained and given the resources necessary to collect evidence, interview subjects and witnesses, and compassionately work with victims.

**What is your view of United States Forces Korea initiatives to prevent additional sexual assaults?**

United States Forces Korea's approach is prevention-focused with an uncompromising commitment to victim assistance. This approach is outlined in two United States Forces Policy Letters, #1 Zero Tolerance and #9 United States Forces Korea Sexual Assault Prevention & Response Program. If confirmed, I intend to assess the current initiatives – and consider others – while conducting a command-wide survey.

**What is your view of the adequacy of the training and resources available to United States Forces Korea to investigate and prosecute allegations of sexual assault?**

United States Forces Korea components have adequate training and resources in place to investigate and respond to all allegations. All services have established guidelines for a 24/7 sexual assault response capability for victims at all locations. If confirmed, I will immediately



conduct an assessment of the adequacy of the training and resources required to properly investigate and prosecute allegations of sexual assault.

**What is your view about the role of the chain of command in changing the military culture in which these sexual assaults occur?**

The chain of command is responsible and accountable for maintaining a positive command climate where sexual assaults and harassment are not tolerated. It is a Commander's responsibility to promulgate his or her policy on sexual harassment and sexual assault to all Service Members within his or her command, and to enforce training standards on awareness, prevention, and response. Setting the right unit culture is the direct responsibility of the commander and must be supported by the entire chain of command.

If confirmed, I will set Command-wide expectations for conduct through guidance on core values and will demand that subordinate leaders set the example in their organizations. Commands should monitor their climates as well as the climates of their subordinate units. Chains of command will proactively engage in resolving issues pertaining to command climate, and commanders will be held accountable for their units' actions.

**Surveys report that up to 62 percent of victims who report a sexual assault perceive professional or social retaliation for reporting.**

**If confirmed, what will you do to address the issue of retaliation for reporting a sexual assault?**

United States Forces Korea has strong policies and procedures in place to protect victims of sexual assault from retaliation and, if confirmed, I intend to reinforce them. I believe Commanders have the tools to take appropriate action to ensure that Service Members can report sexual assaults without fearing retaliation or other repercussions. I will continue to support the current efforts by United States Forces Korea components to comply with the Department of Defense's 2017 strategy to prevent retaliation associated with reporting sexual assault or harassment. This strategy requires United States Forces Korea Sexual Assault Prevention and Response personnel to track all retaliation allegations and their outcomes. I will also strongly reemphasize the FY 2014 laws on retaliation, specifically the prohibition on retaliation against service members for reporting sexual assault and retaliatory personnel actions. I will expect commanders to create a culture intolerant of retaliation. Setting the right unit climate not only encourages the reporting of any crime or misconduct, but also eradicates retaliation. This combination is a crucial component of the effective elimination of sexual assault in the military.

**Sexual assault is a significantly underreported crime in our society and in the military. If confirmed, what will you do to increase reporting of sexual assaults by military victims?**

I believe that trust is essential to creating an environment where victims will have the confidence to report sexual assault. If confirmed, I intend to establish a command climate that is based on trust, in which a victim can report a sexual assault without any fear of retaliation, ostracism, or

isolation from other members of the command. I intend to establish clear policies and procedures for leaders at all levels to take action to prevent sexual assault, protect and support victims and to ensure a safe and healthy environment for those in their charge.

**In your view, what would be the impact of requiring a judge advocate outside the chain of command, instead of a military commander in the grade of O-6 or above as is currently the Department's policy, to determine whether allegations of sexual assault should be prosecuted?**

I believe that commanders are responsible and accountable to establish good order and discipline in their unit. Good order and discipline is the foundation of unit readiness. The Commander's role in military justice is long-standing and essential to the effectiveness of our military. I assess that if Commanders lose their disposition authority over violations of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the commander's authority to enforce good order and discipline will be negatively impacted. Commanders are not alone in this process, as we have trained, experienced Judge Advocates at every echelon to advise them on immediate decisions following notification of an allegation, throughout the investigative process, and through the entirety of the military justice and/or adverse administrative action processes. Many of these processes have mandatory investigative and review steps which further ensure commanders are professionally and thoroughly reviewing each case, with the advice of their legal advisors.

**What additional steps would you take, if confirmed, to address the problem of sexual assaults at United States Forces Korea?**

If confirmed, I will ensure that personnel clearly understand they are accountable for fostering a climate where sexist behavior, harassment, and assault are not tolerated. Dignity, trust, and respect are core values we live by and define how we treat one another. Victims' reports are to be treated with the utmost seriousness, full privacy, and appropriate sensitivity. Bystanders should be motivated to intervene because offensive or criminal conduct is neither tolerated nor condoned. Offenders will know that they will be held appropriately accountable for their actions in an effective system of military justice.

**What is your assessment of the effect, if any, of recent legislation concerning sexual assault on the capability of United States Forces Korea commanders to prosecute sexual assault cases?**

I believe recent legislation, such as the Military Justice Act of 2016, which will enter into force on 1 January 2019, provides commanders appropriate authorities to ensure sexual assault cases are appropriately investigated and adjudicated. For example, by elevating military courts to allow judges to issue subpoenas, investigators will have the opportunity to act more quickly on cases than they have in the past, potentially providing commanders more thorough investigative reports.

**In your view, what is the appropriate role for a U.S. military commander who is working with coalition partners, when that U.S. officer becomes aware of allegations of sex trafficking or of child abuse by members of that coalition force?**

U.S. Commanders should ensure any allegation of sex trafficking or child abuse, regardless of the nationality of the offender, is appropriately reported.

**If confirmed, what direction would you give to U.S. personnel assigned to your command who become aware of such allegations?**

Misconduct degrades military readiness, regardless of which flag a Service Member wears on their sleeve. This is particularly true when the misconduct targets innocent and disadvantaged populations, which sex trafficking and child abuse do. If confirmed, I will not tolerate such misconduct in my command from U.S., Alliance, or international partner nations and will ensure subordinate commanders understand my expectations to ensure allegations are appropriately reported, investigated, and adjudicated.

**Under what circumstances would you expect U.S. personnel under your command to intervene to stop such misconduct if they suspect it or observe it?**

These types of misconduct are neither tolerated nor condoned, and I would expect all U.S. personnel to intervene and report appropriately. United States Forces Korea has annual online and in-person training throughout Korea regarding human trafficking. The Command takes combating prostitution and human trafficking very seriously and has in place enduring efforts to inform all U.S. service members about human trafficking on a daily basis. Also, the Command maintains an updated listing of “off limits areas and establishments,” which includes any businesses or premises that have been identified as engaging in or supporting prostitution and trafficking of persons. This list is updated and published every month and distributed to all service members and civilians across the Korean Peninsula. In conjunction with this listing, nightly patrols are conducted near major installations to ensure compliance.

### **Congressional Oversight**

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

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

**Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security**

**protection, with respect to your responsibilities as Commander, United Nations Command/Combined Forces Command/United States Forces Korea?**

Yes.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

**Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?**

Yes.

**If confirmed again, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?**

Yes.