

Advance Policy Questions for Lisa S. Disbrow
Nominee for Under Secretary of the Air Force

Defense Reforms

The Committee has recently held a series of hearings on defense reform.

What modifications of Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 provisions, if any, do you believe would be appropriate?

I have no specific suggestions for modifications to the Goldwater-Nichols legislation at this time, but I agree with the overall goal of defense reform: to ensure the effective employment of our Nation's Armed Forces. The Secretary of Defense is carefully examining this issue and if confirmed I will support that effort. Also, if I am confirmed and identify areas that merit reform, I will propose those changes through the appropriate established process.

Qualifications

What background and experience do you have that you believe qualifies you for this position?

I believe that my 30 years of combined leadership, policy, and requirements with the Department of Defense has prepared me to serve as the Under Secretary of the Air Force. I've been a member of the Air Force, both in uniform and civil service, since earning my commission from Officer Training School in 1985.

In my current position as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management & Comptroller), I am responsible for the efficient and effective management of Air Force resources and providing for the welfare for more than 664,000 active duty, Guard, Reserve and civilian Airmen and their families. Before that, I served as the Vice Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment on the Joint Staff. There, I was responsible for developing future warfighting capabilities; conducting joint force structure and warfighting studies; evaluating Department of Defense plans, programs, and strategies for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

If confirmed as Under Secretary of the Air Force, I look forward to continuing to apply this experience in support of the Air Force, Airmen and their families.

Duties

Section 8015 of title 10, United States Code, states the Under Secretary of the Air Force shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe.

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Under Secretary of the Air Force?

The position of the Under Secretary of the Air Force is established by law within the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force. Subject to the Secretary of the Air Force's direction and control, the Under Secretary exercises the full authority of the Secretary to conduct the affairs of the Department of the Air Force (except as limited by law, regulation or limitations imposed by the Department of Defense or the Secretary of the Air Force). The Under Secretary also serves as the Chief Management Officer of the Air Force.

What recommendations, if any, do you have for changes in the duties and functions of the Under Secretary of the Air Force, as set forth in section 8015 of title 10, United States Code, or in Department of Defense regulations pertaining to functions of the Under Secretary of the Air Force?

At this time, I am unaware of any reason to change the duties and functions of the Under Secretary as set out in Title 10 and pertinent Department of Defense regulations. If I am confirmed and I identify areas that I believe merit changes, I will propose those changes through the appropriate established processes.

Assuming you are confirmed, what additional duties, if any, do you expect will be prescribed for you?

If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Secretary of the Air Force to further her vision and goals for the Air Force. I expect the Secretary to prescribe duties for me relating to the Under Secretary of the Air Force's responsibilities, particularly in the role of Chief Management Officer.

Section 904(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, directs the Secretary of a military department to designate the Under Secretary of such military department to assume the primary management responsibility for business operations.

What is your understanding of the business operations responsibilities of the Under Secretary of the Air Force?

It is my understanding that the business operations responsibilities of the Chief Management Officer, consistent with Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, include the following: ensuring the Air Force's capability to carry out the Department of Defense's strategic plan in support of national security objectives; ensuring the core business missions of the Department of the Air Force are optimally aligned to support the Department's warfighting mission; establishing performance goals and measures for improving and evaluating overall economy, efficiency, and effectiveness and monitoring and measuring this progress; and working with DoD's Chief Management Officer to develop and maintain a strategic plan for business reform.

How do you perceive your role in setting the agenda for the Air Force Deputy Chief Management Officer?

If confirmed, I expect the Secretary to prescribe duties for me relating to the Under Secretary of the Air Force's responsibilities as the Chief Management Officer. In turn, I will appropriately set the agenda for the Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO). The Air Force recently re-designated the DCMO role, along with the Office of Business Transformation, as the Deputy Under Secretary of the Air Force, Management, reporting to the Under Secretary of the Air Force. I expect the DCMO role to continue to include facilitating continuous process improvement across the Air Force and chairing already established working groups that contribute to improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Air Force mission, core competencies and functional areas.

Relationships

If confirmed, what would be your working relationship with:

The Secretary of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense serves as the principal assistant to the President on all Department of Defense matters. The Secretary of the Air Force is subject to the authority, direction and control of the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of the Air Force works for the Secretary of the Air Force. The Under Secretary also serves as the Chief Management Officer of the Air Force, the senior energy official, and the focal point for space at the Air Force headquarters. As the focal point of space for the Air Force, the Under Secretary coordinates all of the space functions and activities across the Air Force, and is the primary interface to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for space matters. If confirmed, I would look forward to working closely with the Secretary of Defense and his office on space-related matters, energy issues, and other matters as directed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense assists the Secretary of Defense in carrying out his duties and responsibilities and performs those duties assigned by the Secretary of Defense or by law. If confirmed, I will work closely with the Deputy Secretary of Defense on a range of matters. In particular, I would look forward to working with and supporting the Deputy Secretary of Defense in his role as Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

The Chief Management Officer and Deputy Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

The Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) is the principal staff assistant and advisor to the Secretary of Defense and Deputy Secretary of Defense for matters relating to the management and improvement of integrated Department of Defense business operations. In this role the DCMO is charged with leading the synchronization, integration, and coordination of the disparate business activities of the Department to ensure optimal alignment in support of the warfighting mission. If confirmed, I look

forward to building on the close working relationship I established with the DCMO in my current position in my new capacity as the Air Force Chief Management Officer.

The Secretary of the Air Force.

Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force is responsible for and has the authority necessary to conduct all affairs of the Department of the Air Force. The Under Secretary of the Air Force is subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force. If confirmed, I expect the Secretary to assign me a wide range of duties and responsibilities involving, but not limited to, organizing, supplying, equipping, training, maintaining, and administering the Air Force. I look forward to working closely with the Secretary as her deputy and principal assistant.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force is directly responsible to the Secretary of the Air Force and performs duties subject to his authority, direction, and control. For the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff is responsible for providing properly organized, trained, and equipped forces to support the combatant commanders in their mission accomplishment. The Chief of Staff oversees members and organizations across the Air Force, advising the Secretary on plans and recommendations, and, acting as an agent of the Secretary, implementing plans upon approval. If confirmed, I would foster a close working relationship with the Chief of Staff to ensure that policies and resources are appropriate to meet the needs of the Air Force and respect his additional responsibilities as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force.

The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force assists the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force in conducting the affairs of the Department of the Air Force, fulfilling duties that the Chief of Staff, with the approval of the Secretary, may delegate to him. The Vice Chief of Staff is also a Co-Chairman of the Air Force Council with the Under Secretary of the Air Force. If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with the Vice Chief of Staff.

The Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force.

The Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force carry out the goals and priorities of the Air Force. If confirmed, I will assist the Secretary in building a strong team through close relationships and information sharing, and I look forward to working with the Assistant Secretaries to further the Secretary's vision.

The General Counsel of the Air Force.

The General Counsel (GC) is the senior civilian legal advisor to Air Force senior leaders and all officers and agencies of the Department of the Air Force. The GC serves as the chief ethics official. If confirmed, I look forward to developing a strong working relationship with the GC and his staff.

The Inspector General of the Air Force.

The Inspector General (IG) of the Air Force is a general officer who is detailed to the position by the Secretary of the Air Force. When directed, the IG inquires into and reports on matters affecting the discipline, efficiency, and economy of the Air Force. He also proposes programs of inspections and investigations as appropriate. If confirmed, I would look forward to developing a good working relationship with the IG.

The Surgeon General of the Air Force.

The Surgeon General (SG) of the Air Force is the functional manager of the Air Force Medical Service and provides direction, guidance, and technical management of Air Force medical personnel at facilities worldwide. The SG advises the Secretary of the Air Force and Air Force Chief of Staff, as well as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, on matters pertaining to the medical aspects of the air expeditionary force and the health of Air Force personnel. If confirmed, I would look forward to developing a good working relationship with the SG.

The Judge Advocate General of the Air Force.

The Judge Advocate General (TJAG) is the senior uniformed legal advisor to Air Force senior leaders and all officers and agencies of the Department of the Air Force and provides professional supervision to TJAG's Corps in the performance of their duties. If confirmed, I will look forward to developing a good working relationship with TJAG and the TJAG staff.

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau is the senior uniformed National Guard officer responsible for formulating, developing, and coordinating all policies, programs, and plans affecting Army and Air National Guard personnel, and is also a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Appointed by the President, he serves as principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense through the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on National Guard matters. He is also the principal adviser to the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Air Force on all National Guard issues and serves as the Department's official channel of communication with the governors and adjutants general. If confirmed, I will look forward to developing a good working relationship with the chief of the National Guard Bureau on appropriate matters affecting the Air Force.

The Under Secretaries of the military services

If I am confirmed, I will work diligently to foster a close working relationship with the Under Secretaries of the Army and Navy. I look forward to sharing information and expertise that will assist in the management of the Department of the Air Force and our coordination with the other Services on matters of mutual interest, particularly in our capacities as Chief Management Officers for our respective Services.

Major Challenges and Priorities

In your view, what are the major challenges that will confront the next Under Secretary of the Air Force?

The Air Force must continue find innovative ways to do the following in the face of continued fiscal challenges: Ensure the Air Force can meet the increasing demand for airpower, while improving our readiness. Modernize air and space capabilities. Continue to strengthen the nuclear enterprise. Evolve our cyber enterprise. Address contested and congested Space.

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

Ensuring the Air Force can meet the increasing demand for airpower, while improving our readiness requires a multi-faceted approach. A shortfall in Air Force capability has a disproportionately negative effect on the success of the joint force. We have to continue to be agile and innovative to meet the demand for airpower, while also making it affordable. Inclusion across the Air Force components is vital to create the strategic agility required to meet the challenges emerging from strategic uncertainty, fiscal constraints, and rapidly evolving threats. In order to meet our AF goal of 80 percent full spectrum combat readiness by 2023, the Air Force must set end strength commensurate with increasing global requirements; must divest aging platforms and infrastructure in order to free up fiscal resources and experience manpower; and will continue to advocate for funding stability and increased dwell time to sharpen needed skills.

Modernizing air and space capabilities. We must ensure the Air Force can always provide responsive and effective Global Vigilance, Global Reach, Global Power. The Air Force's top three acquisition programs, the F-35, the KC-46 and the long-range strike bomber, are operational imperatives for the joint force of 2025 and beyond. Developing and delivering air superiority must be a multi-domain, technology-driven process focused on capabilities and capacity. Without consistent investment and improvement, continued U.S dominance of the air is in doubt. Rapidly changing operational environments mean we can no longer develop weapon systems on the traditional linear acquisition process. Capability development now requires adaptable, affordable and agile processes with increasing collaboration between our science and technology, acquisition, and requirements professionals, as well as our sister services.

Continue to strengthen the nuclear enterprise. The Air Force provides two legs of the nuclear triad while maintaining forward-based capabilities in support of NATO. Our long-term investment strategy for our nuclear forces is active modernization/recapitalization of Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, bombers, dual-capable aircraft and associated infrastructure. We will continue to improve the way we do the business of the nuclear mission. These improvements will cultivate a positive culture built on prestige, investment, integrity and excellence at every level.

Evolve our cyber enterprise. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force directed the stand-up of Task Force Cyber Secure, responsible for synchronizing all efforts seeking to improve the security of our information and warfighting systems. The ultimate role of the task force is to enable the Air Force to fly, fight and win in a cyber-contested environment, ultimately increasing the robustness and resilience of critical Air Force systems for core missions in and through cyberspace. Meanwhile, the Air Force must continue to

integrate cybersecurity throughout the lifecycle of weapon system development in all mission areas.

Space has become increasingly contested, congested, and a critical enabler of every mission the DoD conducts. We need to continue to improve our space situational awareness capabilities for information collection and processing, while looking at ways to add resilience to our space systems. We must partner with industry and international partners, as a healthy space industrial base is essential to national security and US civil space goals and objectives.

What do you consider to be the most serious problems in the performance of the functions of the Under Secretary of the Air Force?

I'm unaware of any serious problems in the performance of the functions of the office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force. If confirmed and if I identify any problems as the Under Secretary, I will work tirelessly toward finding and implementing solutions.

If confirmed, what management actions and time lines would you establish to address these problems?

Again, I am unaware of any serious problems in the performance of the functions of the office of the Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Duties and Responsibilities as Chief Management Officer

Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 designates the Under Secretary of the Air Force as the Air Force's Chief Management Officer (CMO). Section 908 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 requires the CMO of each of the military departments to carry out a comprehensive business transformation initiative.

What is your understanding of the duties and responsibilities of the Under Secretary in the capacity as CMO of the Department of the Air Force?

The duties and responsibilities of the Under Secretary in the capacity as CMO is to ensure effective and efficient management of Air Force business operations.

Responsibilities of the Chief Management Officer, consistent with Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, Section 908 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 to include the following: ensuring the Air Force's capability to carry out the Department of Defense's strategic plan in support of national security objectives; ensuring the core business missions of the Department of the Air Force are optimally aligned to support the Department's warfighting mission; establishing performance goals and measures for improving and evaluating overall economy, efficiency, and effectiveness and monitoring and measuring this progress; and working with DoD's Chief Management Officer to develop and maintain a strategic plan for business reform.

What background and expertise do you possess that you believe qualify you to perform these duties and responsibilities?

My background and expertise make me uniquely qualified to serve in the capacity the Air Force's Chief Management Officer (CMO). Having served over 30 years in the capacity of a either military officer or DoD civilian, I have arrived at a point where I am confident in my ability to manage Air Force business operations, cultivate AF and OSD-level relationships, and carry out CMO responsibilities as defined in USC, DoD policy, and AF Mission Directives.

Do you believe that the CMO has the resources and authority needed to carry out the business transformation of the Department of the Air Force?

I believe Congress has given adequate CMO authority to carry out business transformation of the Department of the Air Force. Resourcing is a challenge, allocation has been given for top priorities, such as auditability compliance, but the speed which needed business transformations can be achieved is limited by Air Force budget constraints.

What role do you believe the CMO should play in the planning, development, and implementation of specific business systems by the military departments?

To directly engage on matters of strategic and implementation importance among my OSD and Service counterparts in the Department. My role includes directing and overseeing the activities of the Air Force Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) who engages on military departments implementations through the Defense Business Council.

What changes, if any, would you recommend to the statutory provisions establishing the position of CMO?

At this time, I am unaware of any reason to change the duties and functions of the Under Secretary as set out in Title 10 and pertinent Department of Defense regulations. If I am confirmed and I identify areas that I believe merit changes; I will propose those changes through the appropriate established processes.

Section 2222 of Title 10, United States Code, requires that the Secretary of Defense develop a comprehensive business enterprise architecture and transition plan to guide the development of its business systems and processes. The Department has chosen to implement the requirement for an enterprise architecture and transition plan through a "federated" approach in which the Business Transformation Agency has developed the top level architecture while leaving it to the military departments to fill in most of the detail. The Air Force business systems, like those of the other military departments, remain incapable of providing timely, reliable financial data to support management decisions.

If confirmed, what steps, if any, would you take to ensure that the Air Force develops the business systems and processes it needs to appropriately manage funds in the best interest of the taxpayer and the national defense?

Consistent with Section 883 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2016, I would

ensure the process associated with business systems development has been, or is being, reengineered to be as streamlined and efficient as practicable; the system and business system portfolio are or will be in compliance with the defense business enterprise architecture; the system has valid, achievable requirements and a viable plan for implementing those requirements; the system has an acquisition strategy designed to eliminate or reduce the need to tailor commercial off-the-shelf systems; and it is in compliance with the Department's auditability requirements.

Do you believe that a comprehensive, integrated, enterprise-wide architecture and transition plan is essential to the successful transformation of the Air Force business systems?

Yes. A comprehensive and integrated enterprise architecture and transition plan are crucial to ensure across the Department of Defense and the Air Force we leverage common solutions to address critical business requirements, reduce duplication, and realize effective mission support in an affordable fashion. Enterprise-wide architectures help us ensure compliance with key, common requirements, such as [SFIS and DPAP data standards. We work closely with the Air Force Chief Information Officer on Air Force Enterprise Architectures and the OSD Deputy Chief Management Officer on Defense Business Enterprise Architecture.

What steps would you take, if confirmed, to ensure that the Air Force's enterprise architecture and transition plan meet the requirements of section 2222?

Section 2222 of Title 10, United States Code, requires that the Secretary of Defense develop a comprehensive business enterprise architecture and transition plan to guide the development of its business systems and processes. The Department has chosen to implement the requirement for an enterprise architecture and transition plan through a "federated" approach in which the OSD Defense Business Council has developed the top level architecture while leaving it to the military departments to fill in most of the detail.

I would take steps to ensure we continue to evolve Air Force enterprise architectures and transition plans to achieve the requirements of Section 2222 and satisfy priority mission and business requirements the Air Force is responsible.

What are your views on the importance and role of timely and accurate financial and business information in managing operations and holding managers accountable?

Timely and accurate financial and business information is essential to managing operations and holding managers accountable. Several ongoing AF business transformation initiatives will improve the timeliness and accuracy of AF financial and business information. We are making key investments, though significantly constrained by budget limitations.

How would you address a situation in which you found that reliable, useful, and timely financial and business information was not routinely available for these purposes?

We address aspects of this issue with the Air Force DEAMS implementation. In general, if I were presented an issue related to reliable, useful, and timely financial and business information, I would engage our business leaders and my Deputy Chief Management Officer to apply our disciplined process of Services Development and Delivery process to define the problem, needed improvement, and requirements to meet the need. We would ensure we comply with Section 2222 as well as any other applicable laws, policies, and regulations pertaining to the financial and business area situation.

What role do you envision playing, if confirmed, in managing or providing oversight over the improvement of the financial and business information available to Air Force managers?

I envision playing a key leadership and oversight role if confirmed. I will direct and oversee the activities of the Air Force Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) and Air Force Office of Business Transformation, SAF/MG, in carrying out Air Force business transformation initiatives to improve our financial and business processes, information, and capabilities we provide Air Force managers. My primary objective will be ensuring efficient and effective management of Air Force Business operations. I will motivate actions and efforts from major transformation to leveraging Airmen front-line innovation.

Headquarters Streamlining

The Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act directs reforms to consolidate the headquarters functions of the Department of Defense and the military departments.

If confirmed, what would be your role in streamlining functions, as well as identifying and implementing reductions in the Department of the Air Force headquarters?

One of the Under Secretary of the Air Force duties given me by Secretary James, was oversight of the Air Force inputs to the Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) of the Department of Defense's review of the Department's major headquarters. Secretary James and I agree this involvement, as well my past experience as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Financial Management and Comptroller and Vice Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment on the Joint Staff, position me to effectively chair the internal Air Force group devising options and cost estimates for consolidating and/or eliminating a headquarters.

What areas and functions, specifically and if any, do you consider to be the priorities for possible consolidation or reductions within the Department of the Air Force?

Since 2010 the Air Force reduced its headquarters and support functions costs so as to not cut deeper in mission forces, readiness, and future military capabilities. In 2010,

Secretary Gates gave us a \$1.3B O&M savings target for overhead and support functions spending. To hit this savings target between 2010 and 2012 we cut redundancy in next echelon support functions at regional major commands and their subordinate headquarters and centralized common administrative services. In 2013, Secretary Hagel gave us a \$0.63B O&M savings target for three Air Force components management headquarters spending across a 5-year period. We went beyond management headquarters and planned to save \$ 1.15B O&M across all headquarters and administrative activities over that period. We achieved the major portion of these savings from consolidating and eliminating redundancy between active component headquarters staffs through business process re-engineering for planning, programming, budgeting, and execution (PPBE), acquisition, cyber and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) management as well as installation and mission support. A smaller yet still significant portion was tied to planned force structure reductions in our FY15 budget.

The Air Force has already achieved savings in our headquarters by consolidating responsibilities of Major Commands (MAJCOMs) and Numbered Air Forces (NAFs). However, to achieve more savings than we already have planned, we need to have a reduction in the demand signal from the combatant commands as well as force structure reductions.

To the extent that the Department of the Air Force has functions that overlap with the Department of Defense, Joint Staff, or military departments, what would be your approach to consolidating and reducing redundancy?

One of the observations from the major headquarter activities review led by OSD DCMO is the variance between Department of Defense components on functions done at the headquarters vice units a couple echelons down from the headquarters. With this, we may be able to consolidate certain functions across organizations and divest the workload to lower organizational level units as a cost savings. Additionally, we are engaged in Secretary Carter's review of the 1986 Goldwater-Nichols Act and believe efficiencies are possible in our current joint headquarters structure.

Combat Air Forces Capacity

According to the force sizing construct in the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance and the 2014 QDR, U.S. forces should be able to “defeat a regional adversary in a large-scale multi-phased campaign, and deny the objectives of—or impose unacceptable costs on—another aggressor in another region.”

In your opinion, is OSD's force sizing construct an adequate approach for the Air Force given the dynamics of the current and projected geostrategic and fiscal environments?

Yes, the force sizing construct, which also includes homeland defense and supporting global counter-terror operations, is an adequate approach to address the challenges of the current and projected environment. The dynamic fiscal environment does not change the force required to meet this construct, but does present challenges to the Air Force in how we can best achieve the necessary balance of force readiness, capacity and capabilities

required by the construct.

In your view is the Air Force accepting higher risk with the current strategy; can it execute the strategy, or are increased resources required by the Air Force with regard to airpower capability and capacity?

Yes, increased resources would help the Air Force address this problem and be an appropriate response to the continuous demands placed upon the Air Force. The Joint Force has become dependent on the Air Force to provide air superiority, airborne ISR, precision strike, space-based navigation and surveillance, cyberspace access, rapid global mobility, and the command and control that integrates Joint Force airpower. As a result, capability, capacity, and readiness issues pose a complex problem that could make it difficult for the Air Force – and the Joint Force - to execute the current strategy.

Based on the current defense strategy, defense planning scenarios, and force-sizing construct, what are your views on the ability of the Air Force to meet current and future combatant commander requirements with regard to combat fighter, bomber, and joint enabler force structure capacity?

Today's Air Force is smaller, older, and less ready than at any time in its history. Our sister services have gained some breathing space to reconstitute and modernize after the reduction of land forces in Iraq and Afghanistan; however, after twenty five years of deployments, the Air Force remains engaged in sustained ISR operations around the world, as well as combat air operations in Iraq and Syria. These operations have consumed readiness and prematurely aged combat systems. The Air Force strives to balance capability, capacity, and readiness in order to provide a force that is both sized and shaped to meet the strategy. Absent any additional resources, it will be difficult to meet the demands of future combatant commander requirements with regard to combat fighters, bombers and joint enablers.

Long Range Strike – Bomber (LRS-B)

The Air Force recently awarded the largest development contract in several decades for a new strategic bomber.

In your view, what capabilities does the LRS-B provide in the future that the Air Force doesn't already have in its current bomber force, other than a newer platform?

In the near future, all legacy bombers will have increased mission degradation in contested environments and the AF must develop the LRS-B now to ensure we maintain the capability to counter emerging threats. The LRS-B will provide the ability to penetrate modern air defenses to accomplish objectives despite an anti-access/area denial environment. While providing long range, mixed payload and ability to be highly survivable in heavily defended airspace and attack targets without prohibitive losses, the LRS-B is able to support of national security objectives.

The LRS-B will support the nuclear triad providing a visible and flexible nuclear deterrent capability that will assure allies and partners. Additionally, the LRS-B is one

part of a Family of Systems portfolio—including ISR, electronic warfare, prompt strike, communications, and weapon effects.

Furthermore, the LRS-B is being designed to have an open architecture, able to integrate new technology and respond to future threats across the full spectrum of operations. This emphasizes supportability to enable continued competition and long term affordability for this platform across the life cycle.

Secretary Gates cancelled the previous “Next Generation Bomber” program in 2007 over concerns of cost growth and schedule risk. In your opinion, what steps did the Air Force take with the establishment of the LRS-B program to assuage those concerns?

The guiding principles for the LRS-B program focused on keeping the design simple in order to reduce system and programmatic complexity. This fundamental to this approach is having stable and achievable requirements, and we have kept these stable. We are achieving these requirements by leveraging experience from other programs and through the re-use of existing and mature technologies to minimizing new technology development and risk.

Additionally, the establishment of a firm Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) requirement, not previously done on a major aircraft development program, kept the affordability as a constant focus area and restrained desires to adjust requirements. Other steps taken include LRS-B being designed to have an open architecture, able to integrate new technology and respond to future threats across the full spectrum of operations. This emphasizes supportability to enable continued competition and long term affordability for this platform across the life cycle.

What is your assessment of the acquisition strategy for the LRS-B and how does it provide the best value for the American taxpayer?

From the beginning of the program there has been a focus on the lifecycle costs – manufacturing, sustainment and upgrade potential – to ensure that we could not only develop and procure the LRS-B, but also operate and sustain the platform in the future. The LRS-B program acquisition strategy focused on simplicity, stability, risk reduction/avoidance and affordability across the life cycle of the program. The program is founded on stable and achievable requirements, while requiring the re-use of existing and mature technologies. The acquisition strategy set for a plan for the program to execute a robust risk reduction phase to ensure mature designs prior to a down-select decision. Additionally the program incorporates open architecture, which will allow more rapid integration of new technology and respond to future threats across the full spectrum of operations. This emphasizes supportability to enable continued competition and long term affordability for this platform across the life cycle.

In your view, how does the LRS-B acquisition strategy mitigate previous acquisition program failures such as significant cost and schedule overruns and performance deficiencies experienced with the B-1, B-2, F-22, and F-35 programs?

The guiding principles for the LRS-B program focused on keeping the design simple in

order to reduce system and programmatic complexity. Fundamental to this approach is having stable and achievable requirements, and we have kept them stable. We are achieving these requirements by leveraging experience from other programs and through the re-use of existing and mature technologies to minimizing new technology development and risk.

By using existing and mature technologies, the development risk is reduced from that experienced on previous programs. Overall this ensures achievable requirements and not nested ACAT ID programs. Building on this, the acquisition strategy includes a well thought out incentive plan for development and initial production to ensure the program remains on schedule and budget.

In your opinion, why would the Air Force choose a cost-plus/incentive-fee contract vehicle over a fixed-price contract for the engineering and manufacturing development phase of the LRS-B?

After careful consideration of all possible contract types and analysis of the pros and cons of each type, the Department of Defense decided on a Cost Plus incentive fee arrangement for the Engineering Manufacturing and Development contract, which meets both statutory and regulatory guidance. We conducted risk reduction efforts during the technology development phase, but there is still integration risk that remains. This contract type is an appropriate balance for a new design activity versus upgrade or derivative aircraft program. There were several factors taken into account and the decision was outlined in the Request for Proposal, evaluated during multiple peer reviews and approved by the Milestone Decision Authority.

F-35 Joint Strike Fighter

The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program, which is the largest and most expensive acquisition program in the Department's history, was formally initiated as a program of record in 2002, with a total planned buy of 2,443 aircraft for the U.S. The program has not yet completed the System Development and Demonstration (SDD) phase, and is not due to enter full rate production until 2019, 17 years after its inception. At projected procurement rates, the aircraft would be procured by the Department well into the 2030 decade to reach its total quantity buy.

The Senate Armed Services Committee report accompanying S. 1376, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, requires the Secretary of Defense to assess the current requirement for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter total program of record quantity, and then revalidate that quantity or identify a new requirement for the total number of F-35 aircraft the Department would ultimately procure.

What will be your role in assisting the Secretary of the Air Force to revalidate the Air Force's F-35A total program quantity, currently established at 1,763 aircraft?
The Air Force continually evaluates procurement programs such as the F-35 to determine whether adjustments should be made. Factors such as current and future threat

environments, available resources, and operational requirements are regularly assessed to update/revise our program of record. As Under Secretary, I will work with the appropriate stakeholders to ensure we provide the Secretary a recommended F-35 buy that balances warfighter needs within the context of current budget realities.

Do you believe the Air Force's current and planned force mix of short-range fighters and long-range strike aircraft is sufficient to meet current and future threats around the globe, and most especially in the Asia-Pacific theater of operations where the "tyranny of distance" is such a major factor?

The Air Force is committed to balancing long and short range capabilities in order to meet warfighter requirement in various scenarios. In these scenarios, we find that developing a capability mix of long range, increased payload, and highly survivable fighters and bombers suitable for operations in a highly contested theater is essential to enabling the rest of the Joint Force. In the short term, we'd like to have more penetrating long range capacity to ensure persistent air operations in long range scenarios. That's why the LRS-B is so important. We'll need to continue to address our short term capabilities by integrating new weapons, sensors, and defensive capabilities onto our legacy bomber fleet, and we'll need to make sure the LRS-B remains an affordable augmentation and replacement of our legacy bomber fleet. The Long Range Strike-Bomber (LRS-B) is one part of our commitment to long range capabilities and we are looking at options to both increase the range of our fighter forces and improve the capabilities of our legacy bombers for Asia-Pacific scenarios. However, increased resources will be required to develop such capabilities without taking unacceptable risk in other mission areas.

If the Air Force were to revalidate their original 1,763 F-35A requirement, and continue procurement of even 80 aircraft per year, it will take approximately 20 years to purchase all F-35As. In your opinion, can the Air Force afford this effort in light of KC-46A, LRS-B, JSTARS, T-X, nuclear enterprise modernization, and myriad other investment programs all anticipated to be required simultaneously in the decade of the 2020s?

Our annual budget submissions represent our best attempt at ensuring we achieve these critical mandates. However, given the current and projected future threat environment, the Air Force will require additional resources to simultaneously modernize and sustain existing conventional and nuclear force structure, recapture readiness with additional training facility capacity and manpower, and more expeditiously recapitalize the fleet.

After completion of the SDD and commencement of full rate production, the F-35 will require a robust Follow-On Development program to ensure the aircraft capabilities continue to outpace our potential adversaries' technological advancements.

In your opinion, should the F-35 follow-on development program be designated as a separate Major Defense Acquisition Program from the current F-35 program of record?

The F-35 follow-on development program, now known as the follow-on modernization program, is a continuation of the existing program rather than a new sub program. does

not need to be designated as a separate Major Defense Acquisition Program. The existing management and oversight structure in place for the F-35 Program will be used to manage the follow-on modernization effort.

The different variants of the F-35 for each Service have specific follow-on capabilities required for each, and even common capabilities are prioritized in different ways between the Services depending upon their assigned warfighting requirements. Do you believe the Joint Program Office should be disbanded and each Service stand up their own F-35 program offices to better accommodate the needs of each Service with respect to required follow-on capabilities?

The F-35 Joint Program Office should not be disbanded. The F-35 Program Office is accommodating the needs of the Air Force as we define the required capabilities to be developed during the follow-on modernization phase. In addition, a single program office provides one voice to the contractor and allows the Air Force to share development costs with the Navy and our Partners.

Remotely Piloted Aircraft (RPA) Enterprise Management

The Air Force has struggled for nearly a decade to assimilate and normalize the medium altitude ISR mission and its MQ-1 and MQ-9 fleets into the Air Force capabilities portfolio, resulting in severe manning shortages due to insufficient training pipelines, and causing low retention and poor morale across the enterprise.

In your view, what steps should the Air Force take to remedy these issues?

DOD and Air Force leadership have been personally working solutions to both of these issues and, over the next couple of weeks will be announcing their decisions. I would respectfully request we delay the discussion of this issue until after that has taken place. I would then be pleased to respond in detail.

The U.S. Army operates some of the same medium altitude ISR platforms as the Air Force, uses warrant officers and enlisted personnel to supervise and conduct ISR and strike operations, and are led by very few officers. What is your assessment of the Air Force reintroducing a warrant officer program or using enlisted personnel to operate its RPA fleets to increase manning and reduce costs, as well as relieve manning level stress on other rated career fields?

DOD and Air Force leadership have been personally working solutions to both of these issues and, over the next couple of weeks will be announcing their decisions. I would respectfully request we delay the discussion of this issue until after that has taken place. I would then be pleased to respond in detail.

How do you see the Air Force integrating the medium altitude ISR mission into its future operating concepts?

Both the medium and high altitude ISR missions are already integrated into our operational concepts and are critical to our success in the full spectrum of warfare. The lessons of past 15 years (and beyond) have not been lost on your Air Force and have

proven the importance of the integration of both. Equal, is the importance of the integration of high/medium ISR, space capabilities and cyber, as well as non-traditional ISR, to build complete battlespace awareness.

Management of Space Activities

As the Under Secretary of the Air Force, you would have an important role in helping the Secretary of the Air Force discharge her responsibilities as the Department of Defense Principal DOD Space Advisor or PDSA, in particular, for developing, coordinating, and integrating policy, plans and programs for major defense space acquisitions.

If confirmed, how will you support the PDSA in carrying out her missions?

The Under Secretary is designated as the primary Headquarters Air Force official responsible for space matters. Additionally, the Under Secretary supports the SecAF in all her responsibilities, to include serving as the primary space advisor to senior DoD officials. From an administrative standpoint, this includes reviewing materials, reports and requests to extend experiments prior to PDSA approval. In addition, the PDSA and I continue a pro-active approach to study space concerns and issues through the Space Mission Update process. We collaborate on upcoming policy initiatives and concerns on specific topics, to include rendezvous and proximity operations and international space cooperation, to inform the PDSA's advisory role. Finally, the Under Secretary of the Air Force should be an active participant in the Defense Space Councils (DSCs) and monitor the annual Space Strategic Process Reviews (SPR).

In your view, what are the authorities of the PDSA: (1) the budgets, programs, and plans of the various Service and Defense Agency space programs; and (2) milestone decisions for space acquisition programs of the various Services and Defense agencies?

The PDSA will provide the DoD Space Enterprise with more focused strategic planning and programming in order to respond to present and evolving threats to our Nation's space constellation and capabilities, as well as adversary space capabilities that threaten our forces.

The PDSA has the authority to:

1. Provide the Deputy's Management Action Group (DMAG) and SECDEF with prioritized programmatic choices for space capabilities through the annual Program and Budget Review cycle
2. Provide oversight to the Space Security and Defense Program
3. Actively participate in the Defense Acquisition Board and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and related subordinate bodies, to support tighter alignment of requirements and acquisition decisions with space strategy and space policy
4. Review the budget submission of every entity with responsibilities for space capability development and assess their compliance with National Security Council-approved Implementation Plans and departmental policy and programmatic guidance

5. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the DoD Space Portfolio
6. Conduct collaborative assessments of the National Security Space (NSS) architecture with the Intelligence Community

The DepSecDef has increased the PDSA's authority as the Department's senior space official on all space-related Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and Defense Acquisition Board (DAB). The PDSA or designated senior representative will be present on all milestone decision reviews for space programs.

Per the DepSecDef Designation memo, the PDSA is responsible as the primary space advisor to the Deputy's Management Action Group (DMAG), Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) and the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB), additionally the PDSA is the primary space advisor to senior DoD officials including the Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Office of Secretary of Defense Principal Staff Assistant (PSAs) and the Commander of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Vice Commander of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Additionally, the PDSA is the Principal DoD Space Control Advisor.

As the chair of the Defense Space Council (DSC), the PDSA has expanded the DSC membership to include all DoD elements with space programmatic authorities. This combined with leading an annual Space Strategic Posture Review (assisted by CAPE) with a focus on strategic portfolio-level decisions vice individual programmatic actions.

PDSA is advised and assisted by Service and OSD leads for strategy, space policy, plans, programming, budget, acquisition, architecture assessment and operations. This supports the DepSecDef's vision of a more cohesive and unified governance model.

What are your views regarding defending our U.S. assets in space?

We recognize that space is a congested and contested environment and is a critical element that underpins everything we do in the military. However, the relative superiority the US has held in space power has diminished. Yes, we still project phenomenal capabilities in and through space, but our comparative advantage is threatened by external actors. We must ensure our right to self-defense in any domain, which includes space.

How do you differentiate the Joint Interagency Combined Operations Center (JICSPOC) and how will you ensure it does not duplicate the Joint Space Operations Center (JSPOC)?

JICSPOC seeks to improve unity of effort and information sharing across the national security space (NSS) community to effectively respond to potential future real-world threat events. It does this through experimentation to develop integrated tactics, techniques and procedures (TTPs), courses of action and inform future space command and control and system requirements.

Due to its experimental nature, the JICSPOC does not duplicate the real-world command and control functions performed daily by JSPOC.

Do you support the JSPOC taking on the role as a BMC2 mission center for defending our space assets?

The JSpOC has been successfully conducting command and control of assigned space forces to include defending those assets for over 10 years. The potential threat to our space systems continues to grow. In response, the JICSpOC was developed to conduct experimentation on improving unity of effort across the national security space community. I support this effort as a critical first step to inform decisions on future roles.

Are you concerned with ground system supporting the GPS III constellation (OCX)?

GPS provides a critical warfighter capability and is a ubiquitous worldwide utility. As a result, the current challenges with the OCX program are at the forefront of senior Air Force leadership concerns.

What efforts will you take in ensuring its costs and schedules are being monitored?

The Air Force and the OCX prime contractor (Raytheon) will continue to focus on a more efficient execution of the developmental effort to field this critical capability. In addition, the Air Force is going to take a performance-driven approach by instituting significant oversight with weekly program management reviews and quarterly reviews by USD(AT&L).

Do you support revising the ground system acquisition to a firm fixed price if the program continues to slip?

The current path forward is to continue with the current cost-type contract. The Air Force needs to assure mission success and delivery of this critical warfighter capability. Converting the contract to fixed price would limit the Air Force's insight and oversight of the program and potential loss of focus to provide this critical capability as soon as possible.

Do you support developing a back-up alternative program if necessary in case the current program defaults on its cost and scope?

The Air Force has committed to making risk mitigation investments in alternate program paths to preserve off-ramps should continue problems with OCX prove intractable.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has consistently pointed to fragmented leadership as a key contributor to disconnects in space programs and acquisition problems.

What do you think your role would be, if confirmed, in bringing together the space community versus protecting only the institutional interests of the Air Force?

If confirmed, I certainly will support Secretary James to the utmost of my ability, but is important to understand there is a clear delineation between her role as PDSA and as Secretary of the Air Force. The PDSA construct provides strategic governance and unity of effort across the DoD space enterprise and increased collaboration across the broader

National Security Space enterprise (NASA, Commercial, Civil). In my Air Force position I will represent the Air Force component of that enterprise, just as any other Service or Agency would, to the PDSA. However, once enterprise decisions are made, it is my duty to ensure Air Force aligns with the broader enterprise priorities.

How would you foster better cooperation and coordination with agencies inside and outside the Defense community?

The Defense Space Council (DSC), chaired by Secretary James as the PDSA, continues to serve as the cornerstone for enterprise-wide governance and cooperation. DSD recently directed its expansion, through the addition all NSS stakeholders such as MDA, DARPA and DISA. With an empowered PDSA and comprehensive membership from all aspects of NSS the DSC will continue to set the tone for enhanced cooperation across the enterprise.

The Commander of U.S. Strategic Command (CDRUSSTRATCOM) established the Joint Space Doctrine and Tactics Forum (JSDTF) to improve DoD space by increasing coordination between the DoD and IC. In addition, it will develop the warfighting culture within the NSS and create operational concepts and tactics, techniques and procedures (TTPs) for future space operations. The JSDTF is a two-tiered structure co-chaired by the CDRUSSTRATCOM and the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO). The Forum met several times and spurred a national-level tabletop exercise along with a Joint Publication overhaul that will boost emphasis in the space control mission area. The JSDTF has already yielded benefits in fostering a common culture across National Security Space.

Do you see a need to strengthen the authority of the Under Secretary of the Air Force or to establish any new authority to ensure better government-wide coordination for space?

The Department has already recognized the need to respond to a changing future and the possibility that conflict could expand to space and is taking prudent steps in the focus areas of acquisition, operations, programming, capabilities and governance to ensure an enterprise vice a stovepiped approach to future readiness. The PDSA model is new but already making strides in governance. At this point I think we have the appropriate authorities in place to guarantee a unified effort across all four focus areas.

Do you foresee circumstances in the future that would favor the consolidation and establishment of space forces as a separate service either as its own department or within an existing military department?

I know this question has arisen in many forms over the years. While I will not say it could never happen, I do not see it as a near-term necessity. Space is already integrated into nearly every aspect of our terrestrial warfighting capabilities in all Services. The steps we are already taking toward enhanced governance are appropriate and have DoD space on the correct path. As we continue to enhance our capabilities, and develop our operational concepts through the JSDTF/JICSPOC relationship, that is certainly one potential future; but I believe it is premature to make a definitive statement either way at this time.

Readiness

What is your assessment of the current readiness of the Air Force to meet national security requirements across the full spectrum of military operations?

Our combat coded unit's readiness is assessed against full spectrum military operations. Less than one-half of those units are rated as ready. However, if called upon, your Air Force can present the President with formidable air, space and cyber options to meet almost any crisis.

What is your assessment of the near-term trend in the readiness of the Air Force?

Past year's investments in modernization, force structure, readiness and manpower were predicated on several assumptions. First, that the wars in the Middle East were drawing to a close and our units would be coming home to train, and second, that we would be allowed to reduce force structure to pay for modernization and recapitalization, and to use the manpower to convert to our new aircraft and missions. Neither of those materialized which will challenge us to make any near term improvements in readiness. Training and maintenance manpower continue to drive our low readiness rates.

How critical is it to find a solution to sequestration given the impacts we have already seen to readiness in fiscal years 2013, 2014, and 2015?

Sequestration would result in even more significant losses of readiness and would significantly prolong any recovery, even once full funding was restored.

What is your understanding and assessment of the methods currently used for estimating the funding needed for the maintenance of Air Force equipment?

Air Force sustainment requirements for our aircraft, engines, and other equipment are developed to ensure these systems are safe and operating properly to train to full spectrum missions. This ongoing sustainment includes activities such as periodic inspections and component maintenance. For example, aircraft depot maintenance is accomplished on a cyclical basis to support the life cycle of the weapon system. These maintenance requirements are enduring and underpin Air Force readiness to support the warfighter. Ongoing operations have accelerated maintenance and supply requirements and have challenged us to keep pace. To cope with the high operations tempo we continue to rely on OCO funding.

Given the backlog in equipment maintenance over the last several years, do you believe that we need an increased investment to reduce this backlog?

Past sequestration budgets, resulted in significant backlogs at the depots, parts that are critical to our combat units to regain readiness. We are now funding WSS to the maximum we can execute, but that is still below the requirement.

How important is it to reduce the materiel maintenance backlog in order to improve readiness?

Funding predictability is essential to maintenance and supply planning, and the Air

Force's ability to properly sustain our equipment is essential to readiness. The supply chain and depot workforce require long lead times to posture; therefore, sufficient and stable funding is essential to effectively manage the Air Force's sustainment enterprise.

How important is it to receive OCO funding after the end of combat operations in order to ensure all equipment is reset?

Transferring OCO funding to our baseline is one of the necessary conditions for a full readiness recovery. Major Air Force weapon systems do not have one-time "reset" requirements. The sustainment of these platforms is an enduring requirement and requires a persistent investment. OCO funding to maintain or extend the service life of our platforms, or to accelerate their replacement will be most important. It will also take years of additional OCO funding to replace the munitions inventory we have either depleted or deferred. There are many more instances where OCO funding must continue beyond combat operations, but these are two examples of the most critical.

Nuclear Enterprise Modernization

Following completion of the 2014 Nuclear Enterprise Review, the Air Force established internal processes to track implementation of recommendations and to ensure the sustained focus of senior Air Force leadership.

What are the processes and metrics by which the Air Force measures improvement in the nuclear mission across the Air Force. If confirmed, what would be your role? What shortcomings or gaps continue to exist?

The Air Force continues to work towards strengthening nuclear enterprise assessment processes and developing meaningful metrics to ensure the changes we institute are measurable and enduring. In support of that objective, the findings and recommendations of the Nuclear Enterprise Reviews have assumed a central place in the Air Force's governance process for the nuclear enterprise. Through forums like the Nuclear Oversight Board, chaired by the Secretary and Chief of Staff with participation from all ten major command commanders, I intend to ensure the Air Force continues to apply sustained focus on improving the health of the nuclear enterprise.

Strategic Delivery Systems

Over the next 5 years DOD will begin to replace or begin studies to replace all of the strategic delivery systems. For the next 15 plus years, DOD will also have to sustain the current strategic nuclear enterprise. This will be a very expensive undertaking.

Do you have any concerns about the ability of the Department to afford the costs of nuclear systems modernization while meeting the rest of the DOD commitments?

As a vital component of our national security strategy, I am fully committed to the modernization of our nuclear deterrence forces so they remain credible and effective in the years ahead. Affordability is always a key consideration in managing any major acquisition effort, as is the stability and consistency of appropriations—factors that are

more relevant than ever as DOD commitments and fiscal constraints grow. If confirmed, I am committed to working across DOD and with the Congress to achieve affordable nuclear modernization and sustainment.

If confirmed will you review the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) system to ensure that it uses high technology readiness level technologies, has requirements that do not change after milestone B and is cost effective?

Yes. I am committed to ensuring that affordability, stable requirements, and the use of mature technologies remain cornerstones of the Air Force's strategy to field GBSD.

If confirmed will you work with the Air Force's Global Strategic Command to ensure the GBSD goes through its milestone A review in Fiscal Year 2016?

Yes. The GBSD program remains on track for its milestone A review in Fiscal Year 2016. If confirmed, I will work to ensure the efforts of stakeholders across the Air Force—including elements of Air Force Global Strike Command, Headquarters Air Force, and the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center—remain tightly integrated to keep this critical program on schedule.

If confirmed will you work with the Air Force's Global Strategic Command to ensure the Long Range Standoff Weapon goes through its milestone A review in Fiscal Year 2016?

Yes. The LRSO program remains on track for its milestone A review in Fiscal Year 2016. If confirmed, I will work to ensure collaboration on LRSO remains strong both within the Air Force as well as with our mission partners at the Department of Energy as they work to align development of a life-extended warhead for the LRSO.

Strategic Communications Systems

Section 1052 of the Fiscal year 2014 NDAA established a "Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control and Communications System".

What do you see as the most pressing challenges in nuclear command, control and communications from a policy and acquisition perspective?

Nuclear command and control must be an enduring priority of which one challenge is to sustain existing capabilities until new, modernized capabilities can be fielded. We designated the nuclear command, control, and communications system as a weapon system and assigned Air Force Global Strike Command as the lead major command.

There are significant challenges given the legacy systems that are part of our operational baseline architecture in this area and the cybersecurity vulnerabilities sometimes introduced when applying commercial solutions directly. Walking a line between GOTS and COTS and having the patience and resources to fund potential solutions are the most pressing challenges in NC3. To this end, we must strike a carefully considered, risk managed balance between readiness and modernization. Much of our existing capabilities are supported on platforms which have reached or are nearing end of life and

must be upgraded. Decisions on the timing and prioritization of our sustainment and investment portfolios are a top priority.

What do you see as the most pressing challenges in overall national leadership communications from a policy and acquisition perspective?

The cyberspace domain is a key enabler in providing fully assured national leadership communications capabilities, which depend upon both military and commercial communication systems. The most pressing challenges are competing budget priorities to acquire an efficient and integrated capability as well as system compatibility across the enterprise to address Service-specific requirements. The Air Force will continue to look at options that will enhance interoperability and compatibility of our national leadership communications platforms and systems.

One challenge is to sustain existing capabilities until new, modernized capabilities can be fielded. Another challenge is providing an assured, survivable and enduring communications capability that allows senior defense advisors to communicate with the President, the Combatant Commands and strategic Allies during normal day-to-day operations and during national crises from a fixed, mobile or airborne location. The ability to provide our national leadership secure, reliable voice, video and data communications is a critical capability.

If confirmed will you actively support Section 1052 to ensure the President has at all times control of nuclear weapons?

Yes.

If confirmed will you review the status of the Air Force's support to the NATO nuclear mission and report back to this committee on key findings that are in need of future improvement including personnel and material?

Yes, the Air Force fully supports NATO's nuclear mission, which is a cornerstone of our nuclear assurance. I will review our current efforts to identify possible areas to improve our support. I look forward to working with Congress to ensure the Airmen in Europe have the appropriate resources.

Secretary Hagel's Review of the Nuclear Forces and the Force Improvement Program

In 2014 Secretary Hagel conducted an assessment of the state of nuclear deterrence operations of the Department of Defense, commonly known as the "Creedon – Fanta" report.

Do you agree with its findings?

Yes. To date, we have implemented a number of the Air Force-specific recommendations in both the internal and independent Nuclear Enterprise Reviews. If confirmed, I will continue to implement the remaining recommendations.

How do you think they may be improved upon over the next five years?

If confirmed, I will work to ensure the Air Force continues implementing and tracking Nuclear Enterprise Reviews follow-on actions. Our goal is a systematic and responsive process that will yield tangible and lasting improvements.

Will you actively support the findings and their implementation?

Yes. If confirmed, I will work to promote a culture of critical self-assessment and continuous improvement within the nuclear enterprise.

Will you work with the Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation Office as part of a continual assessment of the Air Force nuclear programs and, if asked, report the status of that to the Congress?

Yes, our continued partnership with the Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation Office is critical to the implementation of Nuclear Enterprise Reviews. This relationship will ensure senior leader focus and accountability remain strong.

Please explain how you interpret the Air Force's Force Improvement Program and what actions will you take to support those efforts?

The Force Improvement Program (FIP) was a 2014 effort intended to address urgent, short-term operational needs. FIP was only one element of a much broader Air Force effort to recapitalize its nuclear enterprise. The FY17 PB reflects the Air Force's commitment to pursuing a comprehensive approach to meeting NDO requirements.

National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force (NCSAF)

In the Air Force's response to the NCSAF recommendation (#42) on Up or Out policy, the Commission recommends, "Congress should amend restrictive aspects of current statutes that mandate "up-or-out" career management policies to enable the Air Force to retain Airmen of all components actively working in career fields where substantial investment in training and career development has been made and where it serves the needs of the Air Force."

In your opinion, would the reinstatement of a warrant officer program in the Air Force attract and keep certain skilled people who are more interested in remaining in a particular career field rather than worrying about additional institutional requirements they must accomplish for promotion in the officer ranks?

The Air Force previously considered reinstating WOs in 2008, 2012 and most recently with regard to RPA pilots in 2015; however, the Air Force believes adding a third category of serving members in addition to officers and enlisted Airmen does not align well with our Air Force culture and our enlisted force development objectives. That said, the Air Force sees value, whether it be through our highly talented enlisted force, adjustments to "up or out," or other mechanisms, such as providing a flexible "technical track" in being able to attract and retain talented Airmen. We recognize not all officers need to be developed the same way and requirements in some leadership tracks may not apply to Airmen in technical tracks. Some of these areas would require legislative

assistance like reform of “up or out,” but others could be pursued today and the Air Force has been investigating multiple options.

Do you believe certain career fields could receive benefit from a warrant officer program in operational or technical positions such pilot training instructor pilots, remotely piloted aircraft pilots, and cyber warfare specialties?

The Air Force is a highly technical force, and we believe our enlisted corps has the technological and leadership capability to perform to the same level of a WO corps without instituting a fundamental change in our NCO developmental and progression. As such, the Air Force is actively exploring the utilization of enlisted members as RPA operators to assist in the long-term development and stabilization of the RPA community. Our enlisted force has already demonstrated this capability within the cyber and space communities. We are also exploring numerous other alternatives (e.g.- “technical track,” “up or out reform”) that will provide capability without having to alter Air Force culture. Another key aspect is to increase “permeability” between our Active and Reserve components, providing increased cooperation within existing resources while leveraging existing talent and capabilities. Finally, we must also factor in the tremendous capability that our civilian force brings throughout the enterprise.

In the Air Force’s response to the NCSAF recommendations, the recommendation (#5) to disestablish the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) is the only commission recommendation with which the Air Force outright disagrees.

Can you provide your views regarding this disagreement?

The Air Force is concerned that this recommendation lacks the research, data, and analysis necessary to disregard six decades of organizational lessons learned and undo congressionally instituted reforms that have led to today’s cost-efficient and mission-effective force for our Nation. This recommendation would also weaken the Chief of the Air Force Reserve’s ability to execute key statutory obligations in the management of congressionally authorized and appropriated resources. It would place at risk the sustained readiness of Air Force Reserve forces, which afford the Nation operational capability, strategic depth, and surge capacity across all Air Force core missions.

If AFRC were not disestablished, in your view does there still need to be what appears as redundant staffs between AFRC headquarters and the staff for the Chief of the Air Force Reserve in the Pentagon?

There are not two, redundant staffs. In accordance with 10 U.S.C. § 10174, the Commander of Air Force Reserve Command also serves as the Component Chief of the Air Force Reserve. As a result of this statutory requirement, he has two distinct roles necessitating a small component staff (~90 Airmen) along with an appropriately-sized major command staff. It is important to note there is no overlap in staff functions.

To your knowledge, do other major commands maintain staffs at both their own headquarters and at the Air Staff?

The Commander of Air Force Reserve Command is, statutorily, also the Chief of the Air Force Reserve. No other major command commander is also a component

commander requiring a component staff.

Audit Readiness

The Department of Defense remains unable to achieve a clean financial statement audit. The Department also remains on the Government Accountability Office's list of high risk agencies and management systems for financial management and weapon system acquisition. Although audit-readiness has been a goal of the Department for decades, DoD has repeatedly failed to meet numerous congressionally directed audit-readiness deadlines.

What is your understanding and assessment of the Air Force's efforts to achieve a clean financial statement audit by 2017?

The AF remains cautiously optimistic that we will be prepared to undergo a full financial statement audit beginning Sept 30, 2017. We have a dedicated Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) team leading this effort, with audit coaching provided by Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC), a recognized audit leader in the federal and private sectors. Our efforts are governed by a cross-functional executive steering committee, and our senior leader's performance plans hold them accountable to a performance standard that supports our FIAR objectives. We actively participate in forums sponsored by OUSD(C), and collaborate with the other components and service providers, to both lead and support the department-wide effort to achieve auditability.

Based on the experience of other federal and private sector audits, it is unlikely that we will immediately receive an unmodified opinion. A review of audits for similar agencies indicates that it takes an average of five to eight years to resolve the findings necessary to receive an unmodified opinion. The entire AF enterprise is engaged to help us exceed this expectation and, as evidenced by our significant progress over the past four years, we will continue to address each audit preparation challenge in accordance with our FIAR plan.

In your opinion, is the Department of the Air Force on track to achieving this objective, particularly with regard to data quality, internal controls, and business process re-engineering?

Yes. The AF is on track to meet the mandate to be audit ready by Sept 30, 2017 and begin a full financial statement audit for FY18. Our audit preparation activities are guided by a comprehensive master plan with regular progress evaluations. In specific reference to data quality, internal controls, and BPR, we have completed control reviews in 50 of 78 systems (25 of 46 are Air Force owned), and have developed corrective action plans (CAPs) for all internal findings. These CAPs encompass data quality improvements and business process re-engineering. Our Schedule of Budgetary Activity (SBA) auditors, Ernst & Young (EY) also produced a list of approx. 180 system findings for us to address, most of which were discovered in our internal reviews. We are confident that we will be able to close or adequately mitigate these findings and remain on track for a full financial statement audit.

If not, what impediments may hinder the Air Force's ability to achieve this goal and

how would you address them?

The Air Force is on track to achieve its objective to undergo a full financial statement audit by Sept 30, 2017. The highest risk areas for audit are (1) reconciling Funds Balance with Treasury, (2) reconciling the universe of transactions, (3) supporting all journal vouchers, (4) substantiating existence, completeness, and valuation for property, plant, and equipment, and (5) strengthening IT system controls.

The Air Force is actively addressing all of these risks. I'm proud to say the Air Force was the first service to receive a favorable opinion on our Funds Balance with Treasury reconciliation, and our process was used as a model for the other services. With the help of DFAS, we reconciled 39/45 universe of transaction systems for our recent SBA audit, with approx. 25 remaining for our full financial statement audit. We accomplished this in just over two years. Following the DFAS model for journal voucher support, we continue to strengthen our documentation, as well as participate in various working groups to eliminate journal vouchers where possible. We achieved favorable opinions on our assertions for the existence and completeness of mission critical assets, we currently have AF/PWC teams conducting asset verification, and we are actively participating in OUSD(C) working groups to determine the department strategy for valuation. As referenced earlier, we have and will continue to develop and implement corrective action plans to eliminate or mitigate our IT control weaknesses.

In your view, are the steps that the Air Force needs to take consistent with the steps that DOD needs to take to achieve full auditability by 2017?

Yes. The Air Force approach to audit readiness is consistent with the Department of Defense. As an active member of the FIAR Governance Board, the Air Force collaborates with other components and functional partners to establish goals, objectives and guidance to produce auditable financial statements for the Department. The Air Force adheres to the guidance published by OUSD(C) which controls the standards for sampling, threshold, and scope to be used during audit readiness efforts. The Air Force shares plans and findings with the other services, and collaborates with them to leverage lessons learned.

What steps will you take, if confirmed, to ensure that the Air Force moves to achieve these objectives without an unaffordable or unsustainable level of one-time fixes and manual work-arounds?

The Air Force has established a governance process to oversee our audit readiness objectives, which is aligned to our Investment Review process, to ensure Senior Leadership oversight across the Air Force enterprise. This governance is aligned to OSD governance to ensure Department-wide integration of efforts to achieve our audit objectives and to avoid stove-piped, unaffordable, and unsustainable fixes. A key element of this governance is the standardization of business processes across the Air Force to ensure they are traceable and auditable. In order to do this, the Air Force implemented a standard set of tools to validate, document, re-use, and sustain the results from our audit readiness efforts, while also ensuring auditability of our Information Technology systems.

Utilizing these standards and tools enables Senior Leader oversight on the corrective action plans being implemented across the Air Force in collaboration with the Army, Navy, and Service Providers throughout the Federal Government. This holistic, enterprise-wide

approach will allow us to determine impacts of business process changes, ensure alignment with the DoD Business Enterprise Architecture, and inform our IT investment decisions. Finally, our strategy will provide a mechanism to encourage culture change, which is necessary for future continuous process improvement, the results of which will also be documented and auditable.

Air Force Information Technology Programs

What major improvements would you like to see made in the Air Force's development and deployment of major information technology systems?

Today our IT systems are hamstrung by legacy processes executed within stovepipe systems that force multi-year budgeting and implementation. These 3-5 year, and often longer, development cycles are not in alignment with best practices nor the pace of technology. Budgeting and requirements processes that focus on operational vice technical requirements, coupled with budgeting processes that enable proven pathfinder efforts to more rapidly acquire and deploy capability is needed. Execution to meet requirements of business processes and the underlying systems is widely distributed across the department, and across Air Force.

A streamlined approach to getting to the Joint Information Environment is needed. Deliberate unified programs of record within the Air Force and across the department will bring to build the enabling framework. We've seen some progress with the Joint Regional Security Stacks, and should continue to improve sound governance to build out the remainder of the transformation plan to leverage common computing environments and cloud based technologies.

How will you encourage process and cultural change in organizations so that they maximize the benefits that new enterprise information technology systems can offer in terms of cost savings and efficiency?

Our Total Force cyberspace workforce continues to transform under the leadership of the Air Force CIO. In addition, the department will soon publish an updated set of policies for how we govern and operate enterprise IT/cyberspace capabilities. We also have several strategic initiatives underway, including formulating a cyber-aptitude test for recruitment, standing up a cyber innovation center at USAF Academy (AFCIC) for workforce and new officer development, and leveraging the new Silicon Valley detachment (Defense Innovation Unit Experimental – DIUx) for commercial technology infusion. I will continue to encourage such initiatives.

We are undertaking a nascent effort to align the Air Force IT governance and requirements processes with the Defense Enterprise Service Management Framework (DESMF). The DESMF takes advantage of commercial best practices to focus organization efforts on the IT services necessary to support mission outcomes. This focus on mission outcomes will enable the implementation of several initiatives recommended by our Task Force Cyber Secure to pay significantly more attention to the cyberspace platform that underpin the execution of our Air Force core missions.

In your view, what is the relationship between Air Force efforts to implement enterprise information technology programs and supporting computing services and infrastructure to support Air Force missions, to the efforts being undertaken by the Defense Information Systems Agency and the Assistant Secretary of defense for Networks and Information Integration?

The Air Force is a full and leading partner with DOD CIO, DISA and our sister Services in the design and implementation of the Joint Information Environment (JIE). The Air Force has provided its extensive expertise garnered from our AF Network (AFNET) consolidation to shape JIE architectures and processes. Consolidating requirements, resources and overlapping operational frameworks with the broader Joint community will enable the Air Force to shift its focus from making capital investments in commodity IT services and capabilities in favor of acquiring these "as a service" from DISA or commercial providers. This partnering with DISA and the Services has highlighted the cultural stubbornness within the AF to release our control of IT services. Our requirements and governance processes must shift to documenting our operational requirements instead of poring over the technical details of how those requirements are met.

Acquisition Reform

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 emplaced myriad changes to defense acquisition processes, including reinserting service chief influence and accountability into acquisition processes.

Do you support the acquisition reform provisions in the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act?

We support the acquisition reform provisions and appreciate the Congressional support. The Air Force needs to focus on our main mission – fighting and winning our nation’s wars. To do this, we must balance current readiness and future modernization of the Air Force. Going forward continued Congressional support will enable the Air Force to build a modernized force that is agile, adaptable, and resilient, capable of once again widening the technological gap between us and the adversary.

What additional acquisition-related reforms do you believe the Committee should consider?

There are a number of acquisition-related reform proposals being considered at the OUSD(AT&L)-level. The proposals focus on workforce improvements, streamlining processes, and fostering innovation. We will continue to support those proposals.

How can the Department and the Air Force better access and integrate commercial and military technology to remain ahead of its potential adversaries?

The current strategic context is marked by rapid change (technological, social, political, economic, and cultural) and the widespread diffusion of commercially available technologies are adding complexity and unpredictability. It is clear our adversaries are trying to leverage technologies to advance their goals. We need to outpace them,

therefore warfighting experimentation and rapid prototyping is a critical methodology to help us achieve strategic agility. The Air Force is doing just that.

It is important to understand that warfare is a human endeavor. Focusing on technology for technology's sake (i.e., using tech transition as a metric) without considering the doctrine, organization, training, policy, and other factors required to provide a complete military capability will result in poor integration of technology. The decisions on what technologies to explore, how they might be employed, and whether to incorporate them into a military capability has to be based on credible analysis backed by quantifiable data, not paper studies and analyses loaded with assumptions.

The most effective and efficient way to accomplish this is by conducting logical, well-thought out experimentation campaigns that bring together the operational community, technologists, systems engineers, and acquirers to understand how new technologies (commercial or from government labs) can best be employed. This will dramatically shorten the fielding cycle and reduce cost, performance, and schedule risks.

To gain better access to commercial technologies, the Air Force is supporting a Better Buying Power 3.0 initiative to inform DoD managers on methods and best practices to engage more effectively with commercial technology companies. Access to the broader technology base, enhances our solution sets to address potential adversary's existing and emerging threats. The Air Force, under Secretary James' Bending the Cost Curve, is also encouraging innovation through active industry engagements to improve the way we procure our systems and drive down cost. One of the major themes of this initiative is expanding competition among traditional and non-traditional industry partners, which then allows for better access to emerging technologies.

Air Force Science and Technology

If confirmed, what direction would you provide regarding the importance of innovative defense science and technology in meeting Air Force missions?

The innovative technology produced by the Air Force Science and Technology (S&T) Program balances high-risk with high-return science and knowledge. If confirmed, the direction I provide would focus on supporting the Air Force capabilities fundamental to providing agile and responsive intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, projecting power in anti-access and area denial environments, operation in space and cyberspace, maintaining a safe, secure and effective strategic deterrent, and integration of operations in all three domains (air, space and cyberspace).

Do you believe the current balance between short- and long-term research is appropriate to meet current and future Air Force needs?

Yes, the future success of the Air Force will depend on continued innovation and technical excellence in our research. We must balance our portfolio across many factors. We must develop technologies across, near-, mid-, and far-term timeframes, across core Air Force mission areas, and between requirements pull efforts to address known

capability needs and technology push efforts to pursue revolutionary technologies. The future strategic environment will require an agile, affordable, and flexible military. Therefore, the Air Force S&T Program must continue to invest in a broad portfolio of research to anticipate future needs and maintain a good balance between: near-term, quick-reaction capability support; mid-term technology development to modernize the force; and revolutionary technologies that address far-term warfighting needs.

What role would you have in helping the Department implement the nascent Third Offset Strategy?

As outlined in the Air Force Strategy, A Call to the Future, I will continue to support the pursuit of game-changing technologies to maintain and advance our technological superiority. The Air Force Research Laboratory maintains awareness of advancing technology and harvests opportunities to inject them into new Air Force capabilities. As part of the Third Offset Strategy, the Air Force is pursuing hypersonics, directed energy, and autonomous systems, to name a few technology areas. I plan to continue to reinvigorate our development planning efforts that will leverage robust experimentation campaigns and evaluate the impact of new capability concepts and offset strategies.

Air Force Laboratories

What role should Air Force laboratories play in supporting current operations and in developing new capabilities to support Air Force missions?

We must prioritize our efforts and balance the allocation of our resources appropriately. To accomplish this, we must clearly understand our warfighter's capability gaps, the potential capability inherent in new technology, and the cost associated with maturing, integrating and transitioning it to the warfighter. For current operations, we must continue to improve processes to rapidly respond to urgent warfighter needs with innovative solutions. We must continue to forge ahead on a path of innovation to achieve strategic agility, breaking paradigms and leveraging technology to design agility and affordability into our capability development. This requires an ever-closer relationship between our research laboratory, operators, and acquisition and requirements communities. These steps will enable effective investment in research programs that will maximize the benefit to the warfighter and ensure the continued national security of the United States.

If confirmed, how will you ensure that Air Force laboratories have the highest quality workforce, laboratory infrastructure, resources, and management, so that they can continue to support deployed warfighters and develop next generation capabilities?

If confirmed, I will actively work with the Air Force S&T Executive, the Air Force Chief Scientist and Air Force Research Laboratory leadership to ensure we maintain a high quality workforce and infrastructure and resource those priorities accordingly. Ensuring the Air Force continues to have war-winning technology requires the proactive management of its current Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) workforce and a deliberate effort to grow the laboratory scientists and engineers of the

future. Those researchers need state-of-the-art laboratory facilities to best support deployed warfighters with ready-to-use technologies and develop next generation capabilities. I will rely on and support the senior leadership of the acquisition community to assess and invest in infrastructure and the workforce necessary to support the future technology needs of the Air Force.

Do you support the full utilization of authorities established by Congress under the Laboratory Personnel Demonstration program?

Retaining the current world-class, highly-skilled workforce is an important part of the Air Force's Bright Horizons STEM Workforce Strategy. I understand that the Laboratory Demonstration program has done much to ensure the Air Force Research Laboratory's ability to attract and retain personnel since its inception in 1997. This flexible system has helped to achieve the best workforce for the mission, adjust the workforce for change, and improve overall quality. If confirmed, I will work with the laboratory leadership to monitor the Laboratory Demonstration program to ensure it remains effective for its primary purpose and propose changes to the program, if they become required. Congressionally-authorized personnel and hiring authorities have greatly helped to improve the Air Force's compensation and hiring abilities.

Do you believe that the Air Force's laboratories and engineering centers should have a separate, dynamic personnel system, uniquely tailored to support laboratory directors' requirements to attract and retain the highest quality scientific and engineering talent?

If confirmed, I look forward to carefully examining the Air Force's experience with the Laboratory Demonstration program and working with the laboratory leadership to determine future needs and authorities for the program. I will also monitor our ongoing expansion of the Acquisition Demonstration program to ensure we continue supporting efforts to recruit, retain and develop a world-class STEM workforce for the Air Force and the Nation.

How will you assess the quality of Air Force laboratory infrastructure and the adequacy of investments being made in new military construction and sustainment of that infrastructure?

I am aware that the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) effort, successfully completed in September 2011, provided several new, state-of-the-art facilities within the Air Force Research Laboratory. While this provided us an opportunity to consolidate and improve many laboratory facilities, the Air Force continues to have prioritized needs for military construction (MILCON) projects in other areas of the Air Force Research Laboratory. I will also ensure we continue to leverage minor MILCON authorities for laboratory renewal and infrastructure sustainment. If confirmed, I will work closely with the leadership of the acquisition community to ensure that we remain vigilant and upgrade our S&T infrastructure in a timely manner, so that major research and programs are not put at risk due to aging facilities.

Are you concerned about the current or future supply of experts in defense critical

disciplines, particularly personnel with appropriate security clearances, to hold positions in defense laboratories?

Yes, I am always concerned about maintaining a solid representation of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) professionals in the critical defense disciplines our laboratories and acquisition enterprise require. Nurturing the next generation of STEM professionals is an Air Force, DoD and national concern. To maintain the U.S. military's decisive technological edge, the Department must be able to recruit, retain and develop a capable STEM workforce in the face of worldwide competition for the same talent. An objective of the Air Force STEM Strategic Communication Plan is to encourage all Airmen to attract tech-savvy students to an Air Force career. The Air Force has successfully used tools such as the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship for service program to accomplish this mission. Over the past eight years, the Air Force has averaged 60 scholarships per year to scientists and engineers. After payback of the recipient's service commitment, the Air Force has retained 88 percent of scholars in Air Force jobs. Additionally, the Air Force's Bright Horizons STEM Workforce Strategy addresses and investigates requirements to attract and retain the right STEM qualified people in the right place, at the right time, and with the right skills.

Test and Evaluation Issues

What do you see as the role of the developmental and operational test and evaluation communities with respect to rapid acquisition, spiral acquisition, and other evolutionary acquisition processes?

The role of the developmental and operational test and evaluation communities is the same as in a normal development.

That role is to:

- Ensure test objectives address operational requirements and concepts
- Ensure requirements are testable
- Ensure test capabilities, including workforce, are adequate and available
- Validate system performance against requirements
- Ensure effectiveness and suitability are assessed in a representative operational environment

What are your views on the appropriate roles of OSD developmental and operational testing organizations with respect to testing of Air Force systems?

OSD should only provide oversight of service testing approaches for major acquisitions and provide the associated congressional reporting. Detailed test management, execution, and reporting should be left to Service test organizations.

Air Force Military and Civilian Personnel Management

Recruiting and Retention

The retention of quality Airmen, officer and enlisted, active-duty and reserve, is vital to the Department of the Air Force.

How would you evaluate the status of the Air Force in successfully recruiting and retaining high caliber personnel?

In all components, the Air Force is meeting its recruiting targets, however the size of the youth market, propensity of high school graduates to serve, and market competition (especially for highly-skilled areas such as aviation/remotely piloted aviation, cyber, engineers and special operators) are all growing concerns.

Overall, the Air Force continues to retain well; however, as the Air Force grows to restore readiness and meet increasing operational demands across the globe, we must address key capability gaps in the nuclear, maintenance, cyber, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance as well as support career fields.

What initiatives would you take, if confirmed, to further improve Air Force recruiting and retention, in both the active and reserve components?

I think it imperative that we look at recruiting and retention from a holistic, or what we routinely refer to as Total Force, perspective. Any approach must address both the active and reserve components' unique roles, capabilities and limitations, but also the interrelationship between the two. More specifically, as part of Secretary Carter's Force of the Future proposals we will work with his staff and the other Services to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of recruiting and accessions. We'll review use of modern data analytics, expansion of non-cognitive testing, digitizing the Military Entrance Processing System (MEPS) process, and examining other enhancements to how we recruit, who we recruit and where we recruit. It is essential that we continue to expand our traditional recruiting pools to gain access to a greater pool of candidates and ensure we recruit the best talent available. Having consistently funded advertising and marketing (cohesive for all accession sources) will ensure national Total Force brand recognition that contributes to recruiting the right people, the right skills, at the right time.

On retention, we must continue our emphasis on compensation, specifically our special and incentive pays to retain Airmen in critical skills. However, retention is about much more than just pay. Maintaining quality of life for our Airmen and their families is imperative. Funding for our Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) and Airman and Family programs is essential to retain and create a culture of resiliency and high morale among Airmen and their families. Last, we must continue to leverage Force of the Future initiatives, to attract and retain talent while mindful of our overall readiness and ability to meet demanding missions worldwide.

Delivery of Legal Services

What is your understanding of the respective roles of the General Counsel and Judge Advocate General of the Air Force in providing the Secretary of the Air Force with legal advice?

Both the General Counsel and the Judge Advocate General (TJAG) have important roles in providing legal advice to the Secretary and senior Air Force leaders. The General Counsel is established within the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force and, subject to the direction and control of the Secretary, serves as the chief legal officer and Designated Agency Ethics Official of the Air Force. The law also provides that TJAG is the legal advisor of the Secretary and of all officers and agencies of the Air Force. These dual statutory roles have been strengthened by the robust working relationship that the General Counsel and TJAG have established between their organizations. The General Counsel and TJAG have a collaborative working relationship in addressing challenging legal issues that face the Air Force, with each maintaining the crucial ability to provide independent legal advice that is vital to the Air Force senior leader decision-making process. If confirmed, I look forward to establishing effective working relationships with both the General Counsel and TJAG.

What are your views about the responsibility of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force to provide independent legal advice to the Chief of Staff of the Air Force?

The Judge Advocate General's ability to provide independent legal advice to the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has been statutorily recognized as essential to the effective delivery of legal services. I share that view. Uniformed attorneys bring another perspective and can provide insight and advice shaped by years of service throughout the Air Force.

What are your views about the responsibility of staff judge advocates within the Air Force to provide independent legal advice to military commanders?

The Judge Advocate General's ability to provide independent legal advice to the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has been statutorily recognized as essential to the effective delivery of legal services. I share that view. Uniformed attorneys bring another perspective and can provide insight and advice shaped by years of service throughout the Air Force.

Judge Advocate General Corps Resourcing

What is your understanding of the current and projected manpower requirements in the Air Force JAG Corps?

The Air Force JAG Corps continuously evaluates emerging mission requirements (e.g., air and space law, cyberspace law, and sexual assault victim representation) to project future manpower demands. The Air Force JAG Corps, based on current mission sets, has sufficient manpower authorizations to meet existing mission requirements, notwithstanding the ongoing discussion regarding the reinstatement of key leadership positions described in the response to question 2 below.

Of note, in March 2015, the Secretary of the Air Force authorized an increase in Air Force JAG Corps manpower authorizations (58 officer positions and 15 enlisted positions) to resource the Special Victims' Counsel Program and other key military justice positions in an effort to enhance the Air Force's capability to combat sexual assault.

If confirmed, will you review the judge advocate manning within the Air Force, including leadership requirements, and determine whether current active-duty strengths are adequate?

I will continue to work closely with the Air Force Judge Advocate Corps' senior leadership to ensure sufficient manning to meet existing and emerging mission requirements. As an example, the Secretary of the Air Force recently provided a report to the Congressional Defense Committees, as directed by the Senate Report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Senate Report 114-49, page 133-34), describing the importance of reinstating three key senior leadership positions (brigadier general positions) within the Air Force JAG Corps.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

What is your assessment of the Air Force's sexual assault prevention and response program?

We are making progress in the right direction thanks to funding and support from Congress, but we still have work ahead of us to combat this crime. Since FY2012, sexual assault prevalence has decreased while sexual assault reporting in the Air Force has increased, indicating the program's progress in both preventing sexual assault and increasing Airmen's confidence in the program. Another indication of Airmen's confidence is the increase in the percentage of unrestricted reports, which is up to 70% from 64% in 2013. Next year, the Air Force will be rolling out a scientifically proven prevention program to the Force; we anticipate great benefits from using this new approach.

What is your assessment of the Air Force's programs to address and prevent retaliation or reprisal against individuals who report sexual harassment or sexual assault?

Our current effort is to understand the scope of the problem and capture data through our Sexual Assault Response Coordinators who review incidents at monthly Case Management Group meetings. Discussing retaliation incidents during our Case Management Group meetings is key to allowing our Commanders to address retaliation incidents through command channels. These meetings are hosted by the installation or host wing Vice Commander and include the SARC, the legal advisor, investigators and unit commanders. The CMG will monitor all reports of retaliation until each case has reached final disposition or the retaliation has been appropriately addressed. What we're finding is that most of the retaliation victims are reporting is when their peers in their unit treat them differently, whether these acts are intended to be retaliatory or are simply misguided with good intentions. I'm not satisfied we've done enough to address retaliation, but we're going to continue to work with DoD and our sister services to get at

this problem.

What do you see as the greatest challenges to the success of those programs? If confirmed what changes if any would you make to improve those programs?

We're making progress by tracking reports of retaliation, but we need to understand what types of incidents Airmen experience as retaliation and why they haven't reported retaliation when they experience it. If confirmed, I will ensure we find actionable ways to use the data we are currently gathering to improve the care we provide to our Airmen.

What is your assessment of Navy and Marine Corps programs and policies to hold individuals accountable for retaliation or reprisal against individuals who report sexual harassment or sexual assault?

A commander has a range of disciplinary tools to hold an Airman accountable for retaliation or reprisal. These options include administrative action, nonjudicial punishment, and court-martial. The commander's decision is based on the specific evidence, facts, and circumstances of the individual case, including the nature or consequences of the misconduct. For example, a complaint of social ostracism by an Airman's peers could result in a less severe disciplinary action than an allegation that an Airman's supervisor has reprisal against an Airman. The Uniform Code of Military Justice and Air Force regulations make it possible for a commander to take disciplinary action against an Airman found to have committed an act of retaliation or reprisal.

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

Giving victims the ability to file a restricted report empowers them to access services and support that are unmatched in the civilian community, without fear of impacting their privacy, reputation, career or any other personal concern. Although restricted reporting limits the service's ability to hold perpetrators accountable, it does allow the Air Force to preserve evidence collected during a sexual assault forensic exam when the victim elects this option. The evidence may be used in support of a future investigation should the victim later decide to change their report to unrestricted. If one of our Airmen is assaulted, we must empower them with choice and control and focus on restoring them to become survivors. Another indication of the success of our efforts is a proportional increase in unrestricted reporting; suggesting Airmen's confidence in the military justice system and overall Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program is increasing.

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

The chain of command is deeply and directly involved in providing support to victims of sexual assault. Even before a specific allegation arises, commanders are responsible for ensuring all Airmen are educated on sexual assault prevention and response. When a commander is notified of a sexual assault allegation, he or she takes immediate steps to ensure the victim's safety and well-being as well as the safety of the accused. Specifically, the commander makes sure that the victim is physically safe, emotionally stable, and being provided assistance from all available resources and agencies, including the SARC, legal office, medical, and chaplain. The commander is also directly involved

in decisions such as if the victim requests an expedited transfer to another location; has the authority to issue a no-contact order or a military protective order; and is specifically responsible for keeping the victim informed on actions being taken on the case. Furthermore, the commander stays informed about the victim's well-being and the status of the case and, in turn, informs the multi-disciplinary Case Management Group to ensure the victim is fully supported. In conjunction with the legal office, the chain of command obtains input from the victim as the case is processed for disposition and adjudication.

What is your assessment of the Department of the Air Force's implementation of the requirement to establish special victim's counsel?

The Air Force led the way with the implementation of its Special Victims' Counsel (SVC) Program on 28 January 2013 as a pilot program within the DoD to combat sexual assault and provide world class response capabilities to victims. Due to the unrivaled success of the Air Force SVC Program, on 14 August 2013, the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) directed each Service establish a special victims' advocacy program. In June 2014 the Program expanded eligibility to children, and the 2016 NDAA expands eligibility to DoD civilians. Since the stand-up of the Air Force SVC Program, SVCs have represented 2,065 victims of sexual assault, and of those 1,063 were represented in courts-martial. Anonymous victim impact surveys reflect an overwhelming positive experience with their SVC representation. Ninety-nine percent indicate that they would recommend an SVC to a victim of sexual assault.

What is your understanding of the adequacy of Air Force's resources and programs to provide victims of sexual assault the medical, psychological, and legal help they need?

The Air Force provides a multitude of legal resources to assist victims of sexual assault. Due to the consistent increase in demand for special victim's counsel and prosecutor services, the Air Force has added additional manpower resources and funding for the program. These positions are currently manned between 60-70%. Once the vacant SVC/SVP billets are filled, the Air Force will be adequately manned to provide legal support to those victims currently eligible for SVC services.

Victims also have a variety of medical and psychological resources available to them. The Air Force Medical Service has trained Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners at every Military Treatment Facility to serve as the medical point of contact post-assault when medical care for the purposes of collecting forensic evidence or assessing and treating medically-related injuries is necessary. Victims are offered mental health support by providers who are expertly trained to deliver both crisis-counseling services and ongoing care often needed when overcoming trauma events.

What is your view of the steps the Air Force has taken to prevent additional sexual assaults both at home station and deployed locations?

In my view, the decrease in prevalence and the increase in reporting are strong indicators that the Air Force's efforts are making progress. The Air Force has built a robust response system that's unmatched in the civilian community, now we will be building on that foundation to initiate a 5-year prevention strategy, which I believe will continue our

progress in eliminating sexual assault from our ranks.

What is your view of the adequacy of the training and resources Air Force has in place to investigate and prosecute allegations of sexual assault?

The Air Force continues to build on the training and resources for the Airmen charged with investigating and prosecuting allegations of sexual assault. Air Force Office of Special Investigation special agents are trained and credentialed at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to conduct felony-level investigations, including of sexual assaults. Air Force judge advocates receive specialized training to partner with OSI agents on sexual assault investigations and to prosecute sexual assault cases. In addition, the Air Force added 24 OSI special agents to focus on sexual assault investigations at certain installations and designated 9 senior trial counsels with advanced training to specialize in prosecuting sexual assault cases. The Air Force has also funded 9 examiners at the United States Army Criminal Investigations Laboratory (USACIL) who work exclusively on testing DNA samples for Air Force sexual assault cases. Even given this current status regarding training for investigators and prosecutors, we risk serious jeopardy to the integrity of our military justice process if we don't focus equally on the resourcing and training of the Air Force defense bar. If military members and the American public begin to believe that our system has lost balance, they will lose faith in the fairness of the system. I believe the training and resources for Air Force defense counsel are currently adequate and I will do my part to ensure they remain that way.

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 has, and should retain, ultimate responsibility for the morale, welfare, good order, discipline, and effectiveness of military units. In the past, commanders have effectively dealt with issues including racial integration, illegal drug use during the Vietnam War, and the repeal of "Don't Ask-Don't Tell". We are ensuring commanders place the same focus and emphasis on sexual assault prevention and response and we hold commanders accountable for the professionalism of the Airmen they command. Every Airman must be treated with dignity and respect, and commanders must have both the incentives and the tools to do so.

In your view, what would be the impact of requiring a judge advocate outside the chain of command to determine whether allegations of sexual assault should be prosecuted?

Creating a separate, external function for prosecutions of sexual assault risks severe negative consequences from constraining commanders' authority and responsibility to hold Airmen accountable. Currently, the commander, supported by his or her staff judge advocate, plays a pivotal role in the military justice system, which is the essential tool to deliver a disciplined Air Force ready to defend the nation. Air Force commanders and their lawyers agree on the appropriate disposition in over 99% of cases where the staff judge advocate recommends trial by court-martial. Outsourcing military justice decisions to external lawyers diminishes the authority of commanders and cannot achieve optimal military discipline. Furthermore, removing commanders from military justice decision making sends the confusing message to Airmen that you can trust your commander to

send you into battle, where your commander's decisions may require your ultimate sacrifice, but you cannot trust your commander to hold an Airman accountable for committing a crime. This message is more than just confusing; it degrades Airmen's trust and confidence in their commanders and, in turn, degrades the military discipline necessary to accomplish the mission of national defense.

What additional steps would you take, if confirmed, to address the problem of sexual assaults in the Air Force?

I will ensure we continue to properly resource this program with money and manpower at all echelons. We are making progress in the right direction, and the new five-year prevention and response strategy Secretary James recently signed will continue to build on our successes. The true key to defeating this crime is to prevent perpetration of it, rather than continue to respond to victims of it, and the scientifically-based approach to prevention we will take over the next five years will help eliminate this crime from our ranks.

Balance Between Civilian Employees and Contractor Employees

The Air Force employs many contractors and civilian employees. In many cases, contractor employees work in the same offices, serve on the same projects and task forces, and perform many of the same functions as federal employees. Both contractors and civilians make up an integral part of the Department's total workforce.

Do you believe that the current balance between civilian employees and contractor employees is in the best interests of the Air Force?

I do believe we must continue to ensure that inherently governmental functions are performed by organic personnel and scrutinize those areas where the distinction is blurred. If confirmed, I will continue to work with the Secretary and leaders across the Air Force to assess this matter to ensure compliance with the law and strive to develop the optimum balance between our civilian and contractor workforce.

In your view, has the Department utilized contractors to perform basic functions in an appropriate manner?

Yes. Contractors are integral to how the Air Force accomplishes its mission for the security of our nation. Through our requirements review process, we continue to challenge ourselves in determining the best approach (a value consideration business case) for the Air Force in the long term. I believe there continues to be a great effort in this area to ensure we maintain the capability in performing our core functions and ensure the functional expertise to properly oversee contract operations.

Do you believe that the Air Force should undertake a comprehensive reappraisal of "inherently governmental functions" and other critical government functions, and how they are performed?

I believe the Air Force does a good job in avoiding contracting for inherently governmental and critical functions, and we should maintain that vigilance.

Are there non-monetary reasons why the Air Force would need or desire one type of manpower over the other? If so, provide relevant examples where of those reasons? Under what circumstances should cost be used as the primary factor?

Generally, outside of inherently governmental and critical functions, cost should be the tipping factor assuming that there is a choice between contract and civilians. There are instances where one or the other of those may not be available at a given location or within a given timeframe. There are also instances where we should maintain a certain level of in-house capability, expertise, and knowledge which could potentially override costs.

If confirmed, will you work with other appropriate officials in the Air Force to review the contractor and civilian force mix for cost and mission effectiveness?

Yes, I will.

Would you agree that the balance between civilian employees and contractor employees in performing Air Force functions should be determined by the best interests of the Air Force and its mission requirements?

Yes, I will.

If confirmed, will you work to remove any artificial constraints placed on the size of the Air Force's civilian and contractor workforce, so that the Air Force can hire the number and type of employees most appropriate to accomplish its mission?

Yes, I will.

Women in Combat Integration

Do you believe Congress should amend the Selective Service Act to require the registration of women?

I definitely see the need for SSA participation to be actively reviewed, but recognize that this is a national issue that extends past departmental policy.

If women become subject to the draft, should they also be prepared for involuntary assignment based upon the needs of the Air Force?

The Air Force routinely considers the desires of all our members with respect to which occupation they are classified in and where they are assigned, but the needs of the Air Force remain paramount to maintain our mission readiness. That would remain consistent if women were subject to the draft.

What is your opinion on whether men and women in the combat career fields should have the same physical fitness tests for the duration of their careers?

The Air Force's physical standards are linked to specific air force specialty codes and are tied to the operational mission ... they are gender neutral. I support this approach of linking standards to operational tasks, devoid of gender considerations. I would also note, that AF standards have not changed, and will not change based on career fields opening to both genders. Our current predictive tests and standards have been validated to

tie to occupational standards. The same standard will be used to assess females as well as males. Specifically, in regard to combat career fields, the Air Force has validated and verified occupational standards based on battlefield requirements and the Air Force plan requires the physical and mental standards for Battlefield Airmen specialties be occupationally specific and operationally relevant.

In light of Secretary Carter’s decision to open all military positions to women, what do you believe are the primary challenges to implementing full integration in the Department of the Air Force and how do you plan to address them?

The Air Force has already developed and validated their mental and physical standards as being gender neutral and in-compliance with public law. Going forward, my role would be to ensure the Air Force implements and maintains these physical and mental standards in compliance with Public Laws 103-160 and 113-66, and Public Law 113-291, Section 524. In addition, I will help ensure the Air Force Inspector General is also engaged to validate the physical and mental occupational standards and our implementing methodologies are in compliance with the Public Laws mentioned, at a minimum of every three years through compliance inspection programs.

We must continue to be deliberate, methodical, evidence-based, and iterative to ensure readiness and combat effectiveness to protect the welfare of our Airmen. Through this, the Air Force will follow its natural timeline to recruit, assess, select, train and assign females into these newly opened occupations.

Maternity Leave

The Secretary of the Air Force recently announced she would follow the Navy Secretary’s plan to provide 18 weeks of maternity leave for Sailors.

What is your view on whether the Air Force should follow the Navy’s policy to extend maternity leave to 18 weeks?

The Air Force is reviewing the policy for maternity leave in conjunction with OSD and the other Services in light of the Navy’s recent policy change. Readiness and operational impacts have been an integral part of that discussion and have been considered. The Secretary has been very clear in her support of expanded maternity leave as a key aspect of meeting retention goals and maintaining top talent.

If the Air Force were to follow the Navy’s lead, what would be your plan to augment or back-fill those positions occupied by female Airmen on extended maternity leave? Would you consider utilizing reservists to back-fill those positions?

The Air Force would look at a variety of options. Planning and scheduling at the unit level is an important factor in being able to mitigate some of the potential impact. Other options could include increasing end strength; use of reservists, temporary contract support, detailees from other units, or other management actions such as transferring workload within the unit.

In your view, how would the Air Force account and pay for the cost of additional

personnel to fill positions left vacant by Airmen on extended maternity leave?

There is an associated cost, but we also currently have significant costs associated with decreased retention, increased accession and training requirements and lost expertise. While not directly linked, our request for military end-strength growth will also assist in minimizing the operational impact to a force that is already stretched thin.

Do you support uncharged paternity leave for male Airmen? If so, how many weeks do you believe is an appropriate amount of time?

As with maternity leave, paternity leave is also under active consideration (as are other forms of “parental leave” (adoption, single parent etc.) In conjunction with OSD and the other Services, we must fully consider all aspects of each proposal, to include the operational impact. The specific proposal and timelines are still being discussed. Changes to this leave category would require legislation to adjust the current law.

Do you believe the Air Force fully understands what the cost of this reform will be? If so, describe those costs.

Extending maternity leave from 6 to 18 weeks will cost approximately 937 lost man-yrs. or \$113 M annually. In addition to the fiscal cost, there is also a cost in terms of operational capability. This will vary by unit and specialty code depending upon the number of women in the respective career field or unit. As such, it is important to be able to take a flexible approach and provide as many options for commanders to deal with their respective impacts.

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation

If confirmed, what challenges do you foresee in sustaining Air Force MWR programs in the future fiscal environment?

Taking care of people remains Air Force’s number one priority and robust MWR programs are paramount to achieving mission success. MWR programs are essential in supporting USAF’s objectives of “Building and Maintaining Ready, Resilient Airmen & Families.” Continuous constrained budgets undoubtedly tax our ability to provide the funding needed; however, Air Force leadership remains committed to holding the line on sufficient support to help meet total force quality of life needs. MWR Programs are the right investment for Airmen and their families, even in times of scarce resources, as they are directly tied to resilience, morale and ultimately readiness/mission performance.

Military Health Care

In your view, what should the Air Force Medical Service do to improve access to care in its medical treatment facilities?

The Air Force Medical Service has taken several important steps this year to improve access to care and those steps are having a positive impact. Examples include simplified appointing schedules and a policy to grant access upon the first contact with the patient. The Surgeon General has identified additional measures such as reduction of

staffing gaps during personnel transitions that will further improve access to care. I will work with the Surgeon General to ensure our staffing and scheduling processes meet the demand of the populations we serve.

If confirmed, how would you work with the Surgeon General of the Air Force to improve the healthcare experience for Airmen and their families?

In addition to providing great access to care, the Surgeon General's Trusted Care initiative is a comprehensive approach to preparing our medical professionals to provide reliably safe, patient-centered care. We are building an action plan that includes tiered developmental education and training to ensure our people are skilled and knowledgeable in streamlining processes to improve the experience of care and leading a culture of safety. The Surgeon General has implemented a new performance management system that measures patient satisfaction as well as quality of care. I will work with the Surgeon General to ensure these initiatives move forward for the benefit of those we serve in our military treatment facilities and at our deployed sites.

Family Readiness and Support

Airmen and their families in both the active and reserve components have made, and continue to make, tremendous sacrifices in support of operational deployments. Senior military leaders have warned of concerns among military families as a result of the stress of deployments and the separations that go with them.

What do you consider to be the most important family readiness issues for Airmen and their families, and, if confirmed, how would you ensure that family readiness needs are addressed and adequately resourced, especially in light of current fiscal constraints?

Taking care of people is the Air Force's number one priority. The most important family readiness issue for Airmen and their families is investment in Airmen and Family programs and the MWR Portfolio. MWR and family programs have a direct impact to retention, resiliency, and readiness. Understanding the current and future budget constraints, we must fund Airmen and family programs with the greatest impact to retention, resiliency and readiness. Doing so builds a "community" of Airmen and families not just working for the Air Force, but who are Air Force Members. Funding programs centered on Airmen and Families creates "touch points" that strengthen our sense of Air Force community. There is no stronger impact to success than Airmen who are able to focus on the mission because they know the family back home is part of a close-knit community.

Suicide Prevention

The numbers of suicides in each of the Services continue to be of great concern to the Committee.

If confirmed, what role would you play in shaping suicide prevention programs and policies for the Department of the Air Force to prevent suicides and increase the resiliency of Airmen and their families?

I would take an active role in supporting the development of an Air Force integrated prevention strategy focused on suicide, sexual assault, substance abuse and family member maltreatment. The AF Suicide Prevention Summit held in September brought together the foremost subject matter experts from across DoD, Federal agencies and academia to address this critical issue and generated a strong strategy to reverse the rising trend. I am committed to moving forward with a comprehensive action plan and working collaboratively with the Defense Suicide Prevention Office (DSPO) and other Services to significantly reduce the frequency of suicide in our force. I will also ensure the Air Force continues to actively research means of more effectively mitigating risk for suicide within the force, including continued progress toward a resilient culture of Airman through Comprehensive Airman Fitness.

Support for Wounded, Ill, and Injured Airmen

Servicemembers who are wounded or injured in combat operations deserve the highest priority from the Air Force and the Federal Government for support services, healing and recuperation, rehabilitation, evaluation for return to duty, successful transition from active duty if required, and continuing support beyond retirement or discharge.

What is your assessment of the progress made by the Air Force to improve the care, management, and transition of seriously ill and injured Airmen?

We continue to keep care for our Wounded, Ill and Injured (WII) at the forefront, and are making steady progress in elevating that care. We have created Care Management Teams to guide our WII through their recovery and transition, and the synergy and focus these teams provide are increasing support for our WII Airmen and their families. Even so, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force and I are assessing WII Airmen program outcomes in an effort to strengthen our support even more as we look to the future.

If confirmed, are there additional strategies and resources that you would pursue to increase the Air Force's support for wounded Airmen, and to monitor their progress in returning to duty or to civilian life?

The Air Force A1 and SG teams will continue to collaborate closely to ensure our WII receive the highest level of support possible by applying medical care advancements and maintaining our capability to grow our capacity if the need arises.

Senior Military and Civilian Accountability

While representative of a small number of individuals in DOD, reports of abuses of rank and authority by senior military and civilian leaders and failures to perform up to

accepted standards are frequently received. Whistleblowers and victims of such abuses often report that they felt that no one would pay attention to or believe their complaints. Accusations of unduly lenient treatment of senior officers and senior officials against whom accusations have been substantiated are also frequently heard.

What are your views regarding the appropriate standard of accountability for senior civilian and military leaders of the Department?

The success of our Air Force depends on Airmen having complete trust and confidence in one another. Each of us must live by our core values of Integrity First, Service Before Self and Excellence In All Do. As senior leaders we must maintain the highest levels of adherence to these values.

If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure that senior leaders of the Air Force are held accountable for their actions and performance?

As senior leaders in our world's greatest Air Force, we must be held to the highest levels of accountability and professional conduct. We must also ensure that we create a safe and respectful environment for all our Airmen. If confirmed, I will ensure that results of investigations are taken seriously and given full review and that appropriate administrative, disciplinary, and/or legal action is taken where necessary.

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, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Under Secretary of the Air Force?

Yes.

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

Yes.

Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of

communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted Committee, or to consult with the Committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Yes.