Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

DOD Security Cooperation: An Overview of Authorities and Issues

‚name redacted,
Research Assistant

‚name redacted,
Specialist in International Security Affairs

August 23, 2016

Congressional Research Service
7-....
www.crs.gov
R44602

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

DOD Security Cooperation: An Overview of Authorities and Issues

Tables

Appendixes

Contacts

Introduction

Over the past decade, the increasing scope, pace, and cost of Department of Defense (DOD) security cooperation missions have raised many questions about appropriate DOD and State Department roles and responsibilities in and the utility of such efforts. For some policymakers, DOD's new and expanded missions enable the United States to meet the challenges of the complex global security environment more effectively. As such, congressional approval of new DOD security cooperation statutes represents a necessary response to perceived shortcomings of the overarching legal regime through which, for more than 50 years, Congress has largely authorized and funded the State Department to lead and DOD to administer security assistance to foreign countries. Other policymakers, however, question whether DOD's growing emphasis on and authority to conduct security cooperation missions undermines the State Department's lead role in assisting foreign security forces and "militarizes" U.S. foreign policy.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Congress has given DOD increasing authority to conduct a wide array of security cooperation programs under Title 10 of the *U.S. Code*, which governs the organization and operations of DOD and U.S. military forces, as well as through the annual National Defense Authorization Acts. DOD may conduct activities such as training, equipping, and otherwise supporting foreign military forces to fight terrorist groups or to enable them to participate in coalition or other operations. DOD may also conduct humanitarian assistance, military and government educational programs, and other initiatives to assist foreign militaries, as well as their governments and populations. Such activities are intended to encourage better relations between DOD personnel and representatives from foreign militaries, governments, and populations.

This report provides a general overview of current DOD Title 10 authorities to assist foreign governments, militaries, security forces, and populations funded by the DOD budget. It presents background information on the evolving DOD security cooperation mission and the recent development of the statutory framework through which DOD conducts security cooperation activities. It provides summary overviews of nine categories of security cooperation assistance and activities, including the amounts of congressionally authorized funding, where available, and any legislatively required State Department input.[1] It discusses recent issues related to the development, implementation, sustainment, and coordination of security cooperation to support continuing congressional oversight. Two tables in the appendix provide information on current Title 10 security cooperation authorities. The first catalogs current security cooperation authorities, noting legislative mandates for State Department input and notification and reporting requirements. The second provides a snapshot of authorized and/or appropriated funding levels for select security cooperation authorities.[2]

Congress has several avenues of influence in the design, implementation, and oversight of U.S. security cooperation activities. Congress determines which activities and operations will be conducted, and it provides input on the selection of recipient countries, organizations, and groups. It defines the division of labor between DOD, the State Department, and other agencies, including

[1] This report uses congressionally authorized funding amounts, where available. DOD has not made available any reliable estimates on obligations or expenditures by total or category.

[2] Not all Title 10 and NDAA authorities have funding levels specified by authorization and/or appropriations legislation. Funding for some security cooperation authorities may be subsumed under a larger budget category or simply drawn from the defense-wide operations and maintenance budget, making identification of funding levels for difficult.

specifying the modes of interagency collaboration. It determines the levels of assistance and appropriates funds. In addition, Congress sets conditions on how the funds may be used and, through its committees, oversees security cooperation activities by instituting reporting and assessment requirements.

Terminology: Security Assistance and Security Cooperation

"Security assistance" and "security cooperation" are two terms that refer to U.S. activities to train, equip, and otherwise assist foreign partners. The term security assistance is a generic term used throughout the U.S. government to describe assistance provided to foreign military and security forces, regardless of the agency providing that assistance. However, DOD uses the term security assistance to refer specifically to assistance provided under Title 22 authority, funded with monies appropriated to the State Department and managed by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), an agency under the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Policy.[3]

DOD defines "security cooperation" as a broad set of activities undertaken by DOD to encourage and enable international partners to work with the United States to achieve strategic objectives. Included in the definition are DOD interactions with both foreign defense and foreign nonmilitary security establishments. Security cooperation includes all DOD-administered security assistance programs that (1) build defense and security relationships that promote specific U.S. security interests, including all international armaments cooperation activities and security assistance activities; (2) develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations; and (3) provide U.S. forces with peacetime and contingency access to host nations.[4] According to DOD, security assistance is a subset of DOD's security cooperation portfolio.

Authority for DOD to conduct security cooperation activities is enacted in two primary places: Title 10 (Armed Forces) U.S.C. and National Defense Authorization Acts.

Background

The DOD role in U.S. assistance to train, equip, and otherwise support foreign military (and at times other security) forces has evolved over recent decades. Since military aid became a major component of U.S. foreign assistance to counter the rise of the Soviet Union after World War II, the State Department has historically exercised the lead in security assistance activities.[5] Since 1961, Congress generally authorized military and other security assistance under Title 22 of the *U.S. Code*, funded it through the State Department budget, and charged the Secretary of State with responsibility to provide "continuous supervision and general direction" to ensure its coherence with foreign policy.[6] With certain exceptions, security assistance was largely a secondary DOD mission.

[3] There is no State Department-issued definition for security assistance. The State Department's congressional budget notification identifies six budget accounts that fall under "International Security Assistance." DOD defines security assistance as a group of State Department programs authorized by the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) and the Arms Export Control Actor of 1976 (AECA). For additional information on the terminology associated with security assistance and security cooperation, see CRS Report R44444, *Security Assistance and Cooperation: Shared Responsibility of the Departments of State and Defense*, by (name redacted) .

[4] DOD Directive 5132.03, "DOD Policy and Responsibilities Relating to Security Cooperation," October 24, 2008.

[5] For additional information on the historical evolution of roles and responsibilities, see Appendix B of CRS Report R44444, *Security Assistance and Cooperation: Shared Responsibility of the Departments of State and Defense*, by (name redacted) .

[6] Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (P.L. 87-195, Section 622(c) (22 U.S.C. 2151 et. seq.). A major exception was during the Vietnam War, when funding for Vietnamese and other friendly Southeast Asian forces was provided in the DOD budget and civilian input appears to have been provided as part of overall White House and/or (continued...)

Beginning in the 1980s, Congress began to expand gradually the scope and character of the statutory framework by authorizing DOD to directly train, equip, and otherwise assist foreign military and other security forces through new provisions in annual NDAAs, some codified to Title 10 of the *U.S. Code*. Following the September 11th attacks, U.S. government periodic planning documents indicated that the changing security environment presented a new set of challenges.[7] Instead of combating nation-states, the U.S. military would increasingly face networks of non-state actors in areas where the United States was not necessarily conducting combat operations. To achieve success in these areas, successive Administrations judged that countering decentralized networks of violent extremists would require long, complex operations involving the U.S. military, other government agencies, and international partners.[8] Accordingly, many in DOD and elsewhere maintained that the U.S. military needed to adopt an indirect approach that increased partner capacity (better known by the term "building partner capacity," or BPC) for a variety of purposes, to include: the more effective prosecution of counterterrorism operations, increasing the capacity of states to manage their own regional security challenges in order to prevent an eventual U.S. or international crisis intervention, and as an exit strategy for post-9/11 military campaigns.[9] To implement such concepts, DOD requested that Congress grant new authorities to build the capabilities of partner nations and enhance interoperability with U.S. forces, some of which Congress granted.

As Congress provided DOD with more authority to address such emerging challenges, however, DOD identified statutory and institutional challenges in the development and implementation of programs authorized by the growing number of security cooperation authorities. In the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), DOD stated that U.S. security is "inextricably tied to the effectiveness of our efforts to help partners and allies build their own security capacity."[10] Security cooperation efforts, however, remained "constrained by a complex patchwork of authorities, persistent shortfalls in resources, unwieldy process, and a limited ability to sustain such undertakings beyond a short period."[11] In addition to the challenges posed by the existing patchwork, the 2010 QDR concluded that initiatives to develop the security sectors of partner nations required "comprehensive, whole-of-government programs and activities, but the current patchwork of authorities incentivizes piecemeal, stove-piped approaches."[12] Similarly, the 2011 National Military Strategy (NMS) concluded that to improve the effectiveness of security

(...continued)

ambassador-level oversight. The United States began providing substantial military and other security force aid during the early years after World War II. Prior to the adoption of the FAA, such assistance was provided under Mutual Security Act legislation, for which the President generally assigned oversight responsibility to the Secretary of State. For about four years in the 1950s, however, White House officials, including U.S. ambassadors for some of this period, provided program direction and oversight.

[7] See The White House, *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, 2002; Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review*, 2006; Department of Defense, *National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism*, 2006; Department of Defense, Quadrennial *Defense Review*, 2010; Department of Defense, *National Military Strategy*, 2011.

[8] Department of Defense, *National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism*, 2006, p. 13.

Former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates noted that addressing such security threats in unstable states that lack effective institutions to govern or provide security and would be "the main security challenge of our time." See Robert M. Gates, "Helping Others Defense Themselves," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 89, no. 3 (May/June 2010).

[9] For addition information on BPC, see CRS Report R44313, *What Is "Building Partner Capacity?" Issues for Congress*, coordinated by (name redacted) .

[10] Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review*, 2010, pp. 73-74.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

assistance, comprehensive reform was needed, including "more flexible resources" and "less cumbersome processes."[13]

In an effort to improve U.S. efforts to enhance the security capacity of allies and partner nations, in 2013, the Obama Administration issued Presidential Policy Directive (PPD) 23. PPD 23 mandated improvements in the ability of the United States to "enable partners in providing security and justice for their own people and responding to common security challenges," and outlined policy guidelines to improve the U.S. government's "capacity to plan, synchronize, and implement security sector assistance through a deliberate and inclusive whole-of-government process that ensures alignment of activities and resources with our national security priorities."[14]

As efforts to implement PPD-23 unfolded, DOD stressed in the 2014 QDR the continuing importance of security cooperation programs. DOD stated that one of its priorities for the 21st century is establishing innovative partnerships and enhancing key alliances and partnerships. In line with this strategy, DOD stated that counterterrorism efforts would place a stronger emphasis on building partnership capacity, especially in fragile states, while maintaining a robust capability for direct military action. In a fiscal environment calling for increased austerity, DOD concluded that employing partnerships and innovative approaches, such as security cooperation activities, would continue to be an integral part of maintaining U.S. global leadership.[15]

Since the last QDR, challenges that have arisen from Russia and China are shifting attention toward building partner capacity to meet threats in addition to counterterrorism. Some analysts expect that a variety of security cooperation activities will accompany BPC efforts in Europe and the Pacific in the coming years. In line with this effort, the 2015 NMS identifies military engagement and security cooperation as a joint force prioritized mission.[16]

Challenges and Gaps in the Current Statutory Framework

As DOD's security cooperation responsibilities and authorities have multiplied, general agreement has emerged that the statutory framework has evolved into a cumbersome system.[17] In particular, the statutory framework is seen to be difficult to navigate, and that it sometimes hampers the timely development and implementation of DOD security cooperation programs. Although in some cases DOD conducts entire programs under one authority, in many others DOD must draw on multiple authorities to conduct a single program. The need to draw together multiple authorities to conduct one program can present the following difficulties:

[13] In addition, the NMS called for the adoption of authorities that would allow for a "pooled-resources approach" and encourage "complementary efforts across departments and programs, integrating defense, diplomacy, development, law enforcement, and intelligence capacity-building activities." Department of Defense, *National Military Strategy of the United States*, 2011, pp. 15-16.

[14] These priorities include the following: ensure consistency with broader national security goals; foster U.S. government policy coherence and interagency collaboration; build sustainable capacity through comprehensive sector strategies; be more selective and use resources for the greatest impact; be responsive to urgent crises, emergent opportunities, and changes in partner security environments; ensure that short-term interventions are consistent with long-term goals; inform policy with rigorous analysis, assessments, and evaluations; analyze, plan, and act regionally; and coordinate with other donors. The White House, "Fact Sheet: U.S. Security Sector Assistance Policy," April 5, 2013.

[15] Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review*, 2014, VII-12.

[16] Department of Defense, *National Military Strategy*, 2015, p. 11.

[17] See RAND, *From Patchwork to Framework: A Review of Title 10 Authorities for Security Cooperation*, 2016.

- Difficulty aligning and allocating resources towards the full range of DOD strategic priorities.
- A loss of strategic focus due to the time and resources required to navigate the many authorities needed to deliver capabilities such as equipment, training, and logistical support to combatant commands (COCOMS).
- Unpredictability in program execution due to program delays or cancellations caused by inconsistent requirements for State Department input among the various authorities, and thus the need to coordinate with multiple offices, possibly with different response times.

Program development and implementation problems stemming from the use of multiple authorities may be exacerbated by

- insufficient spending timelines for certain security cooperation authorities,[18] and
- staffing problems such as high levels of staff turnover, limited training, and insufficient numbers of personnel.

Interagency coordination and congressional oversight may be complicated by

- inconsistent definitions and practices involving concurrence, consultation, and coordination mechanisms between DOD and the State Department;
- inconsistent notification and reporting requirements; and
- insufficient numbers of State Department personnel to coordinate with DOD on security cooperation activities where required.

In addition, defense analysts have perceived several gaps in DOD authorities. These include a lack of authority to[19]

- sustain partner nation capabilities and equipment gained through U.S. security cooperation programs;
- conduct snap training exercises with foreign partners to respond quickly to provocative actions taken by hostile actors; and
- rapidly provide inexpensive, general-purpose military equipment, such as uniforms and other personal gear, small arms, ammunition, and common supplies and replacement parts.[20]

Also needed, according to some defense analysts, are

- coherent authority to conduct large-scale activities;

[18] RAND, *Review of Security Cooperation Mechanisms Combatant Commands Utilize to Build Partner Capacity*, 2013, p. 69. Hereafter referred to as RAND, *Review of Security Cooperation Mechanisms*. RAND recommends that DOD request authority to lengthen the time period for certain Title 10 security cooperation authorities and funding to a minimum of three years "to enable effective institutionalization of capabilities."

[19] RAND has identified additional gaps in the current framework. They include a lack of authority for building cyber capability; difficulty sharing information with foreign forces on issues of ballistic missile defense (BMD); limits in some authorities on working with interior agency forces or other gendarme or civil authorities to address emerging transnational threats or other missions; and lack of mechanisms for training and equipping regional organizations. See Rand, *From Patchwork to Framework: A Review of Title 10 Authorities for Security Cooperation*, 2016.

[20] RAND, *Review of Security Cooperation Mechanisms*, p. 67.

- authority to address emerging threats in the maritime domain other than counterterrorism; and
- broad authority to conduct counterterrorism training, particularly training that constitutes preventive action.[21] (Although there are two Title 10 authorities under which DOD may conduct counterterrorism training, these authorities are limited to situations where there is an emerging threat.)

Coordination of Authorities and Resources

Combined exercises and support for coalition forces are two of the missions that draw on multiple authorities, each with its own coordination processes and funding timelines, which may lead to delays and sometimes cancellations. For instance, DOD officials state that a recent U.S. European Command naval combined training exercise required eight authorities, which made program implementation and coordination among participants difficult. U.S. military efforts to train, equip, transport, and sustain Georgian military forces to assist the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan required multiple authorities and funding streams from FY2010 through FY2012 (during which $46.2 million was spent), which led to unanticipated problems and delays throughout the multiyear process.

Overview of DOD Security Cooperation Authorities

Congress has provided DOD with, by CRS's estimate, more than 80 separate authorities to assist and engage with foreign governments, militaries, security forces, and populations, although other organizations have identified a larger number of authorities.[22] These authorities are briefly described below under the following rubrics:

- Contingency Operations and Related Coalition Operational Support;
- Global and Regional, Non-Contingency Train and Equip, and Other Assistance;
- Multi-purpose;
- Operational Support;
- Counternarcotics, Counter-Transnational Organized Crime, and Counterproliferation;
- Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief;
- Exercises;
- International Armaments Cooperation;
- Education and Exchange Programs;
- Military-to-Military Contacts;
- Defense Institution Building and Support; and
- Recovery and Accounting of Missing Personnel.

(The **Appendix** provides detail on and statute citations for these authorities organized under the same rubrics.)

[21] RAND, *Review of Security Cooperation Mechanisms*, p. 63.

[22] The number of authorities identified by CRS is derived from the DOD security cooperation programs catalogued in the current DISAM Security Cooperation Programs handbook. Other organizations have adopted different counting methodologies and, as a result, have identified a larger number of authorities. For instance, RAND lists 184 separate authorities, which includes authorities derived from *U.S. Code* titles such as Title 22, Title 6, Title 50, Title 32, Title 42, public laws, and executive orders. See RAND, *Review of Security Cooperation Mechanisms*.

Unlike State Department security assistance authorities that are broad and usually subject to a wide range of general conditions elsewhere in law, Title 10 security cooperation authorities are usually targeted, specifying the types of support or assistance that may be provided and the conditions associated with these types of assistance. One condition on security cooperation authorities (with certain exceptions) is the DOD Leahy Law (10 U.S.C. 2249e) prohibition on assistance to units of foreign security forces credibly believed to have committed gross violations of human rights.[23] Conforming to the Title 22 U.S.C. law vesting the Secretary of State with responsibility to exercise "continuous supervision and general direction" of military assistance, including military education and training, many security cooperation statutes require Secretary of State "concurrence" (i.e., approval) or other State Department input.[24]

Contingency Operations and Related Coalition Operational Support: Afghanistan, Africa, Iraq, Syria, Ukraine

Congress has provided DOD with several authorities to support U.S. military operations or other military efforts in conflict zones. A significant number of these authorities pertain to Afghanistan; the remainder pertain to Africa, Iraq, Syria, and Ukraine. The activities authorized by these provisions span a broad range of missions and activities, including traditional train and equip authority to build partner capacity, humanitarian assistance, and infrastructure development.

In *Afghanistan*, the major authority is the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF), which permits DOD to train, equip, and provide other supplies and services to Afghan military and police forces with the Secretary of State's concurrence. The FY2017 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) request for ASFF is $3.4 billion. Although it recently expired, the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF), a joint DOD-State Department authority, allowed the two departments to develop and implement infrastructure projects jointly. FY2016 appropriations legislation (P.L. 114-113) makes $50 million available for additional costs associated with existing projects.

There are additional Afghanistan-specific authorities. One requires Secretary of State concurrence and authorizes DOD to transfer U.S. non-excess defense articles and related services up to $250 million in replacement value to Afghanistan's military and security forces. Two others do not require Secretary of State concurrence: one is the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP), which authorizes U.S. military commanders to fund urgent humanitarian or small-scale reconstruction projects. For FY2016, Congress has authorized $10 million for this purpose. The other is a logistics support statute that authorizes up to $450 million for DOD to aid coalition partners supporting U.S. military and stabilization operations in Afghanistan.

In *Africa*, Congress has authorized up to $50 million for DOD, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to support foreign forces involved in operations against the Lord's Resistance Army.[25] Another authority, adopted in the FY2016 NDAA, permits DOD, in coordination with

[23] The exceptions are disaster and humanitarian assistance, and national security emergencies. The law also does not apply to DOD support that is not "assistance," including familiarization, interoperability, and safety training, and operational support such as aid to coalition partners in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

[24] Section 622(c), the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (FAA, P.L. 87-195), 22 U.S.C. 2382 (c). For additional information on the relationship between and responsibilities of the State Department and DOD for U.S. assistance to train, equip, and otherwise engage with foreign military and other security forces, see CRS Report R44444, *Security Assistance and Cooperation: Shared Responsibility of the Departments of State and Defense*, by (name redacted) .

[25] For additional information, see CRS Report R42094, *The Lord's Resistance Army: The U.S. Response*, by (name redacted), (name redacted), and (name redacted) .

Secretary of State, to provide up to $100 million in logistical support to allied nations conducting counterterrorism operations in Africa.

In *Iraq*, the Iraq Train and Equip Fund (ITEF) authorizes up to $715 million in FY2016 for DOD, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to train, equip, and provide additional types of support to military and other security of forces of or associated with the Government of Iraq.

In response to the conflict in *Syria*, Congress has authorized DOD to pursue a wide range of security cooperation activities. DOD is permitted, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to assist vetted elements of the Syrian opposition with training, equipment, sustainment, and other support. The FY2017 budget request for the Syrian train and equip program is $250 million.

With the concurrence of the Secretary of State, DOD is also permitted to provide training, equipment, and supplies to military and first responder organizations of countries bordering Syria to improve their capabilities to respond to a weapon of mass destruction (WMD) incident. Congress has also authorized DOD, with Secretary of State concurrence, to reimburse the armed forces of Jordan and Lebanon up to $150 million for increasing and maintaining security along their borders with Syria.

Coalition Support Funds (CSF) permit DOD, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to reimburse key cooperating countries for logistic, military, and other support in connection with U.S. military operations in Iraq or in Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan). DOD may also use these funds to provide cooperating countries equipment, supplies and training. The aggregate amount of reimbursements may not exceed $1.2 billion during FY2016.

In response to Russian activities in *Ukraine*, Congress authorized the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI), which does not require State Department concurrence or other input, to improve the security and capacity of U.S. partners in the region. The FY2017 budget request for ERI is $3.4 billion. A new authority, adopted in the FY2016 NDAA, permits DOD to provide training, equipment, and logistical support to Ukraine's military and security forces, in coordination with the Secretary of State.

Global and Regional, Non-Contingency Train and Equip, and Other Assistance

Congress has approved several authorities to provide training, equipment, and other support to build partner capacity. In 2005, Congress passed the first such global authority, frequently referred to as "Section 1206" (now 10 U.S.C. 2282), as "a means to fill long-standing gaps in an effort to help other nations build and sustain capable military forces."[26] This authority requires the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to formulate jointly programs to (1) enhance foreign military or other security forces' ability to conduct counterterrorism missions or support ongoing allied or coalition military or stability operations, (2) enhance the capacity of a foreign country's national maritime or border security forces to conduct counterterrorism operations, and (3) enhance the capacity of foreign national-level security forces that have a counterterrorism mission. The authority requires the concurrence of the Secretary of State. Congress has authorized up to $350 million per fiscal year for 10 U.S.C. 2282. Other authorities permit narrow, targeted support related to building partner capacity (e.g., cryptologic or imagery support).[27]

[26] For additional information on the history of "Section 1206," see CRS Report RS22855, *Security Assistance Reform: "Section 1206" Background and Issues for Congress*, by (name redacted) .

[27] For additional information on building partner capacity, see CRS Report R44313, *What Is "Building Partner* (continued...)

The Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF) is a joint DOD-State Department train and equip authority to support security and counterterrorism activities. The GSCF is similar to "Section 1206," except the Secretary of State exercises the lead role. Congress has authorized DOD to transfer up to $200 million per fiscal year to the fund, but DOD contributions to each project are limited to 80% of the cost.

In addition, Congress has enacted authorities that permit DOD to use U.S. general purpose forces to train with foreign military or security forces of other countries and to pay incremental expenses incurred by foreign states participating in that training. DOD may pay up to $10 million per year incurred by participating foreign forces. Another authority through which DOD may pay for incremental expenses is the Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) authority, which permits specified commanders to pay the incremental expenses incurred by a friendly developing country in conjunction with training of U.S. special operations forces.

A statute unique to Special Operations Forces (SOF) allows up to $85 million for SOF to support foreign forces, irregular forces, or groups or individuals who support the operations of SOF to combat terrorism. Chief of Mission approval is required.

For FY2016, Congress approved the South China Sea Initiative, which permits DOD, with Secretary of State concurrence, to provide up to $50 million in maritime security assistance for countries bordering the South China Sea.

Multi-purpose

A unique multi-purpose authority, the Combatant Command Initiative Fund (CCIF), authorizes combatant commanders to conduct many activities that span a broad range of categories.[28] Authorized activities for which funds may be provided include force training, contingencies, selected operations, command and control, joint exercises, humanitarian and civic assistance, military education and training, personnel expenses, force protection, and joint warfighting capabilities. Some activities conducted under CCIF may include foreign forces and defense personnel. Chief of Mission coordination is required for humanitarian and civic assistance. CCIF's FY2017 budget estimate is $15 million.

Another multi-purpose authority, the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF), provides monies to support and assist foreign security forces or other groups conducting counterterrorism or crisis response activities in the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) and the U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) areas of responsibility. CTPF funds are disbursed under other authority and are subject to the conditions of that authority: thus far all CTPF funds have been channeled under Section 1206/10 U.S.C. 2282 Building Partner Capacity authority (see above). For FY2017, DOD has requested $1 billion for CTPF.

(...continued)

Capacity?" Issues for Congress, coordinated by (name redacted) .

[28] CCIF authorizes activities that fall under many of the categories used in this report to organize DOD security cooperation authorities. The authority specifies that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff give priority consideration to requests to conduct (1) "... activities that would enhance the war fighting capability, readiness, and sustainability of the forces assigned to the commander requesting the funds;" (2) "... activities with respect to an area or areas not within the area of responsivity of a commander of a combatant command that would reduce the threat to, or otherwise increase, the national security of the United States;"(3) "... urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief and reconstruction assistance, particularly in a foreign country where the armed forces are engaged in a contingency operation."

Operational Support, Including Lift and Sustain, and Logistics

Congress has provided DOD with several global authorities to support the participation of other countries in coalition military activities or foreign military activities that respond to mutual interests. Three are logistics support authorities, one of which requires Secretary of State concurrence, and two of which do not require State Department input. Four related statutes authorize DOD to conduct airlift, air transport, and air-refueling activities, or to provide other support. All require some State Department role. Of the logistics authorities, Congress has authorized up to $105 million for 10 U.S.C. 127d, known as the "Global Lift and Sustain" authority.

Counternarcotics, Counter-Transnational Organized Crime, and Counterproliferation

DOD counterdrug authorities were among the first Title 10 security cooperation authorities. In 1981, Congress named DOD the lead agency responsible for detecting and monitoring illegal drugs entering the United States by air and sea. Subsequently, Congress provided DOD with two major authorities to conduct counternarcotics, counter-transnational organized crime, and related counterterrorism security cooperation activities: "Section 1004" adopted in the FY1991 NDAA and "Section 1033" in the FY1998 NDAA. In subsequent years, Congress granted DOD two additional authorities.

Some of the authorities, including "Section 1033," are limited to specific geographic regions. Assistance includes defense articles and services, the provision of non-lethal equipment, training, and other types of support.[29] For FY2015, Congress expanded "Section 1004" to include counter-transnational crime activities, though some of the existing counternarcotics authorities already permit DOD to provide some types of support to agencies conducting counter-transnational crime and counterterrorism activities. Only "Section 1033" requires some level of State Department input. The FY2017 DOD budget estimate for counternarcotics activities is $845 million, of which $522 million is allotted for international support.[30]

Additionally, Congress has also authorized the DOD Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. DOD is permitted to engage in counterproliferation activities and operate programs to enable the elimination, transport, and storage of chemical, biological, nuclear and other types of weapons or weapon components (Sections 1301-1352, P.L. 113-291). For FY2016, Congress has authorized $359 million funds to be available in FY2016, FY2017, and FY2018. Secretary of State concurrence is required for certain provisions.

Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief[31]

Some of DOD's earliest Title 10 authorities, dating to the 1980s, involve disaster relief and humanitarian and civil assistance. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is the U.S. government's lead agency for disaster relief, but DOD is often the first U.S. agency to respond to foreign disasters and humanitarian crises because it is able to deploy resources rapidly. DOD humanitarian assistance is provided not only in response to crises, but also as an operational

[29] In the case of Afghanistan, Section 1033 permits the provision of specified weaponry.

[30] FY2017 budget estimate excludes $215.3 million of OCO funding.

[31] For more on DOD disaster relief and humanitarian assistance, see CRS Report RL33769, *International Crises and Disasters: U.S. Humanitarian Assistance Response Mechanisms*, by (name redacted) .

aid to gain goodwill, increase situational awareness, or deter conflict. DOD humanitarian and related civic assistance also constitutes a part of some training exercises.

Funding for the six major Title 10 humanitarian assistance and disaster relief authorities is appropriated annually under the DOD appropriations Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civil Action account (OHDACA). (The exercise of one authority requires Secretary of State approval; another transfers supplies to the Secretary of State for distribution.) For FY2017, the DOD budget estimate for this account is $105.1 million.

Exercises

Training exercises maintain general U.S. military readiness and ensure a high level of effectiveness in complex military operations. U.S. support for the participation of foreign forces in "combined" exercises involving U.S. and foreign forces requires congressional authorization, unless training is conducted for familiarization, interoperability, or safety.[32]

Some laws authorize combined military exercises undertaken by combatant commanders and their component commands on a one-time or periodic basis. Others permit DOD to pay for some expenses incurred by developing countries participating in combined exercises with U.S. forces, and to construct facilities related to those exercises for use by the U.S. military where there is no permanent U.S. presence. These facilities serve to enhance the exercise experience, but they may remain for host nation use once an exercise concludes. Congress has authorized up to $3 million for unspecified military construction projects and up to $4 million for projects intended to address health or safety deficiencies. (A defense health initiative to combat the spread of HIV/AIDS is conducted as part of some combined exercises, especially in Africa.)

A new authority, introduced in the FY2016 NDAA, permits DOD to provide certain types of training and to cover up to $28 million of incremental expenses incurred by Eastern European military forces participating in multilateral exercises.

International Armaments Cooperation

Congress has provided DOD with two authorities that permit information-sharing and cooperative research with other countries and organizations, related to weapons systems. Another authority authorizes the appropriation of no more than $15 million for nonrecurring engineering costs associated with the establishment of co-production capacity in the United States for Israel's Iron Dome rocket defense program. Only one authority, which permits the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to share testing facilities on a reciprocal basis, requires Secretary of State concurrence.

A new authority, approved in the FY2016 NDAA, authorizes joint DOD-Israeli Ministry of Defense research, detection, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities, and requires consultation with both the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence.

[32] There are three general categories of combined exercises: Field Training Exercises (FTX) involving actual forces in the field; Command Post Exercises (CPX) involving simulated forces; and Table Top Exercises (TTX) involving activities ranging from formal planning to simple discussions. For additional information, see DISAM, *The Management of Security Cooperation*, July 2016.

Education and Exchange Programs

Congress has provided DOD with about a dozen authorities to support the participation of U.S. and foreign military personnel in a variety of educational and personnel exchange activities. Some authorities fund the attendance of international students and military officers at U.S. military academic and post-graduate institutions. Others authorize the creation and administration of institutes, leadership programs, fellowship programs, and academies for military personnel of friendly foreign states. Additional authorities permit reciprocal or nonreciprocal exchanges of U.S. and foreign defense personnel. Some authorize tuition waivers or payment of expenses incurred by foreign military personnel participating in education and exchange activities.

Military-to-Military Contacts

Congress has enacted several statutes whose primary purposes are to authorize DOD efforts to establish and strengthen professional and personal relationships among allied and friendly country personnel and to encourage a democratic orientation of defense institutions and militaries of other countries. These include the broad Military-to-Military Contacts and Comparable Activities authority for the Secretary of Defense to fund, with Secretary of State approval, a wide range of activities, including contact teams and military liaisons, exchanges of DOD and foreign defense ministry civilian and military personnel, personnel exchanges between U.S. and foreign military units, seminars, conferences, and specified related expenses. Three authorities permit DOD to pay the expenses of defense personnel from developing countries to attend conferences. Other statutes fund the participation of U.S. and foreign personnel at specific venues, including Headquarters Eurocorps, the U.S. Center for Complex Operations located at the National Defense University, and multilateral military Centers of Excellence. Some of these authorities require State Department input.

In addition, Congress has authorized a National Guard State Partnership Program, which establishes National Guard personnel exchanges with military forces, security forces, or other government organizations whose primary functions include disaster or emergency response. Congress has authorized up to $10 million to cover related costs of foreign participation.

Defense Institution Building and Support

In recent years, addressing deficiencies in foreign defense institutions has been increasingly perceived as an integral part of BPC programs. To address those perceived deficiencies, Congress has authorized DOD to conduct Defense Institution Building (DIB) activities designed to support the development of effective, transparent, and accountable defense institutions in partner nations.

The Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI), conducted through the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Rule of Law program, carries out military-to-military informational engagements to promote the reform of foreign defense institutions. DIRI's FY2017 budget estimate is $25.6 million. DIRI also supports the Ministry of Defense Advisor Program (MODA), which deploys senior DOD civilian experts as advisors to assist foreign counterparts develop core institutional competencies such as personnel and readiness, logistics, strategy and policy, and financial management. MODA's FY2017 budget estimate is $9.2 million. Only MODA requires State Department input.

The Wales (formerly Warsaw) Initiative Fund (WIF), established to train and equip countries engaged in the State Department-led Partnership for Peace (PfP) program, encompasses all developing NATO partners and focuses on building defense institutions. WIF's FY2017 budget estimate is $21.9 million.

DOD funds six Regional Centers for Security Studies, which provide a venue for instruction and discussion among foreign military and civilian defense officials on regional and global security challenges and strengthening defense institutions. The FY2017 budget estimate is $58.6 million.

Recovery and Accounting of Missing Personnel

Two statutes authorize DOD to conduct activities related to DOD personnel recovery, protection, and accounting with support from and assistance to foreign countries. One requires Secretary of State concurrence with regard to participation of foreign countries, while the other requires Chief of Mission approval. Congress has authorized an expenditure of no more than $25 million to establish, develop, and maintain assisted recovery capabilities. For funds to be expended, a combatant command commander must first determine that an action is necessary to conduct a nonconventional assisted recovery effort.

Issues for Congress

As part of an effort to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and timeliness of its security cooperation programs, DOD seeks to address the multiple problems created by the "patchwork" of Title 10 authorities. This effort includes consolidating and reforming authorities and reconsidering Department of State coordination and approval processes. Also included in this effort are program assessment, program development, and the use of general purpose forces (GPF) to conduct capacity-building programs.

Analysts have suggested a number of ways to address the multiple planning, resourcing, and interagency approval and reporting challenges related to the current framework and statutes. DOD could accomplish some of these on its own; others might require or be helped by congressional action. The sections below present an overview of the statute-related issues that might involve congressional action.

Reform of Title 10 Security Cooperation Authorities Framework

In recent years, DOD officials and other analysts have considered an overhaul of or additions to the Title 10 authorities' framework as a significant element of security cooperation reform. Proposed reforms have ranged from narrow to broad.[33] One set of options would involve simplifying the framework by consolidating current authorities into one or more broader authorities in an effort to better align resources with DOD strategic priorities. Some analysts also propose creating new authority, either broad or targeted, to fill perceived gaps in current statutes.[34] Framework reform arguably could serve several purposes: (1) streamlining planning and development processes, (2) simplifying interagency collaboration and approval processes, (3) facilitating the use and prioritization of available funding streams, and (4) removing inconsistencies. Consolidation might also result in more holistic reporting to Congress.

[33] RAND has suggested consolidation, revision, and clarification of the following categories of authorities: mil-mil engagements; exercises; education and training; train and equip; equipment and logistics support; humanitarian assistance; defense institution building (DIB); maritime security; and cybersecurity. RAND has also proposed the adoption of a cooperative ballistic missile defense (BMD) authority to allow more effective information sharing between combatant commanders and foreign partners, in addition to training and exercises on BMD systems.

[34] RAND, *From Patchwork to Framework: A Review of Title 10 Authorities for Security Cooperation*.

Nevertheless, some argue that the patchwork of targeted DOD authorities is an intentional and inevitable response to specific situations where close congressional oversight is desirable. Some analysts caution that consolidating security cooperation authorities, in and of itself, might broaden DOD authority. Broader DOD authority has also been proposed by recent Senate legislation (see below). Any broadening of DOD authority may have possible implications for future DOD budgets and congressional oversight. In addition, broader DOD authority might affect requirements for State Department oversight and coordination.

Congress may consider

- the specific challenges consolidating Title 10 security cooperation authorities would address and the unintended consequences of consolidating current authorities;
- the extent to which consolidation of Title 10 authorities might improve DOD's development and implementation processes;
- whether a reform of Title 10 security cooperation authorities could be separate from a larger reform encompassing Title 22 and Title 10 authorities, and, if so, to what extent; and
- whether consolidating authorities would enable Congress not only to oversee specific programs, but also to better monitor the ability of these programs to meet long-term strategic goals.

Current Proposed Legislation to Reform Security Cooperation Authorities

Both the House and Senate have responded to DOD proposals to reform the security cooperation enterprise. In the House version of the FY2017 NDAA (H.R. 4909), HASC proposed creating a new chapter in Title 10, *U.S. Code*, entitled "Security Cooperation," and to transfer and codify a number of existing authorities under the following categories: military-to-military engagement, training with foreign forces, support for operations and capacity building, and education and training activities.

In the Senate version of the FY2017 NDAA, SASC proposed a broader and far-reaching reform of security cooperation authorities and the institutional architecture to "modernize and streamline DOD's security cooperation enterprise" and "respond to the complaints of our military commanders and the Department more broadly...."[35] The Senate version (S. 2943) of the bill proposes to consolidate, in some cases also expand, and codify several security cooperation authorities into a new U.S.C. Title 10 chapter, under the same categories as the House. Unlike the House, which proposed minimal changes, codifying existing authorities to the new chapter, the Senate offers several innovations. Three of the Senate proposals would constitute major expansions of DOD's ability to equip, train, and provide educational and schoolhouse training to foreign forces under Title 10 authority.[36] One would expand an existing train and equip authority (10 U.S.C. 2282) to build foreign

[35] Senate Armed Services Committee, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017: Executive Summary," p. 14.

[36] The Obama Administration's Statement of Administration Policy on S. 2943 noted concern that the security cooperation reform provisions would impinge on the Secretary of State's lead role in security assistance. Some analysts have noted particular concerns with the proposals to expand 10 U.S.C. 2282 and 2249c, which they argue largely duplicate State Department authorized and funded Foreign Military Financing (FMF) and International Military Education and Training (IMET), respectively. (For more on FMF and IMET, CRS Report R44444, *Security Assistance and Cooperation: Shared Responsibility of the Departments of State and Defense*, by (name redacted) .) Other concerns are that requirements for Secretary of State concurrence have been removed in some instances where they existed before. For example, the temporary authority for General Purpose Forces to train with foreign forces (P.L. 113-66. Section 1203) contains a concurrence requirement, but an expanded 10 U.S.C. 2011 statute, which would replace and repeal it, does not.

partner capacity to conduct counterterrorism operations, as well as military and stability operations, to include several other types of operations. These include building capacity for operations to counter weapons of mass destruction, drugs, and transnational crime, and to conduct maritime and border security, military intelligence, humanitarian disaster assistance operations, and national territorial defense operations. A second would extend current 10 U.S.C. 2011 Special Operations Forces' Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) authority to General Purpose Forces (GPF), permitting DOD to pay the incremental expenses of foreign security forces participating in a range of training events. A third would expand the 10 U.S.C. 2249c Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program to pay expenses of foreign forces, ministry of defense, and security official for educational and schoolhouse training activities into a Defense Cooperation Fellowship Program, which could also provide funding for personnel at international and non-governmental organizations, provided those activities do not duplicate or conflict, "to the maximum extent possible," with State Department International Military Education and Training (IMET) activities.

Other S. 2943 proposals regarding assistance to foreign forces also would extend the scope of current law. These include the expansion of 10 U.S.C. 127d (Global Lift and Sustain) operational support to include not only forces participating in combined operations with U.S. forces, but also military or stability operations that benefit U.S. national security interests. Another proposal would consolidate four statutes that authorize payment of foreign personnel expenses (10 U.S.C. 1050 for Latin America; 1050a for Africa; 1051 for multilateral, bilateral, or regional cooperation programs; and 1051a for liaison officers) into a single authority for "Payment of Personnel Expenses Necessary for Theater Security Cooperation." Another Senate proposal would revamp DOD's five regional centers for security studies (10 U.S.C. 184) by eliminating two that are located in Washington, DC (the Africa Center for Strategic Studies and the Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies) and deleting the geographical designations in the names of the remaining three, located in Germany, Hawaii, and Washington, DC, rewording the authority from permitting "exchanges of ideas" to "training," and assigning new regional and functional areas of focus to each.

Like the House legislation, the Senate legislation would codify some temporary authorities, among them the Defense Institution Building authority to assign DOD civilian employees as advisors to foreign ministries of defense (P.L. 112-81, §1081). While the House would extend this authority through December 31, 2019, the Senate would make it permanent.

In addition, the SASC legislation includes a number of interrelated measures that proponents argue will improve security cooperation planning, management, and execution, and result in a prioritizing U.S. funding according to strategic needs by

- requiring assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of DOD security cooperation programs and activities, and annual consolidated reporting on security cooperation programs, activities, and performance;
- consolidating responsibility for the oversight of strategic guidance and for overall resource allocation for DOD security cooperation programs and activities to a single Office of the Secretary of Defense office at a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense level or below;
- integrating security cooperation funding streams into one Security Cooperation Enhancement Fund (SCEF), and requiring an annual consolidated DOD security cooperation budget;
- requiring the Secretaries of Defense and State to jointly issue regulations to facilitate and streamline coordination between their departments on all matters relating to the policy, planning, and implementation of security cooperation and assistance programs and activities; and
- creating a "Department of Defense Security Cooperation Workforce Development Program" to oversee the development and management of a professional workforce supporting DOD security cooperation programs and activities.

Security Cooperation Program Improvement

Over the past decade, the results of U.S. efforts to build foreign military capacity have led many to doubt the utility of BPC and related security cooperation activities. In particular, some question whether such activities can effectively create capable and reliable "partners" who can act together with or instead of U.S. troops. Recent outcomes have cast doubt on the concept that such efforts safeguard U.S. security interests at a lower cost than investing in U.S. troops. Many U.S. efforts over the years have not achieved desired results. Among the concrete reasons cited are the levels of U.S. effort, deficiencies in U.S. program design and execution, and cultural, social, and economic factors in recipient countries.[37] Congress's future decision-making on BPC programs

[37] While for much of the post-9/11 period, the new Title 10 security cooperation authorities have targeted assistance at (continued...)

and funding may be influenced by perceptions of whether training foreign military and security forces is a better investment than maintaining additional U.S. troops.

Congress may consider the following:

- Whether the varied outcomes of U.S. BPC efforts over the past decade in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen are due to errors in strategic thinking.
- How better planning, execution, and alignment of resources might lead to improved outcomes.[38]
- Whether DOD sufficiently factors social, cultural, political, and economic dynamics, and the character and organization of recipient military forces, into security cooperation planning and execution, and whether it draws appropriately on the knowledge and resources of the State Department, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and other U.S. agencies in assessing those conditions.
- The extent to which efforts to build partner capacity in foreign forces delivers ancillary benefits, such as increased DOD understanding of local social, cultural, political, and economic realities.
- Whether current strategic assumptions take into account the extent to which security cooperation programs are consistent with U.S. interests, especially in weak states.

Security Cooperation Assessment

Despite a long-standing and repeatedly stated U.S. interest in assessing the effectiveness of U.S. assistance to foreign military and other security forces, the State Department and DOD are still developing metrics and assessment tools to measure progress and determine the results of such assistance over time. As a result, ascertaining the utility of individual security assistance and cooperation programs and comparing results can be problematic.

Congress may consider the following:

- What evaluation and assessment tools are currently used to measure and compare outcomes of security assistance and cooperation programs.
- The results of the PPD-23 process to date, which called for the Administration to develop one or more standardized, interagency tools to assess security assistance and cooperation outcomes.
- Whether, and the extent to which, DOD has evaluated the effectiveness of security cooperation activities conducted by SOF compared with activities conducted by U.S. conventional forces, and if so, what the results were. (U.S. Special Operations Forces are considered the "gold standard" for conducting training missions to improve the technical skills of indigenous military and police

(...continued)

developing countries, a 2014 RAND analysis concludes that security cooperation efforts have been more effective in states that were more democratic, had stronger state institutions, and greater state capacity than in states exhibiting high levels of fragility. RAND, *Assessing Security Cooperation as a Preventative Tool*, 2014, p. xvi.

[38] For additional information, see CRS Report R44313, *What Is "Building Partner Capacity?" Issues for Congress*, coordinated by (name redacted) .

forces, increase understanding of human rights issues, and assist with humanitarian and civic action projects.)

Alignment of Resources and Strategic Priorities

As funding levels for security cooperation activities have risen in recent years, questions about the effectiveness of security cooperation efforts have increasingly been accompanied by the related question of whether the United States appropriately aligns security cooperation resources with its strategic priorities.[39] Those who argue that the current allocation of resources does not align with strategic needs advocate several measures to ensure a better match. These include adopting new budgeting procedures that would facilitate better planning, such as developing a unified security cooperation budget, reworking the current institutional structure for decision-making on resource allocation, and passing new DOD authorities to better align them with strategic concepts.

Congress may consider the following:

- The advantages and disadvantages of amalgamating all security cooperation funding in one budget account.
- Whether the current decentralized planning process for security cooperation, in which planning occurs at the combatant command and embassy levels, poses problems for aligning resources and strategic priorities, and if so, the extent to which planning should be centralized in one or more Pentagon offices.
- The extent to which recent challenges presented by Russia in Europe and China in the Pacific region call for new authorities and a reprioritization of security cooperation funding, which currently is largely oriented to counterterrorism threats.

Oversight and Interagency Collaboration[40]

Through an ever-evolving complex legal and institutional framework, DOD and the State Department share responsibility for training, equipping, and otherwise assisting foreign military and other security forces. Sometimes, DOD activities draw on both Title 22 and Title 10 authority. Both State Department and DOD officials recognize that current modes of collaboration complicate timely implementation of activities and sometimes thwart them.[41] Nevertheless, no consensus exists on how to streamline processes, given inherent tensions in the dual goals of reducing the time required for close collaboration while preserving the coherence of U.S. foreign policymaking.

[39] A calculation of the total funding for security cooperation activities requires an accounting of spending under specific security cooperation authorities and accounts, as well as related spending that may have been drawn from service accounts that would not necessarily be publically available. DOD has yet to conclude efforts to produce "budget quality" figures for public distribution.

[40] For more information on this issue, see CRS Report R44444, *Security Assistance and Cooperation: Shared Responsibility of the Departments of State and Defense*, by (name redacted) .

[41] According to some research, there are examples of effective DOD and State Department collaboration. They include DOD-State-USAID school rebuilding and rehabilitation efforts in Kenya's Rift Valley Province, U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM)-USAID humanitarian assistance and reconstruction in Sri Lanka, and DOD-USAID collaboration in the development of a USAID Transition Strategy for South Sudan. For more information, see G. William Anderson and (name redacted), "Soldiers in Sandals," in *Mission Creep: The Militarization of U.S. Foreign Policy?* ed. Gordon Adams and Shoon Murray (Washington, DC: The Georgetown University Press, 2014), pp. 111-113.

Congress may consider the following:

- What mechanisms for DOD-State Department coordination are in place at the field level—both at the geographic COCOMs and at U.S. embassies—and how well they function; whether improvements possible at this level might expedite State Department oversight and interagency collaboration; and what kinds of improvements might be instituted by the agencies, and which might require congressional action.
- The degree to which the effectiveness of DOD-State collaboration depends on the quality of informal working relationships between DOD and State personnel versus mechanisms established by policy or law, and whether establishing formal mechanisms that govern collaboration might improve DOD-State cooperation across COCOMs.
- Whether Section 1206/10 U.S.C. 2282 is still considered a model for security cooperation collaboration, and, if not, why perceptions have changed. (Security cooperation programs under Section 1206/10 U.S.C. 2282 are developed under a joint-formulation "dual-key" process, which DOD has at times cited as the "gold standard" for interagency planning and cooperation. However, a 2013 RAND report described it as "encumbered by a complex approval process."[42])
- How the planning, implementation, and coordination processes have unfolded under GSCF, and the lessons that can be drawn from the GSCF concept. (The Global Security Contingency Fund was designed to replace the current agency-centric security assistance system with one that would facilitate interagency planning, budgeting, and coordination and eliminate duplication.)
- Whether additional resources would enable the State Department to have a more effective role in overseeing and collaborating in DOD security cooperation activities and applying a "whole of government" approach suggested by DOD.
- Whether the value added by close State Department oversight and collaboration in security cooperation outweighs the problems inherent in the extended timelines State Department input involves, and whether the cost-benefit equation changes for different categories of security cooperation.

Use of General Purpose Forces for BPC[43]

In the past, DOD has relied on Special Operations Forces (SOF) or private contractors to train foreign counterparts. DOD's decision to make building partner capacity a key component of U.S. defense policy necessitated the expanded use of general purpose forces (GPF) to do so. At a time when GPF are being drawn down, some question whether using GPF to train foreign forces detracts from the U.S. military's ability to prepare for combat roles. Some also question whether GPF are adequately trained and qualified to be effective instructors.

Congress may consider

- how GPF are being used to train foreign military forces, and to what extent general purpose forces are suitable substitutes for SOF; and

[42] RAND, *Review of Security Cooperation Mechanisms Combatant Command Utilize to Build Partner Capacity*, p. 27.

[43] For additional information on BPC, see CRS Report R44313, *What Is "Building Partner Capacity?" Issues for Congress*, coordinated by (name redacted) .

- the degree to which DOD still relies on private contractors in its security cooperation programs, the roles they play, and the benefits and costs of their use.

Security Cooperation Program Sustainment

An ongoing problem with DOD security cooperation programs is the need for sustainment, which many DOD authorities do not provide. [44] As a result, the United States depends on the recipient country to sustain provided capabilities. In some cases, DOD has arranged some programs to be sustained through the State Department Foreign Military Financing (FMF) account.[45]

Congress may consider

- the degree to which a partner nation's capacity for and potential interest in sustainment factor into DOD program development, and the metrics, if any, DOD uses to assess the willingness of a partner nation to sustain newly acquired capabilities; and
- how often and in what cases DOD has used FMF to sustain DOD security cooperation programs, and what effect DOD's use of FMF for sustainment purposes has on the FMF budget.

Security Cooperation Staffing and Training

DOD officials note that personnel responsible for security cooperation efforts at the U.S. embassies and in the geographic COCOMs navigate an increasingly complex web of authorities, making coordinated and timely implementation of foreign assistance programs difficult. Although some analysts fault the system as responsible for coordination lapses and other implementation problems, others argue that a lack of adequate staffing and training is at least as responsible for those difficulties.

Congress may consider the following:

- How many people at each of the COCOMS and in key U.S. embassy Security Cooperation Organizations (SCOs) are working full-time on security cooperation programs, and whether increasing the number of dedicated staff or establishing longer tours would improve program development and implementation.
- Whether, given promotion consideration, the creation of a "security cooperation" career path would be desirable.
- What prior training is required for embassy SCO and COCOM staff, and whether this training is sufficient or more extensive training is needed to make management and implementation more efficient.

[44] The term sustainment generally refers to sustainment of equipment.

[45] P.L. 114-113, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, Division K, Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2016.

Developments in the 114th Congress and Implications for the Future

A growing consensus that the statutory framework for DOD security cooperation efforts is unwieldy and inadequate has prompted legislation to consolidate and otherwise reform the myriad laws that govern those efforts. In the second session of the 114th Congress, the Obama Administration, the House, and the Senate have offered proposals (see text above) to modify DOD security cooperation authorities. The Senate version of the FY2017 NDAA (S. 2943) offers especially broad reforms, including restructuring of oversight and funding mechanisms.

While the Obama Administration, in its Statement of Administration Policy responding to S. 2943, expressed its eagerness to work with Congress to undertake DOD security cooperation reforms, it cautioned that the legislation went "beyond the Administration's request with potentially broad ramifications that need to be analyzed carefully."[46] Specifically, the Administration cited the potential impact of reforms on "DOD's current security cooperation and force readiness efforts" and on "the State Department's lead role in foreign policy and security sector assistance...."[47] The Administration offered to work with Congress to "ensure the final legislation undertakes Administration-requested reforms in a carefully considered manner that avoids duplication of efforts and authorities, and unintended consequences for current DOD and State security sector assistance activities."[48] While HASC and SASC proposals are currently under consideration in the FY2017 NDAA conference, some analysts predict that the reform process may take years to unfold fully. The security cooperation reform proposals currently before Congress, with their focus on changes in the DOD legislative framework and a limited number of DOD institutional and DOD-State Department collaboration arrangements, reflect, to some analysts, part of a larger debate. Broader, related issues that some analysts urge be considered over time include further institutional changes in DOD and the State Department to improve coordination within and between those two agencies; further evaluation of the appropriate balance for security cooperation among DOD mission and the ways in which the armed forces should be resourced and organized to balance all missions to ensure the national defense; and the appropriate balance of civilian and military resources to meet national security and foreign policy goals.

[46] Office of Management and Budget, "Statement of Administration Policy: S. 2943—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017," June 7, 2016.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Ibid.

Appendix. DOD Security Cooperation Authorities

Table A-1. Title 10 U.S.C. and National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) Security Cooperation Authorities

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Contingency Operations and Related Coalition Operational Support: Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Ukraine, Africa			
Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism: FY2005 NDAA, Section 1208, P.L. 108-375, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2017. Authorizes Secretary of Defense to aid foreign forces, irregular forces, groups or individuals who support the operations of U.S. special forces to combat terrorism up to $85 million in any fiscal year.	No	Concurrence of Chief of Mission.	CN submitted 15 days prior to exercising authority or no later than 48 hours if extraordinary circumstances exist. Annual report required no later than 180 days after close of fiscal year and every 180 days thereafter. Both to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Section "1233" Coalition Support Funds (CSF), including the Coalition Readiness Support Program (CRSP): FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-181, Section 1233, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to reimburse key cooperating countries for logistical, military, and other support, including access, to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Iraq or in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, and to assist such nations with U.S. funded equipment, supplies and training. Aggregate amount of reimbursements may not exceed $1.16 billion during FY2016. No more than $900 million of the aggregate amount of reimbursements may be used for Pakistan in FY2016.	Yes	No	CN submitted 15 days in advance of reimbursement or other support. Quarterly report. Report due no later than December 31, 2017 on expenditure of funds in support of stability activities in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) All to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC. (Special requirements apply to support to Pakistan.) Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF): FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-	Yes	No	CN submitted 5 days prior to obligation or to transfer of

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
181, Section 1513, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016. FY2016 appropriations legislation (P.L. 114-113) makes $3.65 billion available through September 30, 2017. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to the security forces of Afghanistan, which may include provision of equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction and funding. Also to accept contributions to the ASFF from non-U.S. government sources, and to transfer ASFF funds to other accounts.			ASFF funds. Report on equipment transfers to Afghan security forces submitted no later than 60 days after enactment of FY2014 NDAA and then no later than 30 days after first two quarters of FY2014 and each fiscal half-year thereafter. Quarterly reports on equipment disposition submitted no later than 90 days after enactment of NDAA FY2016. All three above to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D). CN submitted 15 days prior to the receipt of contributions. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D), SFRC, HFAC. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D). Semiannual report on enhancing security and stability in Afghanistan. (SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC)
"1234" Logistical Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Operations in Afghanistan and Iraq: FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-181, Section 1234, as amended. Expires Sept 30, 2016. Authorizes the use of DOD funds (up to $450 million) to provide supplies, services, transportation, and other logistical support to coalition partners supporting U.S. military and stabilization operations in Afghanistan and Iraq to be provided in accordance with the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) and other U.S. export laws.	No	No	Quarterly report submitted no later than 15 days after end of each fiscal year. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D). Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF): FY2011 NDAA, P.L. 111-383, Section 1217. Expired Sept. 30, 2015. FY2016 appropriations legislation (P.L. 114-113) makes no more than $50 million available for additional costs	Not Applicable, as this is a joint DOD-State Department authority.	Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop infrastructure	CN submitted 15 days prior to obligating or expending funds. Report required no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal year in which funds are obligated, expended, or transferred.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
associated with existing projects funded under AIF. Authorized the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State jointly to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in Afghanistan.		projects in Afghanistan to be implemented by the Secretary of State except Secretary of Defense if jointly determined.	Both to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.
Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP): FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81, Section 1201, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016 Section 1201 authorizes U.S. military commanders in Afghanistan to carry out small-scale projects to address urgent humanitarian relief or urgent reconstruction needs within their areas of responsibility. For FY2016, Congress has authorized $10 million.	No	No	Semi-annual report no later than 45 days after the end of each half fiscal year of 2016. CN submitted 15 days prior to obligating or expending funds for a CERP project in Afghanistan with a cost of $500,000 or more. Revised guidance concerning CERP submitted no later than 15 days after enactment of FY2016 NDAA. Report submitted 30 days prior to exercising authority for certain payments to redress authority and loss in Iraq. All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Transfer of Defense Articles and Services to Military and Security Forces of Afghanistan: FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1222, as amended. Expires Dec. 31, 2016. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transfer of up to $250 million (replacement value) per fiscal year in U.S. non-excess defense articles and associated services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan from articles present in Afghanistan.	Yes	No	Revised guidance submitted Report estimating types and quantities of available equipment submitted 15 days before exercise of authority. CN on proposed transfers 15 days prior to such transfers. Quarterly report no later than 90 days after transfers begin and at end of each calendar quarter thereafter through March 31, 2017. All three to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.
Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capabilities of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of	Yes	Mandates DOD compliance with "all applicable	Written notifications to permit assistance to countries not bordering Syria. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Mass Destruction: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1204. Expires Sept. 30, 2019. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide training, equipment, and supplies to military and civilian first responder organizations of countries that border Syria to enhance their capabilities to respond effectively to potential incidents involving weapons of mass destruction; DOD may provide such assistance to other countries after providing written notification, using funds available to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency.		requirements for coordination and consultation within the Executive Branch."	Written notification of the expectation of spending more than $4 million per fiscal year. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D). Report due no later than 90 days after authority is first exercised and 60 days after the end of a fiscal year in which it is exercised. SASC, HASC, SFRC, HFAC, SAC, HAC.
Support of Foreign Forces Participating in Operations to Disarm the Lord's Resistance Army: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1208. Expires Sept. 30, 2017. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $50 million per fiscal year in logistic support, supplies, services, and intelligence support to foreign forces participating in operations to mitigate or eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army.	Yes	No	CN submitted 15 days in advance prior to obligation of funds. SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.
Iraq Train and Equip fund (ITEF): FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section1236, as amended. Expires Dec. 31, 2016. FY2016 appropriations legislation (P.L. 114-113) makes funds remain available until September 30, 2017. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $715 million in assistance to Iraq and partner nations to defend against the Islamic State and its allies, which may include training, equipment, logistics support, supplies, services, stipends, facility and infrastructure repair	No	Secretary of Defense in coordination with Secretary of State.	Not more than 25% of funds may be obligated or expended until (1) 15 days after the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits a report on plans for the funding, and (2) the President submits a report on how the plan supports a larger regional strategy. Quarterly progress report to be submitted no later than 90 days after CN and every 90 days thereafter. All three reports above to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC, Senate and House leadership.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
and renovation, and sustainment.			Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to jointly submit assessments on the Government of Iraq's efforts to increase political inclusiveness, the first due 120 days after enactment of FY2016 NDAA and the next 180 days after submission of initial assessment. Secretary of Defense to submit a report within 30 days of learning that provided equipment or supplies have been acquired by a violent extremist organization. Both to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D), SFRC, HFAC.
Assistance to the Vetted Syrian Opposition: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1209. Expires Dec. 31, 2016. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance, including equipment, supplies, training, stipends, construction of training and associated facilities, and sustainment to appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition and other appropriated vetted Syrian groups and individuals.	No	Secretary of Defense in coordination with Secretary of State.	Report submitted 15 days prior to provision of assistance in conjunction with a report on regional strategy submitted by president. Quarterly progress report submitted no later than 90 days after initial report and every 90 days thereafter. All to SASC, SFRC, SAC, SSCI, HASC, HFAC, HAC, HPSCI.
European Reassurance Initiative (ERI): FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1535. Amounts appropriated will remain available for obligation through September, 30, 2016. FY2016 enacted funding is $789 million. The FY2017 DOD budget request is $3.4 billion. Transfer authority expires September 30, 2016. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to	No	No	CN 15 days prior to transfer of funds to carry out ERI programs under specified authorities or any other authority available to the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of State. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
reassure NATO allies and improve the security and capacity of U.S. partners. The Initiative permits an increased U.S. military presence in Europe, additional exercises and training with allies and partners, improvements to infrastructure to enhance responsiveness, prepositioning U.S. equipment in Europe, and increasing efforts to build partner capacity for newer NATO members and other partners. Total amount authorized for ERI purposes is $1 billion.			
Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1250. Expires December 31, 2017. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $300 million in FY2016 for security assistance and intelligence support, including training equipment, as well as logistics support, supplies and services to military and other security forces of Ukraine. Up to $50 million is authorized for certain types of defense lethal assistance and assistance to the other Partnership for Peace nations against Russian aggression.	No	Secretary of Defense in coordination with Secretary of State	Report submitted every 180 days, as outlined by Section 1275 of FY2015 NDAA (P.L. 113-291). All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Support for National Military Forces of Allied Countries for Counterterrorism Operations in Africa, FY2016 NDAA, Section 1207, P.L. 114-92. Expires September 30, 2018. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $100 million per fiscal year, on a non-reimbursable basis, in logistic support, supplies, and services to the national military forces of an allied country conducting counterterrorism operations in Africa.	No	Secretary of Defense in coordination with Secretary of State	CN no later than 15 days after provision of support. Report due biannually. All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Assistance to the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon for Border Security Operations, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1226.	Yes	No	CN due 15 days prior to providing support. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D), SFRC, HFAC.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Expires December 31, 2018. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide support on a reimbursement basis to the armed forces of Jordan and Lebanon to increase and sustain security along the border of Jordan and the border of Lebanon with Syria and Iraq. Total amount of support may not exceed $150 million from Coalition Support Funds (CSF) or the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF) for any country in any fiscal year.			
Global and Regional, Non-Contingency Train and Equip, and Other Assistance			
Foreign Cryptologic Support: 10 U.S.C. 421. Original legislation: FY1981 Intelligence Authorization Act, P.L. 96-450. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated to DOD for intelligence and communications purposes to pay for the cryptologic support expenses of foreign countries.	No	No	CN if any funds expended. SSCI, HPSCI.
Special Operations Forces: Training with Friendly Foreign Forces (JCETs): 10 U.S.C. 2011. Original legislation: FY1992 and FY1993 NDAA, P.L. 102-190. Authorizes the commander of the special operations command and commander of any other unified or specified combatant command to pay the training and some related expenses incurred by special operations forces in conjunction with training, and training with, armed forces or other security forces of a friendly foreign country. Also authorizes the payment of incremental expenses incurred by a friendly developing country in the course of training with special forces. The primary purpose of the training is to train U.S. Special Operations Forces. (JCETs generally occur within the context of military exercises.)	No	No	Report due no later than April 1 of each fiscal year. Congress. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Imagery Intelligence and Geospatial Information: Support for Foreign Countries, Regional Organizations, and Security Alliances: 10 U.S.C. 443. Original legislation: FY1997 NDAA, P.L. 104-201. Authorizes the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) to use funds appropriated to the NGA to provide foreign countries with imagery intelligence and geospatial information support. The Director may use funds other than those appropriated to provide foreign countries with imagery intelligence and geospatial information support under certain conditions. Coordination with Director of National Intelligence is required.	No	No	None
Building Capacity of Foreign Security Forces, 10 U.S.C. 2282 (formerly known as "Section 1206 Train and Equip"). Original legislation: FY2006 NDAA, P.L. 109-163. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to build the capacity of a foreign country's national military forces to enable such forces to conduct counterterrorism operations or to support or participate in military, stability and peace support operations which benefit U.S. national security interests. Also to enable a foreign country's maritime or border security forces, and other national-level security forces with counterterrorism responsibilities, to conduct counterterrorism operations. The FY2016 NDAA authorizes up to $350 million in FY2015 or FY2016 funding for 10 U.S.C. 2282 programs.	Yes	Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to jointly formulate programs and coordinate their implementation.	CN submitted 15 days prior to the initiation of activities. Annual report submitted no later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year, FY2015 through FY2020. Biennial comptroller audits submitted no later than March 31 of 2016, 2018, and 2020. All three above to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC. FMT Report. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF): FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81, Section 1207, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2017.	Not applicable. Secretary of State in the lead on this authority, with Secretary of Defense concurrence	Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense to jointly formulate programs.	CN submitted 15 days prior to initiation of GSCF activity. CN submitted 15 days after all guidance and procedures for exercising this authority has been issued and processes for implementation are established and fully operational. Annual report no later than October 30. All three above to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes a joint DOD-State Department fund to provide assistance to enhance the capabilities of a country's military or other national security forces to conduct border and maritime security, internal defense, and counterterrorism operations, or participate in military, stability, or peace support operations. Also authorizes support of the justice sector in countries where conflict or instability challenges the capacity of civilian providers. Provides authority for DOD to transfer up to $200 million per fiscal year to the fund, but caps DOD contributions to each project at 80% of the cost.	required for some programs and consultation for others.		Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Training of General Purpose Forces of the United States Armed Forces with Military and Other Security Forces of Friendly Foreign Countries: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1203. Expires Sept. 30, 2017. Authorizes U.S. general purpose military forces to train with the military forces or other security forces of a friendly foreign country and DOD to pay up to $10 million per fiscal year in incremental expenses incurred by participating foreign forces.	Yes	No	CN submitted no later than 15 days before a training event begins. SASC and HASC. Annual report due April 1. SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.
Logistics Support to Foreign Forces Training with U.S. Armed Forces: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1210. Expires Sept. 30, 2016. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $10 million per fiscal year in logistic support for the conveyance of certain defense articles in Afghanistan to the armed forces of a country with which U.S. Armed Forces plan to conduct bilateral or multilateral training overseas during FY2015 and FY2016.	Yes	Authority to be exercised in accordance with the Arms Export Control Act and other relevant export control laws, and with Section 516(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.	Report no later than 30 days after the last day of a fiscal year during which this authority is exercised. SFRC, HFAC, CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
South China Sea Initiative, Section 1261, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92. Expires September 30, 2020. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to increase maritime security and maritime domain awareness of specific foreign countries along the South China Sea by providing assistance and training to national military or other security forces whose functional responsibilities include maritime security missions. For FY2016, $50 million for assistance and training is authorized.	Yes	No	CN 15 days prior to exercising authority. SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.
Multi-purpose			
Combatant Commander Initiative Fund (CCIF): 10 U.S.C. 166a. Original legislation: FY1992 and FY1993 NDAA, P.L. 102-190. Authorizes discretionary funding for combatant commanders to conduct various activities, especially in response to unforeseen contingencies. A few permitted uses are related to foreign assistance. These humanitarian and civic assistance, urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief and reconstruction. Permitted activities also include force training, contingencies, selected operations, command and control, joint exercises, military education and training for military and related civilian personnel of foreign countries, including transportation, translation, and administrative expenses (up to $5 million per year). Up to $10 million per year may be spent to sponsor the participation of foreign countries in joint exercises. The statute itself authorizes the fund, but activities are carried out under other authorities.	No	For Humanitarian and Civic Assistance, Chief of Mission coordination is required "to the extent practicable."	Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF): FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 113-235, Section 1510. No amounts may be transferred from the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund after December 31, 2016. FY2016 appropriations legislation (P.L. 114-113) makes $1.1 billion available until September 30, 2017. Authorizes the appropriation of funds for the Counterterrorism	Required if required by authorities under which it is used.	Required if required by authorities under which it is used.	Plan on intended management and use of CTPF no later than 60 days after enactment of FY2015 NDAA. Semi-annual reports submitted no later than 60 days after the end of the first half of fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017, and the second half of 2015 and 2016.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Partnerships Fund, which provides support and assistance to foreign security forces or other groups or individuals to conduct, support, or facilitate counterterrorism and crisis response activities pursuant to Section 1534 of the FY2015 NDAA. Section 1510 of the FY2016 NDAA authorizes $750 million. Section 1534 of FY2015 NDAA stipulates that funds may be transferred to other accounts for use under existing DOD authority established by "any other provision of law." DOD may conduct CTPF activities only in areas of responsibility of the U.S. CENTCOM and AFRICOM, unless Secretary of Defense determines that authority needs to be applied elsewhere to address threats to U.S. national security.			All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Global Operational Support, including Lift and Sustain, and Logistics			
Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA): 10 U.S.C. 2342. Original legislation: NATO Mutual Support Act of 1979, signed into law in 1980 (P.L. 96-323). Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into reciprocal agreements on logistic support, supplies, and services with NATO countries and subsidiary organizations, the United Nations or any regional international organization, and the non-NATO countries designated as eligible by the Secretary of Defense.	No	Secretary of Defense designates eligible non-NATO countries in consultation with the Secretary of State.	CN submitted 30 days prior to the intended eligibility designation of a non-NATO country. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC.
Cooperative Military Airlift Agreements: Allied Countries: 10 U.S.C. 2350c. Original legislation: FY1983 NDAA, P.L. 97-252. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into cooperative military airlift agreements with the government of any allied country for the transportation of the personnel and cargo of the military forces of that country on aircraft operated by or for U.S. military forces in return for reciprocal transportation of personnel and cargo of U.S. military forces, subject to appropriations, and on terms specified by the statute. Defines "allied country" as: a country that	Yes for any country designated as an allied country for the purposes of this authority.	Yes, requires consultation with the Secretary of State for agreements with NATO members, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, ROK, and NATO subsidiary bodies.	None

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO): Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and the Republic of Korea (ROK); and, any country designated by the Secretary of Defense as an allied country for the purposes of this authority. Also authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into nonreciprocal military airlift agreements with NATO subsidiary bodies, on terms the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.			
Cooperative Logistic Support Agreements: NATO Countries: 10 U.S.C. 2350d. Original legislation: FY1990 and FY1991 NDAA, P.L. 101-189. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into bilateral or multilateral agreements, called Support Partnership Agreements, with one or more of other member countries of NATO participating in the operation of the NATO Support Organization.	No	No	None
Logistic Support for Allied Forces in Combined Operations: 10 U.S.C. 127d. Original legislation: FY2007 NDAA, P.L. 109-364. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $105 million in any fiscal year of logistics, supplies, and services to allied forces participating in a combined operation with the United States, as well as to a nonmilitary logistics, security, or similar agency of an allied government if it would benefit U.S. armed forces.	Yes	No	Annual report due December 31. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Administration of the American, British, Canadian and Australian Armies' Program: FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1274. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into five-year agreements with other countries participating in the American, British, Canadian and Australian Armies' Program for funds, personal property, or services required by the program.	Yes	No	Report due no later than 60 days before the expiration date of an agreement. SASC, HASC.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
DOD Participation in European Program on Multilateral Exchange of Air Transportation and Air Refueling Services (ATARES Program): FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1276. Arrangement or agreement expires five years after the date on which Secretary of Defense first enters into the arrangement or agreement, as described in the legislation. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to allow DOD participation in the Movement Coordination Center Europe Air Transport, Air-to-Air Refueling and other Exchanges of Services (ATARES) program, which provides mutual airlift and inflight refueling services.	Yes	No	Annual report submitted no later than 30 days after end of each fiscal year. Comptroller report submitted no later than one year after enactment of NDAA FY2013. Both to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Cross Servicing Agreements for Loan of Personnel Protection and Personnel Survivability Equipment in Coalition Operations: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1207. Expires Sept. 30, 2019. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to loan, under an ACSA (10 U.S.C. 2342) agreement, certain equipment for personnel protection and survivability to coalition forces participating in coalition or peacekeeping operations with the United States or training for such operations.	Yes	No	CN submitted 15 days prior to loan of equipment. Report due no later than October 30 following the fiscal year in which equipment was loaned. Both to SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC.
Logistics Support for Conveyance of Defense Articles in Afghanistan to Foreign Forces Training with the U.S. FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1210. Expires Sept. 30, 2016.	No	No	Report no later than 30 days after end of fiscal year. SFRC, HFAC, CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $10 million per fiscal year in logistic support for the conveyance of certain defense articles in Afghanistan to the armed forces of a country with which U.S. Armed Forces plan to conduct bilateral or multilateral training overseas during FY2015 and FY2016. Authority is to be exercised in accordance with the Arms Export Control Act and other relevant export control laws, and with Section 516(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.			
Counternarcotics, Counter-Transnational Organized Crime, and Counterproliferation Authorities			
Maintenance and Operation of Equipment for Law Enforcement: 10 U.S.C. 374. Original legislation regarding current Secretary of State role, FY1989 NDAA, P.L. 100-456, Section 1104. [The first version of 10 U.S.C. 374 (P.L. 97-86) provided for operations outside the U.S. land area only in emergency circumstances; a subsequent version permitted assistance to foreign governments, but required the Secretary of State's approval only for emergency assistance (P.L. 99-570).] Authorizes the use of DOD personnel to maintain equipment for federal, state, and local civilian law enforcement officials and, upon request from the head of a federal law enforcement agency, to operate equipment, for counterdrug, counterterrorism, and other anti-crime operations.	No	Operation of equipment for specified purposes for law enforcement operations outside the U.S. land area requires joint approval of the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of State. Specified purposes are the transport of specified personnel, operation of a base of operations, and the transport of suspected	None

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
		terrorists from foreign countries to the United States for trial.	
"1004" Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities and Activities to Counter Transnational Organized Crime: FY1991 NDAA, P.L. 101-510, Section 1004 as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2017. Authorizes DOD-funded assistance in the form of defense articles and services to U.S. and foreign counter-drug and counter-transnational organized crime law enforcement agencies. Assistance may include maintenance of equipment, transportation services, aerial and ground reconnaissance, and counter-drug and counter-transnational organized crime related training.	No	No	21 day advance CN of facilities projects. Biennial Report. All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D) FMT Report.
"Section 1033" Assistance for Additional Counternarcotics Support for Specified Countries: FY1998 NDAA, P.L. 105-85, Section 1033, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide counter-drug support including the transfer of selected non-lethal equipment, maintenance, repair, and upgrades to thirty-nine countries. In the case of Afghanistan, the transfer of specified lethal weapons and ammunition is authorized. Beginning in FY2015, funding may not exceed $125 million per fiscal year.	No	Support provided in consultation with the Secretary of State.	15 day advance written certification for fiscal year; 15 day advance CN; counter-drug plan submitted 60 days in advance each fiscal year in which support is provided. All to SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC. Biannual expenditure reports on direct or indirect support of counter-drug activities of foreign governments to be submitted until October 1, 2017. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D). Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
"1022" Joint Task Forces Support to Law Enforcement Agencies to Counter Transnational Organized Crime and Counter-Terrorism:	No	No	Annual report due December 31 of year in which the authority is in effect. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
FY2004 NDAA, P.L. 108-136, Section 1022, as amended. Expires Sept. 30 2020. Authorizes a joint task force of DOD that provides support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities to also provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counterterrorism or counter-transnational organized crime activities. Funds made available for counter-drug activities made available to a joint task force to support counter-drug activities may also be used for counterterrorism and counter-transnational organized crime support, during fiscal years 2006 through 2020.			D).
"1021" Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia: FY2005 NDAA, P.L. 108-375, Section 1021, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016. Authorizes the use of funds provided to Colombia to support a unified campaign by the Colombian government against narcotics trafficking and terrorist organizations.	No	No	CN submitted 15 days prior to providing assistance.
DOD Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR): FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Sections 1301-1352. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to conduct a program to (1) facilitate the elimination and safe and secure transport and storage of chemical, biological, or other weapons (and weapons components, related materials, and delivery vehicles), and (2) facilitate the safe and secure transport and storage of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons-usable or high-threat radiological materials, nuclear weapons components, and delivery vehicles, as well as the elimination of	Yes, for certain provisions.	No	Report submitted 15 days before obligation of funds; CN submitted 15 days before use of funds for unspecified purposes; CN submitted 15 days before obligation or expenditure of funds in excess of authorized amount; CN submitted no later than 30 days after Secretary of Defense directs on-site manger to resume U.S. participation in a project; annual certifications on use of facilities being constructed for CTR projects due first Monday in February of a year. All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
nuclear weapons, components, and delivery vehicles. Also authorizes the Secretary to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, components, and related materials, technology, and expertise, as well as of weapons of mass destruction-related materials. $358.5 million is authorized to be available for obligation in FY2016, FY2017, and FY2018.			CN submitted when funds are obligated to address certain emergent threats or opportunities; CN submitted when funds are obligated for urgent threat reduction activities in governed areas; CN submitted when President obligates funds for urgent threat reduction activities in ungoverned areas. Both to SFRC, HFAC. CN submitted no later than 30 days after receiving funding contributions for activities conducted under CTR; CN submitted 15 days prior to obligation of funds received from contributions; annual report on contributions due first Monday in February of a year; implementation plan submitted prior to obligation or expenditure of funds from contributions; summary of amounts requested, obligated or expended by project category to be included in annual report and budget notification materials; annual report on activities and assistance carried out due first Monday in February. All to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D), SFRC, HFAC.
Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief			
Humanitarian Aid: 10 U.S.C. 2557. Original legislation: FY1986 DDAA, P.L. 99-145. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to make DOD nonlethal excess supplies available for humanitarian relief and other specified purposes.	No	Excess supplies for humanitarian relief are transferred to Secretary of State for distribution.	None
Humanitarian and Civic Assistance: 10 U.S.C. 401. Original legislation: FY1987 NDAA, P.L. 99-661. Authorizes the secretary of a military department, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, to carry out specified types of humanitarian and civic assistance activities in conjunction with	See next column	Secretary of State to "specifically approve" assistance.	Annual report due March 1. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
authorized military operations.			
Transportation of Humanitarian Relief Supplies to Foreign Countries: 10 U.S.C. 402. Original legislation: FY1988 and FY1989 NDAA, P.L. 100-180. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to transport to any country, without charge, supplies that have been provided by nongovernmental sources and which are intended for humanitarian assistance. The President has delegated responsibility to the Secretary of State for ensuring that the transfer of humanitarian supplies meets specific criteria related to U.S. foreign policy goals and provision of humanitarian assistance. Supplies may only be transported if space is available.	No	Yes (Secretary of Defense in consultation with Secretary of State to ensure specific conditions are met.)	Report due July 31 of each year. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC.
Humanitarian Assistance: 10 U.S.C. 2561. Original legislation FY1993 NDAA, P.L. 102-484. Authorizes the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for providing transportation of humanitarian relief and for other humanitarian purposes worldwide.	No	No	Report on transportation of relief to unauthorized countries submitted 15 days in advance. SASC, SAC, SFRC, HASC, HAC, HFAC. Annual report on provision of humanitarian assistance submitted at the time of budget submission by the President. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Foreign Disaster Relief (FDR): 10 U.S.C. 404. Original legislation: FY1995 NDAA, P.L. 103-337. Authorizes the President to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide disaster assistance outside of the United States for manmade or natural disasters to prevent loss of lives or serious harm to the environment.	No	No	No later than 48 hours after the commencement of disaster assistance, the President shall submit a report to Congress.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Humanitarian Demining Assistance and Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance: 10 U.S.C. 407. Original legislation FY1995 NDAA, P.L. 103-337. Authorizes the secretary of a military department, under Secretary of Defense regulations, to carry out humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance to promote both the security interests of the U.S. and the recipient country, and the operational readiness skills of participating military personnel.	See next column.	Secretary of State to "specifically approve" assistance.	Information on 10 U.S.C. 407 activities included in the annual 10 U.S.C. 401 report (discussed above).
Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance (CFE-DMHA): 10 U.S.C. 182. Original legislation: FY1998 NDAA, P.L. 105-85. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to operate a Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance. The Center provides and facilitates education, training, and research in civil-military operations, particularly operations that require international disaster management and humanitarian assistance and operations that require coordination between the Department of Defense and other agencies. The Center is also authorized to pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate foreign military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management, peace operations, and humanitarian assistance.	No	No	FMT Report.
Exercises			
Unspecified Minor Construction: 10 U.S.C. 2805. Original legislation: Military Construction Codification Act of 1982, P.L. 97-214.	No	No	21 day advance CN (or 14 days if CN submitted electronically) required for projects costing more than $1 million. No committees specified.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to carry out unspecified minor military construction projects, up to $3 million, in support of a combined exercise not otherwise authorized by law, with an amount equal to 125% of the amount authorized by law for such purpose. If the military project is intended to correct a deficiency that is a threat to life, health, or safety, the project may have an approved cost up to $4 million.			
Joint Staff-Sponsored Exercise Program: 10 U.S.C. 153. Original legislation: Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, P.L. 99-433. Periodic or one-time combined command post or field training exercises to be conducted by combatant commands and their component commands with foreign military forces, under the authority of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.	No	No	None
Participation of Developing Countries in Combined Exercises: Payment of Incremental Costs: 10 U.S.C. 2010. Original legislation: FY1987 NDAA, P.L. 99-661. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide payment to a developing country for incremental expenses incurred as a direct result of participation in a bilateral or multilateral military exercise if the exercise is undertaken to enhance U.S. security interests and the country's participation is necessary to achieve exercise objectives.	No	Payment may be made after consultation with the Secretary of State.	Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Training for Eastern European National Military Forces in the Course of Multilateral Exercises, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1251. Expires September 30, 2017.	Yes (to determine eligibility for and appropriateness of training opportunities)	No	CN indicating list of countries eligible for training submitted prior to providing training. Briefing on use of authority no later than 90 days after end of each fiscal year. SASC, HASC

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide certain types of training in the course of multilateral exercises and pay incremental expenses up to $28 million incurred by a country as the direct result of participation in a multilateral exercise.			
International Armaments Cooperation			
Research and Development Projects: 10 U.S.C. 2358. Original legislation: Armed Forces--Codification of Laws, 1962, P.L. 87-651. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to engage in basic research, applied research, advanced research, and development projects related to weapons systems and other military needs or are of potential interest to the Department of Defense. The Information Exchange Program conducted under this authority involves the exchange of technical data with other countries to enhance research, development, testing, and evaluation of U.S. weapon systems.	No	No	None
Cooperative Research and Development Agreements: 10 U.S.C. 2350a. Original legislation: FY1990 and FY1991 NDAA, P.L. 101-189. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with NATO, a NATO organization, a NATO member, a major non-NATO ally, or any other friendly foreign country to conduct cooperative research and development projects on defense equipment and munitions.	No	No	None
Availability of Funds for Co-Production of Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System in the United States: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 234.	No	No	Report due no later than 30 days after obligations or expenditures of funds. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes the appropriation of no more than $15 million to be obligated or expended for nonrecurring engineering costs in connection with the establishment of a capacity for co-production in the United States for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense program.			
Cooperative Agreements for Reciprocal Use of Test Facilities: Foreign Countries and International Organizations: 10 U.S.C. 2350l. Original legislation: FY2002 NDAA, P.L. 107-107. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into formal agreements, such as memoranda of understanding, with a foreign country or international organization to utilize testing facilities for the testing of defense equipment, on a reciprocal basis.	Yes	No	None
Anti-Tunnel Capabilities Program with Israel: FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1279. Expires December 31, 2018. Upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to carry out research, development, testing, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. The amount of maintenance and sustainment support to Israel may not exceed $25 million.	No	Secretary of Defense in consultation with Secretary of State and Director of National Intelligence	Activities permitted by the authority can only be carried out once a report, including a memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel, has been submitted. Report due 15 days prior to providing maintenance and sustainment support to Israel for research, development, testing, and evaluation activities. Semiannual report. SASC, SFRC, SSCI, SCHS, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HPSCI, HCHS, HAC.
Education and Exchange Programs			
Aviation Leadership Program (ALP): 10 U.S.C. 9381-9383. Original legislation: FY1994 NDAA, P.L. 103-160.	No	No	FMT Report.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to establish an Aviation Leadership Program to provide undergraduate pilot training and related training to personnel of air forces of less developed foreign nations. Training shall include language training and programs to improve understanding of the democratic institutions and social framework of the United States.			
Senior Military College International Student Program: 10 U.S.C. 2111b. Original legislation: FY2000 NDAA, P.L. 106-65. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to facilitate the enrollment and instruction of persons from foreign countries as international students at the senior military colleges.	No	No	FMT Report.
Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Studies (WHINSEC), 10 U.S.C. 2166. Original legislation: FY2001 NDAA, P.L. 106-398. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to operate the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, in order to provide professional education and training to eligible military, law enforcement, and civilian personnel of countries in the Western Hemisphere.	No	Secretary of State shall be consulted in the selection of foreign personnel for education or training at the Institute.	CN submitted when foreign gifts or donations to the Institute exceed $1 million in any fiscal year. Annual report to Congress due March 15 of each year. FMT Report.
Payment of Foreign National Liaison Officer Expenses, 10 U.S.C. 1051a. Original legislation: FY2003 NDAA, P.L. 107-314. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide administrative services and support, including payment of expenses in connection with an assignment, for the performance of duties by a foreign liaison officer assigned to the headquarters of a U.S. combatant command, component command, subordinate operational command, or to the Joint Staff. The amount of unreimbursed support for any liaison officer may not exceed $200,000 (in FY2014 constant dollars).	No	Secretary of Defense in coordination with the Secretary of State.	None

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program: 10 U.S.C. 2249c. Original Legislation: FY2004 NDAA, P.L. 108-136. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated to DOD to pay any costs associated with the education and training of foreign military officers, ministry of defense officials, or security officials at military or civilian educational institutions, regional centers, conferences, seminars, or other training programs conducted under the Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program. The total amount of funds spent under this authority may not exceed $35 million.	No	No	Annual report due December 1st of each year. To Congress (no committees specified). FMT Report. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Distribution to Certain Foreign Personnel of Education and Training Materials and Information Technology to Enhance Military Interoperability with the Armed Forces: 10 U.S.C. 2249d. Original legislation: FY2007 NDAA, P.L. 109-364. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to distribute education and training materials, as well as information technology, to foreign military and civilian personnel, in order to enhance interoperability with U.S. forces.	Yes	No	Annual report due October 31. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC.
Tuition Waiver for Department of Defense Regional Centers: FY2009 NDAA, P.L. 110-417, Section 941, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2019. Permits the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement of costs of activities of Regional 1236Centers for personnel of nongovernmental international organizations up to $1 million per fiscal year.	Yes	No	FMT Report.

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Non-Reciprocal Exchange of Defense Personnel: FY2010 NDAA, P.L. 111-84, Section 1207, as amended. Expires December 31, 2021. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into nonreciprocal international defense personnel exchange agreements with an ally of the United States or another friendly foreign state.	No	No	Report due no later than 90 days after end of fiscal year in which authority is exercised. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC.
Temporary Assignment of Foreign Personnel for Information Security: 10 U.S.C. 1051c. Original legislation: FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81. Authorizes the temporary assignment and payment of certain expenses of a foreign military member to a DOD organization to participate in education and training opportunities to improve the member's ability to respond to security threats, vulnerabilities of information security systems, and the consequences of information security incidents.	No	No	None
Attendance at Military Academies: 10 U.S.C. 4344(a)(1); 10 U.S.C. 6957(a)(1); 10 U.S.C. 9344(a)(1). Authorizes the attendance of international students at U.S. military academies.	No	No	FMT Report.
Attendance at the Naval Post-Graduate School: 10 U.S.C. 7046. Authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to allow commissioned officers of foreign military services to attend the Naval Postgraduate School. Presidential authorization is required.	No	No	FMT Report.
Inter-European Air Forces Academy: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1268.	Yes	No	Annual report due no later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year in which the Secretary of the Air Force operates the Academy. SFRC, HFAC, CDCs (SASC,

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Expires Sept. 30, 2019. Authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to operate the Inter-European Air Forces Academy to provide military education and training to military personnel of countries that are NATO Members or signatories to the Partnership for Peace Framework Documents, and provide transportation, billeting, food, health services, supplies, equipment, and a living allowance to such personnel.			HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D). FMT Report.
Training of Security Forces and Associated Security Ministries of Foreign Countries to Promote Respect for the Rule of Law and Human Rights: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1206. Expires Sept. 30, 2020. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to conduct human rights training of security forces and associated security ministries of foreign countries.	Yes	No	Annual report due March 31. SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC.
Military-to-Military Contacts			
Latin American (LATAM) Cooperation: Payment of Personnel Expenses: 10 U.S.C. 1050. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to pay for the expenses of officers and students of Latin American countries and other expenses that the Secretary considers necessary for Latin American cooperation.	No	No	None
Payment of Expenses to Attend Bilateral, Multilateral, or Regional Cooperation Programs: 10 U.S.C. 1051. Original legislation: FY1987 NDAA, P.L. 99-661.	No	No	None

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to pay the travel, subsistence, and similar expenses of defense personnel of developing countries to attend multilateral, bilateral, or regional conferences, seminars, or similar meetings if the Secretary of Defense deems the attendance of such personnel in the national security interests of the United States.			
Military-to-Military Contacts and Related: 10 U.S.C. 168. Original legislation: FY1995 NDAA, P.L. 103-337. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to conduct and provide funds for eight specified types of military-to-military contacts and comparable activities.	See next column.	Secretary of State approval required for the conduct of an activity in a foreign country.	Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Defense Personnel Exchange Program: FY1997 NDAA, P.L. 104-201, Section 1082. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to enter into international defense personnel exchange agreements with the government of a U.S. ally or another friendly foreign country. DOD conducts the Engineers and Scientists Exchange Program (ESEP) under this authority, which involves the mutual exchange of military or civilian engineers and scientists between the U.S. and a foreign country's military RDT&E communities.	No	No	None
Presentation of Awards and Mementos to Foreign Personnel. 10 U.S.C. 1051b. Original legislation: FY2004 NDAA, P.L. 108-136. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to present awards and mementos purchased with funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of U.S. armed forces to members of friendly foreign forces and other foreign nationals who significantly enhance or support the National Security Strategy of the United States.	No	No	None

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Participation in Multinational Military Centers of Excellence: 10 U.S.C. 2350m. Original legislation: FY2009 NDAA, P.L. 110-417. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to permit the participation of U.S. armed forces and DOD civilian personnel in any multinational military center of excellence in order to: enhance the ability of military forces and civilian personnel of countries participating in such centers to engage in joint exercises or coalition or international military operations; improve interoperability between U.S. armed forces and the military forces of friendly foreign states.	Yes	No	Annual report due October 31st of each year. SASC, HASC.
Center for Complex Operations, 10 U.S.C. 409. Original Legislation: FY2009 NDAA, P.L. 110-417. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish the Center for Complex Operations to facilitate coordination among DOD personnel and other USG personnel for complex operations; to foster unity of effort among the U.S. government departments and agencies, foreign governments and militaries, international organizations and international nongovernmental organizations, and domestic nongovernmental organizations; to conduct research in matters relating to complex operations; and to identify and address gaps in the education and training of DOD and other USG personnel relating to complex operations.	Yes (when the Center's efforts and activities involve foreign governments and militaries, and international organizations and NGOs)	No	None
African Cooperation: Payment of Personnel Expenses, 10 U.S.C. 1050a. Original legislation: FY2011 NDAA, P.L. 111-383. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to pay for the expenses of officers and students of African countries and other expenses that the Secretary considers necessary for African cooperation.	No	No	None

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
United States Participation in Headquarters Eurocorps: FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1275. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to allow the participation of U.S. military personnel as staff members of the NATO Rapid Deployable Corps Eurocorps headquarters.	Yes	No	Assignment of more than two members of the U.S. Armed Forces requires Secretary of Defense report and certification and assignment of more than 10 members requires Secretary of Defense notice. SASC, HASC.
National Guard State Partnership Program: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1205, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2021. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to establish a program of activities to support security cooperation objectives of the United States between members of a National Guard of a U.S. state or territory and foreign military forces, security forces, or foreign governmental organizations whose primary functions include disaster response or emergency response, and makes available funds to cover related costs of U.S. and foreign participation (up to a total of $10 million for the latter).	Yes	No	Report assessing previous programs due no later than 180 days after enactment. CN submitted 15 days before initiating an activity that it is in the national security interests of the United States. Annual report due January 31. All three above to SASC, SFRC, SAC, HASC, HFAC, HAC. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Defense Institution Building and Support			
Ministry of Defense Advisors (MODA) Program: FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81, Section 1081, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2017. FY2016 enacted funding is $10.8 million. The FY2017 budget estimate is $9.2 million. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to assign civilian Department of Defense employees as advisors to foreign ministries of defense or security agencies serving a similar defense function to provide advice	Yes	No	CN submitted 15 days prior to assignment of Department of Defense civilian employee to a regional organization with a security mission. Annual report due December 30. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC. Comptroller General report submitted no later than December 30, 2014. SASC, SFRC, HASC, HFAC. Biennial Report. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
and other training and to assist in building core institutional capacity, competencies, and capabilities.			
Regional Centers for Security Studies (RCSS): 10 U.S.C. 184. Original legislation: FY2001 NDAA, P.L. 106-398. Authorizes the administration of DOD Regional Centers for Security Studies for bilateral and multilateral research, communications, and exchange of ideas involving military and civilian participants. Allows the Secretary of Defense to waive reimbursement of costs activities of Regional Centers for foreign participants from developing countries if the Secretary determines that attendance is in the national security interest of the United States. (The five regional centers are: the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies in Germany; the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies in Hawaii; the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies; the Africa Center for Strategic Studies; and the Near East-South Asia Center for Strategic Studies.)	No	No	FMT Report.
Defense Institution Reform Initiative: 10 U.S.C. 168; 10 U.S.C. 1051. The Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI) is conducted through the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Rule of Law program under 10 U.S.C. 168, military-to-military contacts authority, and 10 U.S.C. 1051, developing country participation in multilateral, bilateral, or regional events. DIRI supports foreign defense institutional by determining institutional needs and developing projects to meet them. DIRI both scopes out projects for execution under the MODA and conducts its own military-to-military informational engagements.	No	Yes, as mandated by 10 U.S.C. 168.	Reporting and notification requirements determined by underlying authorities (10 U.S.C. 168 and 10 U.S.C. 1051).
Wales (formerly Warsaw) Initiative Fund. The Wales Initiative Fund (WIF) was formerly named the Warsaw	No	Yes, as mandated by 10 U.S.C. 168 and 10 U.S.C.	Notification and reporting requirements determined by underlying authorities (10 U.S.C. 168, 10 U.S.C. 1051, and 10 U.S.C. 2010).

Authority	Secretary of State Concurrence Required by Legislation?	Other State Department Collaboration Required by Legislation?	Required Congressional Notifications (CN) or Reports and Recipients
Initiative Fund, but was renamed after the Wales NATO summit in September 2014. It supports the participation of 16 developing countries in the State Department-led Partnership for Peace Program. Activities funded by WIF are conducted using the authority of three statutes (10 U.S.C. 168, 10 U.S.C. 1051, and 10 U.S.C. 2010). This fund has enabled a wide range of assistance, including equipment and training, but is currently used primarily for defense institution building, according to DSCA officials.		2010.	
Recovery and Accounting of Missing Personnel			
Assist in Accounting for Missing USG Personnel: 10 U.S.C. 408. Original legislation FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-181. Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide equipment supplies, services, and training to any foreign nation assisting Department of Defense with recovery of and accounting for missing U.S. government personnel.	Yes	No	Report whenever assistance is provided. CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).
Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities (NCARC) Assistance: FY2009 NDAA, Section 943, P.L. 110-417, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016. Authorizes the expenditure of not more than $25 million, upon a determination by a commander of a combatant command that an action is necessary in connection with a nonconventional assisted recovery effort, to establish, develop, and maintain nonconventional assisted recovery capabilities. Includes authority to provide, in limited and special circumstances, equipment, supplies, training, transportation or other logistical support or funding to foreign forces, groups, or individuals in order to facilitate the recovery of U.S. personnel.	No	Concurrence of Chief of Mission.	CN submitted 30 days in advance. Quarterly report. Both to CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Source: Created by CRS.

Notes: Table A-1 abbreviations for committees are as follows: Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC); House Armed Services Committee (HASC); Senate Foreign Relations Committee (SFRC); Senate Committee on Homeland Security (SCHS); House Committee on Homeland Security (HCHS); Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI); House Foreign Affairs Committee (HFAC); Senate Appropriations Committee (SAC); House Appropriations Committee (HAC); and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI). References in legislation to "Congressional defense committees" mean SASC, HASC, and the defense subcommittees of SAC and HAC, abbreviated in the table as CDCs (SASC, HASC, SAC-D, HAC-D).

Other Table A-1 abbreviations are as follows: NDAA=National Defense Authorization Act. "DDAA" in the entry on 10 U.S.C. 2557 stands for Department of Defense Authorization Act, the title given that year to the NDAA legislation. "Biennial Report" means the report on programs carried out by the DOD to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces required by the FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1211. "FMT Report" means the Foreign Military Training: Joint Report to Congress required by the Section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2416) and Section 652 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2008 (P.L. 110-161).

Table A-2. Funding for Select DOD Security Cooperation Authorities

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Contingency Operations and Related Coalition Operational Support: Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Ukraine, Africa			
Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism: FY2005 NDAA, Section 1208, P.L. 108-375, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2017.	Up to $85 million in any fiscal year.		
Section "1233" Coalition Support Funds (CSF), including the Coalition Readiness Support Program (CRSP): FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-181, Section 1233, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016.	Reimbursements may not exceed $1.16 billion during FY2016.		
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF): FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-181, Section 1513, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016.		$3.65 billion available through September 30, 2017.	$3.4 billion.
"1234" Logistical Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Operations in Afghanistan and Iraq: FY2008 NDAA, P.L. 110-181, Section 1234, as amended. Expires Sept 30, 2016.	Up to $450 million.		
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF): FY2011 NDAA, P.L. 111-383, Section 1217. Expired Sept. 30, 2015		FY2016 appropriations legislation (P.L. 114-113) makes no more than $50 million available for additional costs associated with existing projects funded under AIF.	
Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP): FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81, Section 1201, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016	$10 million for FY2016.	$5 million.	

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Transfer of Defense Articles and Services to Military and Security Forces of Afghanistan: FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1222, as amended. Expires Dec. 31, 2016.	Up to $250 million per fiscal year.		
Support of Foreign Forces Participating in Operations to Disarm the Lord's Resistance Army: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1208. Expires Sept. 30, 2017.	Up to $50 million per fiscal year.		
Iraq Train and Equip fund (ITEF): FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section1236, as amended. Expires Dec. 31, 2016.	Up to $715 million.	$715 million.	$630 million.
Assistance to the Vetted Syrian Opposition: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1209. Expires Dec. 31, 2016.			$250 million.
European Reassurance Initiative (ERI): FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1535.	Up to $1 billion in FY2015.	$789 million.	$3.4 billion.
Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1250.	Up to $300 million in FY2016.	$250 million.	
Support for National Military Forces of Allied Countries for Counterterrorism Operations in Africa, FY2016 NDAA, Section 1207, P.L. 114-92. Expires September 30, 2018.	Up to $100 million in any fiscal year.		

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Assistance to the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon for Border Security Operations, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1226. Expires December 31, 2018.	Up to $150 million from Coalition Support Funds (CSF) or the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF).		
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capabilities of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction (FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1204).			
Global and Regional, Non-Contingency Train and Equip, and Other Assistance			
Building Capacity of Foreign Security Forces, 10 U.S.C. 2282 (formerly known as "Section 1206 Train and Equip"). Original legislation: FY2006 NDAA, P.L. 109-163.	Up to $350 million in FY2015 or FY2016.	$344 million.	*$270 million.*
Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF): FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81, Section 1207, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2017.	Up to $200 million per fiscal year.		
Training of General Purpose Forces of the United States Armed Forces with Military and Other Security Forces of Friendly Foreign Countries: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1203. Expires Sept. 30, 2017.	Up to $10 million per fiscal year.		
Logistics Support to Foreign Forces Training with U.S. Armed Forces: FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1210. Expires Sept. 30, 2016.	Up to $10 million per fiscal year.		
South China Sea Initiative, Section 1261, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92. Expires September 30, 2020.	$50 million.	$50 million.	*$60 million.*

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Combatant Commander Initiative Fund (CCIF): 10 U.S.C. 166a. Original legislation: FY1992 and FY1993 NDAA, P.L. 102-190.	Up to $10 million per year to sponsor the participation of foreign countries in joint exercises. Up to $5 million per year for force training, contingencies, selected operations, command and control, joint exercises, military education and training for military and related civilian personnel of foreign countries, including transportation, translation, and administrative expenses.	$15 million.	$15 million.
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF): FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 113-235, Section 1510.	Up to $750 million.	$1.1 billion.	$1 billion.
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Foreign Cryptologic Support (10 U.S.C. 421); Special Operations Forces: Training with Friendly Foreign Forces (JCETs) (10 U.S.C. 2011); Imagery Intelligence and Geospatial Information: Support for Foreign Countries, Regional Organizations, and Security Alliances: (10 U.S.C. 443).			
Global Operational Support, including Lift and Sustain, and Logistics			
Logistic Support for Allied Forces in Combined Operations: 10 U.S.C. 127d. Original legislation: FY2007 NDAA, P.L. 109-364.	Up to $105 million in any fiscal year.		
Logistics Support for Conveyance of Defense Articles in Afghanistan to Foreign Forces Training with the U.S. FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1210. Expires Sept. 30, 2016.	Up to $10 million per fiscal year.		
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA) (10 U.S.C. 2342); Cooperative Military Airlift Agreements: Allied Countries: (10 U.S.C. 2350c); Cooperative Logistic Support Agreements: NATO Countries (10 U.S.C. 2350d); Administration of the American, British, Canadian and Australian Armies' Program (FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1274); DOD Participation in European Program on Multilateral Exchange of Air Transportation and Air Refueling Services (ATARES Program) (FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1276); Cross Servicing Agreements for Loan of Personnel Protection and Personnel Survivability Equipment in Coalition Operations (FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1207).			

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Counternarcotics, Counter-Transnational Organized Crime, and Counterproliferation Authorities			
"Section 1033" Assistance for Additional Counternarcotics Support for Specified Countries: FY1998 NDAA, P.L 105-85, Section 1033, as amended. Expires Sept. 30, 2016.	Up to $125 million per fiscal year.		
DOD Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR): FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Sections 1301-1352.	$358.5 million is authorized to be available for obligation in FY2016, FY2017, and FY2018.	$358.5 million.	*$325.6 million.*
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Maintenance and Operation of Equipment for Law Enforcement: 10 U.S.C. 374); "1004" Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities and Activities to Counter Transnational Organized Crime (FY1991 NDAA, P.L. 101-510, Section 1004, as amended); "1022" Joint Task Forces Support to Law Enforcement Agencies to Counter Transnational Organized Crime and Counter-Terrorism (FY2004 NDAA, P.L. 108-136, Section 1022, as amended); "1021" Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia (FY2005 NDAA, P.L. 108-375, Section 1021, as amended). The FY2017 DOD budget estimate for counternarcotics activities is $845 million, of which $522 million is allotted for international support.			
Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief			
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Humanitarian Aid: 10 U.S.C. 2557; Humanitarian and Civic Assistance: (10 U.S.C. 401); Transportation of Humanitarian Relief Supplies to Foreign Countries (10 U.S.C. 402); Humanitarian Assistance: (10 U.S.C. 2561); Foreign Disaster Relief (FDR) (10 U.S.C. 404); Humanitarian Demining Assistance and Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance (10 U.S.C. 407); Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance (CFE-DMHA) (10 U.S.C. 182). DOD humanitarian assistance and disaster relief is funded through the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA) account. OHDACA supports 10 U.S.C. 401, 402, 404, 407, 2557, and 2561. The FY2017 budget estimate for OHDACA is $105 million.			
Exercises			
Unspecified Minor Construction: 10 U.S.C. 2805. Original legislation: Military Construction Codification Act of 1982, P.L. 97-214.	Up to $3 million in support of a combined exercise not otherwise authorized by law. Up to $4 million to correct a deficiency that is a threat to life, health, or safety.		

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Training for Eastern European National Military Forces in the Course of Multilateral Exercises, FY2016 NDAA, P.L. 114-92, Section 1251.	Up to $28 million.		
Expires September 30, 2017.			
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Participation of Developing Countries in Combined Exercises: Payment of Incremental Costs (10 U.S.C. 2010); Joint Staff-Sponsored Exercise Program (10 U.S.C. 153).			
International Armaments Cooperation			
Availability of Funds for Co-Production of Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System in the United States: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 234.	No more than $15 million for nonrecurring engineering costs.		
Anti-Tunnel Capabilities Program with Israel: FY2016 NDAA, P.L 114-92, Section 1279.	May not exceed $25 million in maintenance and sustainment support to Israel.		
Expires December 31, 2018.			
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Research and Development Projects (10 U.S.C. 2358); Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (10 U.S.C. 2350a); Cooperative Agreements for Reciprocal Use of Test Facilities: Foreign Countries and International Organizations (10 U.S.C. 2350l).			
Education and Exchange Programs			
Payment of Foreign National Liaison Officer Expenses, 10 U.S.C. 1051a. Original legislation: FY2003 NDAA, P.L. 107-314.	Unreimbursed support for any officer may not exceed $200,000 (in FY2014 constant dollars).		
Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program: 10 U.S.C. 2249c. Original Legislation: FY2004 NDAA, P.L. 108-136.	May not exceed $35 million.	$25.6 million	*$26.8 million*

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Tuition Waiver for Department of Defense Regional Centers: FY2009 NDAA, P.L. 110-417, Section 941, as amended.	Up to $1 million per fiscal year.		
Expires Sept. 30, 2019.			
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Studies (WHINSEC) (10 U.S.C. 2166); Senior Military College International Student Program: (10 U.S.C. 2111b); Aviation Leadership Program (ALP) (10 U.S.C. 9381-9383); Distribution to Certain Foreign Personnel of Education and Training Materials and Information Technology to Enhance Military Interoperability with the Armed Forces (10 U.S.C. 2249d); Non-Reciprocal Exchange of Defense Personnel (FY2010 NDAA, P.L. 111-84, Section 1207, as amended); Temporary Assignment of Foreign Personnel for Information Security: (10 U.S.C. 1051c); Attendance at Military Academies ((10 U.S.C. 4344(a)(1); 10 U.S.C. 6957(a)(1); 10 U.S.C. 9344(a)(1)); Attendance at the Naval Post-Graduate School (10 U.S.C. 7046); Inter-European Air Forces Academy (FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1268); Training of Security Forces and Associated Security Ministries of Foreign Countries to Promote Respect for the Rule of Law and Human Rights (FY2015 NDAA, P.L. 113-291, Section 1206).			
Military-to-Military Contacts			
National Guard State Partnership Program: FY2014 NDAA, P.L. 113-66, Section 1205, as amended.	Up to $10 million.		
Expires Sept. 30, 2021.			
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Payment of Expenses to Attend Bilateral, Multilateral, or Regional Cooperation Programs (10 U.S.C. 1051); Military-to-Military Contacts and Related (10 U.S.C. 168); Defense Personnel Exchange Program (FY1997 NDAA, P.L. 104-201, Section 1082); Presentation of Awards and Mementos to Foreign Personnel (10 U.S.C. 1051b); Participation in Multinational Military Centers of Excellence (10 U.S.C. 2350m); Center for Complex Operations (10 U.S.C. 409); African Cooperation: Payment of Personnel Expenses (10 U.S.C. 1050a); United States Participation in Headquarters Eurocorps (FY2013 NDAA, P.L. 112-239, Section 1275).			
Defense Institution Building and Support			
Ministry of Defense Advisors (MODA) Program: FY2012 NDAA, P.L. 112-81, Section 1081, as amended.		$10.8 million.	*$9.2 million.*
Regional Centers for Security Studies (RCSS): 10 U.S.C. 184. Original legislation: FY2001 NDAA, P.L. 106-398.		$55.7 million.	*$58.6 million.*
Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI): 10 U.S.C. 168; 10 U.S.C. 1051.		$12.4 million.	*$25.6 million.*

Authority	Authorized Amount (if available)	FY2016 Appropriations (if available)	FY2017 *Budget Estimate* or Request (if available)
Wales (formerly Warsaw) Initiative Fund.		$32.3 million.	*$21.9 million.*
Recovery and Accounting of Missing Personnel			
Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities (NCARC) Assistance: FY2009 NDAA, Section 943, P.L.110-417, as amended.	Not more than $25 million.		
Expires Sept. 30, 2016.			
Authorization or appropriations legislation does not specify funding levels for the following authorities: Assist in Accounting for Missing USG Personnel (10 U.S.C. 408).			

Source: National Defense Authorization Acts, DOD FY2017 Budget Documents, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (P.L. 114-113).

Note: This list includes only authorities for which Congress has established authorization and/or appropriations levels. Not all Title 10 and NDAA authorities have funding levels established by authorization and/or appropriations legislation. Funding for some security cooperation authorities may also be subsumed under a larger budget category or simply drawn from the defense-wide operations and maintenance budget, making identification of specific funding levels for some authorities difficult.

Author Contact Information

(name redacted)
Research Assistant
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov , 7-....

(name redacted)
Specialist in International Security Affairs
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov , 7-....