

# FY2022 NDAA: Procurement Authorizations

February 28, 2022

The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) typically authorizes appropriations for Department of Defense (DOD) [procurement](#) programs in Title I of Division A of the legislation. DOD procurement accounts [fund](#) the purchase of new equipment and modifications to existing weapons, including ships, aircraft, ground combat vehicles, munitions, and other products and services. The Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force have multiple procurement accounts, including those related to subordinate services (i.e., Marine Corps and Space Force). The Procurement, Defense-Wide account supports Special Operations Command (SOCOM), the Missile Defense Agency, and other agencies reporting to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Congress typically [appropriates](#) funding for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account (NGREA) to procure items for the reserve components.

## Summary of Procurement Authorizations

### *President's Budget Request*

The FY2022 President's budget requested [\\$133.6 billion](#) in discretionary funding for DOD procurement programs—\$8 billion (6%) less than the enacted FY2021 level. Of this amount, [\\$132.2 billion](#) fell within the scope of the NDAA. In a [memorandum](#) to DOD employees, Secretary of Defense Lloyd J. Austin III identified among his priorities innovation and modernization, including the divestment of “legacy systems and programs that no longer meet our security needs.” In an [overview](#) of the FY2022 budget request, DOD identified \$2.8 billion in divestments among the Departments and SOCOM, including certain ships (e.g., Ticonderoga-class guided missile [cruisers](#) and [Littoral Combat Ships](#)), aircraft (e.g., [A-10](#) close air support aircraft and KC-10 and KC-135 refueling [tankers](#)), and other systems.

### *House-Passed NDAA*

The House-passed NDAA would have authorized [\\$147.1 billion](#) for procurement programs—\$14.9 billion (11.2%) more than the request. The House legislation would have authorized \$17 billion in increases to the request (i.e., funding beyond the amounts for certain programs requested in the budget or for programs not requested in the budget). The net effect of these increases would have been offset by \$2.15 billion in decreases to the request.

The Biden Administration [opposed](#) the House bill's “restoration of funding to systems that limit DOD's ability to divest or retire lower priority platforms not relevant to tomorrow's battlefield.”

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

IN11870

### *SASC-Reported NDAA*

The SASC-reported NDAA would have authorized **\$144.1 billion** for procurement programs—\$11.8 billion (9.0%) more than the request. The legislation would have authorized \$12.4 billion in increases to the request. The net effect of these increases would have been offset by \$0.6 billion in decreases to the request.

The Administration **opposed** the SASC bill’s restoration of funding for certain “vulnerable and costly platforms that no longer meet mission or security needs.”

### *Enacted NDAA*

The enacted NDAA authorized **\$146.9 billion** for procurement programs—\$14.7 billion (11.1%) more than the request. The legislation authorized \$16.4 billion in increases to the request, including for certain DOD **unfunded priorities**. The net effect of these increases was offset by \$1.7 billion in decreases to the request. Among the accounts with the biggest increases from the request were National Guard and Reserve Equipment, ground combat vehicles, ships, and aircraft. Among those with the biggest decreases were ammunition. See **Table 1**.

**Table 1. Summary of Procurement Authorizations in the FY2022 NDAA**  
(in billions of dollars)

Account	Request	House-passed	SASC-reported	Enacted	Difference (%)
Aircraft Procurement, Army	\$2.81	\$3.31	\$3.13	\$3.36	19.6%
Missile Procurement, Army	\$3.56	\$3.65	\$3.69	\$3.65	2.5%
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	\$3.88	\$4.72	\$4.53	\$4.70	21.1%
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	\$2.16	\$2.44	\$2.44	\$2.46	13.8%
Other Procurement, Army	\$8.87	\$8.93	\$8.88	\$8.99	1.3%
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	\$16.48	\$19.61	\$19.18	\$19.8	20.2%
Weapons Procurement, Navy	\$4.22	\$4.13	\$4.34	\$4.13	-2.0%
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	\$0.99	\$0.98	\$1.03	\$0.90	-8.7%
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	\$22.57	\$28.42	\$25.12	\$27.28	20.9%
Other Procurement, Navy	\$10.88	\$11.03	\$11.52	\$11.17	2.7%
Procurement, Marine Corps	\$3.04	\$3.62	\$3.72	\$3.62	19.0%
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	\$15.73	\$17.47	\$18.6	\$18.13	15.3%
Missile Procurement, Air Force	\$2.67	\$2.57	\$2.67	\$2.58	-3.5%
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	\$0.80	\$0.79	\$0.80	\$0.71	-10.1%
Other Procurement, Air Force	\$25.25	\$25.79	\$25.73	\$25.75	2.0%

Account	Request	House-passed	SASC-reported	Enacted	Difference (%)
Procurement, Space Force	\$2.77	\$2.77	\$2.80	\$2.79	0.7%
Procurement, Defense-Wide	\$5.55	\$5.89	\$5.88	\$5.92	6.8%
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	\$0.00	\$0.95	\$0.00	\$0.95	n/a
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$132.21</b>	<b>\$147.06</b>	<b>\$144.05</b>	<b>\$146.88</b>	<b>11.1%</b>

**Source:** CRS analysis of funding tables in [H.Rept. 117-118, p. 346](#); [S.Rept. 117-39, p. 378](#); and explanatory statement accompanying the FY2022 NDAA ([P.L. 117-81](#)) in the *Congressional Record*, December 7, 2021, [p. H7362](#).

**Notes:** Totals may not sum due to rounding. Dollars rounded to nearest hundredth; percentages rounded to nearest tenth. "Difference (%)" column is the percentage difference between enacted and requested amounts.

## Selected Increases and Decreases

Among the largest line-item increases for procurement programs in the enacted NDAA from requested amounts, in terms of dollar value, were

- **\$2.9 billion** for the Navy to procure two more [DDG-51](#) Arleigh Burke-class destroyers (for a total of three ships);
- **\$1.1 billion** for the Air Force to modify [F-35A](#) fighter aircraft to the Block 4 configuration (also called Continuous Capability Development and Delivery, or C2D2);
- **\$950 million** for the Departments to buy National Guard and Reserve Equipment;
- **\$889 million** for the Navy to procure 12 [F/A-18E/F](#) fighter attack aircraft; and
- **\$749 million** for the Navy to procure nine more [V-22](#) tilt-rotor aircraft (for a total of 17 aircraft).

Among the largest line-item decreases, in terms of dollar value, were

- **\$263.5 million** for the Army to procure next-generation night vision devices (mostly for the Integrated Visual Augmentation System, or IVAS);
- **\$180 million** for the Navy to procure three fewer auxiliary vessels (i.e., used commercial cargo ships on [reserve](#) for military sealift);
- **\$87.1 million** for the Navy to modify the RIM-162 Evolved SeaSparrow Missile (ESSM), a surface-to-air missile for ship defense;
- **\$76 million** in advance procurement funding for the Navy to procure a [TAO-205](#) John Lewis-class oiler in a future fiscal year; and
- **\$75.5 million** for the Air Force's Joint Direct Attack Munition ([JDAM](#)), a GPS guidance kit for bombs.

## Limitations on Divestments of Certain Aircraft, Ships

Various provisions in the enacted NDAA limited DOD's ability to divest certain aircraft and ships, either by prohibiting the use or limiting the availability of funds for their retirement or inactivation, or by establishing minimum inventory requirements. [Section 134](#) prohibited the use of funds for the retirement of A-10 aircraft; [Section 137](#) limited the number of KC-135 tankers available for retirement; and [Section 138](#) established a minimum inventory requirement for tactical airlift aircraft (e.g., [C-130](#) cargo aircraft). [Section 1018](#) prohibited the use of funds for the retirement of Mark VI patrol boats and [Section 1019](#) limited the availability of funds for the retirement or inactivation of cruisers.

## F-35 Affordability Targets and Transfer of Program Responsibilities

[Section 141](#) of the enacted NDAA required the Secretaries of the Air Force and Navy to limit their F-35 inventory beginning in FY2029 unless they meet certain affordability targets. [Section 142](#) required the Secretary of Defense to transfer “all functions relating to the management, planning, and execution of sustainment activities for the F-35 aircraft program from the F-35 Joint Program Office” to the aforementioned service secretaries.

## Cost Estimate for B-52 Commercial Engine Replacement Program (CERP)

[Section 135](#) of the enacted NDAA limited the availability of a percentage of funding for the Air Force’s B-52 Commercial Engine Replacement Program ([CERP](#)), an effort intended to replace the TF33 engines on the B-52H bomber fleet, until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees on a cost estimate for the program.

## Author Information

Brendan W. McGarry  
Analyst in U.S. Defense Budget

---

## Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS’s institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.