

Advance Questions for General Philip M. Breedlove, USAF
Nominee for Commander, United States European Command and
Supreme Allied Commander, Europe

Defense Reforms

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and the Special Operations reforms have strengthened the warfighting readiness of our Armed Forces. They have enhanced civilian control and the chain of command by clearly delineating the combatant commanders' responsibilities and authorities and the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They have also clarified the responsibility of the Military Departments to recruit, organize, train, equip, and maintain forces for assignment to the combatant commanders.

Do you see the need for modifications of any Goldwater-Nichols Act provisions or the Special Operations reforms?

Successful operations around the world from Iraq and Afghanistan to Libya demonstrated the importance of Goldwater-Nichols. I learned the importance and value of joint training early in my career as an air liaison officer working with the Army in 1985. I am convinced the success of all of our operations over the past years is directly attributable to the joint training and doctrine that came out of Goldwater-Nichols. I do not see the need for modifications at this time.

If so, what areas do you believe might be appropriate to address in these modifications?

I do not see the need for modifications at this time.

Duties

What is your understanding of the duties and functions of the Commander, U.S. European Command (EUCOM) and NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR)?

The Commander of the U.S. European Command is responsible for giving authoritative direction to subordinate commands and forces necessary to carry out all U.S. military operations and activities across the 51 independent states in the European Command Area of Responsibility (AOR) in pursuit of U.S. national military objectives. This AOR includes all of Europe (including Turkey), the Caucasus Region, and Israel. The commander is also responsible for the health, welfare and security of the approximately 64,000 service members forward deployed within that AOR.

The NATO North Atlantic Council and Military Committee assigns specific roles and duties to SACEUR. These include:

- Overall command of all NATO military operations regardless of geographic boundaries.
- Strategic planning to include military planning for the full range of Alliance missions and contributions to crisis management and effective defense of NATO territory and forces.
- Identifying and requesting forces for the full range of Alliance missions.
- Strategic Analysis: In conjunction with Supreme Allied Commander Transformation, supports NATO's Defense Planning Process and conducts strategic level analysis to identify and prioritize type and scale of NATO's critical capability shortfalls.
- Operational Leadership: Executes military measures within the capability of the command to preserve or restore the security of NATO nations.
- Transformation: Cooperates with the Supreme Allied Commander for Transformation (SAC-T) on integrating transformation efforts.
- Crisis Management. Continually monitors and analyses the international environment to anticipate crises, and where appropriate, take active steps to prevent them from becoming larger conflicts.
- Strategic engagement and partnership building: Develops and participates in mil to mil contacts and other cooperation activities with NATO partners around the globe.
- In conjunction with Supreme Allied Commander Transformation, conducts combined and joint training and exercises. This role will be critical to the implementation of the NATO connected forces initiative designed to maintain interoperable forces in the post ISAF environment.

The responsibilities of the Commander EUCOM and the SACEUR are complementary. The fact that they have traditionally been vested in one officer facilitates near-seamless coordination between the U.S. and NATO military command structures.

What background and experience do you possess that you believe qualifies you to perform these duties?

As Commander, United States Air Forces in Europe, Commander, United States Air Forces Africa, and Commander, NATO Allied Air Command, in addition to my six previous assignments in Europe, I have had the privilege of working closely with our joint forces, NATO Allies, and coalition partners. During these assignments, I have had the opportunity to meet with several Ministers and Chiefs of Defense in Europe, providing me a unique opportunity to develop lasting relationships. Recent operations in Europe and Africa have continued to reinforce my belief in the criticality of these partnerships and inspired confidence in future of US and European relations. If confirmed, I believe my knowledge of the region and familiarity with the Alliance, coupled with these personal relationships, will enhance my ability to perform command duties for both EUCOM and SHAPE, and contribute to our Nations' shared security objectives.

Do you believe that there are any steps that you need to take to enhance your expertise to perform the duties of the Commander, EUCOM, or NATO SACEUR?

If confirmed, I will engage with key officials and personnel within the Executive and Legislative branches of the U.S. government to uphold and advance the national policies and interests of the United States in the European theater. To this end, I will also engage with the governments and militaries of our allies to understand the magnitude and interdependent issues within the region. I will seek the cooperation of the Alliance leadership to work together to engage on vital regional issues. I will also continuously improve my understanding of the history and culture of the region.

Relationships

Section 162(b) of title 10, United States Code, provides that the chain of command runs from the President to the Secretary of Defense and from the Secretary of Defense to the combatant commands. Other sections of law and traditional practice, however, establish important relationships outside the chain of command. Please describe your understanding of the relationship of the Commander, EUCOM/NATO SACEUR, to the following:

The Secretary of Defense

The Secretary of Defense exercises authority over the Armed Forces of the United States through the EUCOM Commander for those forces assigned to the EUCOM AOR. The EUCOM Commander exercises command authority over assigned forces and is directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the performance of assigned missions and the preparedness of the Command.

The Deputy Secretary of Defense

The Deputy Secretary of Defense is delegated full power and authority to act for the Secretary of Defense and to exercise the powers of the Secretary on any and all matters for which the Secretary is authorized to act pursuant to law. The EUCOM Commander coordinates and exchanges information with the Deputy Secretary on matters delegated by the Secretary. The Commander directly communicates with the Deputy Secretary on a regular basis.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

A direct command relationship between the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the EUCOM Commander does not exist. However, the EUCOM Commander regularly interacts, coordinates and exchanges information with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on policy issues relating to NATO, European, and Eurasian affairs. The Commander directly communicates with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on a regular basis.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence

There is not a direct command relationship between the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and the EUCOM Commander. However, the EUCOM Commander regularly

interacts with, coordinates and exchanges information with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence on intelligence related matters.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs

There is not a direct command relationship between the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs and the EUCOM Commander. The EUCOM Commander and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs work together on coordinating international security policy and strategy.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

The Chairman functions under the authority, direction and control of the President and Secretary of Defense. The Chairman transmits communications between the President and Secretary of Defense and the EUCOM Commander, as well as oversees the activities of the EUCOM Commander as directed by the Secretary of Defense. As the principal military advisor to the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman is a key conduit between the Combatant Commander, Interagency, and Service Chiefs.

The EUCOM Commander keeps the Chairman informed on significant issues regarding NATO and the EUCOM AOR. The Commander directly communicates with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a regular basis.

The Secretaries of the Military Departments

The Secretaries of Military Departments are responsible for administration and support of forces that are assigned or attached to the EUCOM Commander. The Secretaries fulfill their responsibilities by exercising administrative control (ADCON) through the Service Component Commands assigned to EUCOM.

The other combatant commanders, in particular Commander, U.S. Central Command and Commander, U.S. Africa Command

Formal relationships between the EUCOM Commander and the geographic and functional Combatant Commanders derive from command authority established by title 10 USC, section 164. Combatant commanders closely coordinate as necessary to accomplish all assigned missions.

The NATO Secretary General

The NATO Secretary General is appointed by the 28 Alliance Heads of State and Government. He chairs the North Atlantic Council, the principal decision making body of the Alliance. The SACEUR carries out roles and missions assigned by the North Atlantic Council, and directly communicates with the Secretary General on a regular basis.

Commander, International Security Assistance Force

The EUCOM Commander has no formal relationship with COM ISAF; however, COM ISAF is “dual-hatted”: 1. As the Commander U.S. Forces in Afghanistan he reports to Commander, U.S. CENTCOM (national command and control); 2. The Supreme Allied Commander, Europe exercises command authority over the Commander ISAF via the Commander, Joint Forces Command Brunssum in the Netherlands (operational command and control).

The Supreme Allied Commander for Transformation

Both NATO’s Strategic Commanders, SACEUR and Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT), carry out roles and missions assigned to them by the North Atlantic Council. SACEUR and SACT work together to ensure the transformation of NATO’s military capabilities and interoperability that support Allied Command Operations.

The North Atlantic Council

The North Atlantic Council is the principal policy and decision making body of NATO. SACEUR carries out roles and missions assigned by the North Atlantic Council.

The U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council

There is not a direct command relationship between the U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council and either the EUCOM Commander or the SACEUR. The North Atlantic Council provides direction to NATO military authorities and the U.S. Permanent Representative is one of 28 members of the North Atlantic Council. The EUCOM Commander works with the U.S. Permanent Representative on matters of mutual interest, such as EUCOM military operations and security cooperation activities that support U.S. objectives and military contributions to NATO.

Major Challenges

In your view, what are the major challenges and problems you would confront if confirmed as the next Commander, EUCOM, and SACEUR?

If confirmed, one of the biggest challenges I will face is managing the evolution of NATO, specifically past its operational focus in Afghanistan. The Alliance has evolved from a Cold War construct to one with ambitious aspirations and capabilities after integrating former Warsaw Pact and Eastern European Soviet Republics and building an out of area expeditionary capability. As EUCOM Commander, my challenge is to work diligently to support the broader U.S. government effort to ensure that the Alliance makes the right choices to maintain its capability, capacity, and credibility.

The second challenge is the impact of the sequestration reductions and the continuation of those reductions in the out years. Sequestration negatively affects both theater operations and EUCOM’s ability to support the U.S. Defense Strategy by further reducing an already declining budget. This includes an increased risk to access, degradation of the security cooperation relationships forged over numerous years, and reduced partner participation in operations.

The third challenge is the potential for a long-term continuation of the Arab Spring and its impact to Israel's shrinking strategic depth. Currently Iranian's malign influence in the politics of Syria and Lebanon are a constant concern. Of specific concern for Israel, aside from Iran's nuclear ambitions, are security considerations relative to Syrian chemical weapons and high end conventional weapons, the decline in influence of Egypt's military and the resulting instability in the Sinai and the strength of Lebanese Hezbollah. This instability will remain throughout the region for some time. Our challenge is to lead the military effort to assure Israel of U.S. resolve to guarantee its security.

The fourth challenge I see is the security impact of the European economic crisis. The result of the financial crises upon European militaries is magnified as national Gross Domestic Products (GDP) have fallen, and the percentage of GDP dedicated to defense spending has been cut as governments struggle to deal with reduced revenue and increasing deficits.

The fifth challenge I see is the growing asymmetric terrorist threat in Europe from Al-Qaida and other Islamist extremist groups with extensive ties to Western Europe. Europe is an important venue for recruitment, financing, and attacking U.S. and Western interests. The effects of the financial crisis and austerity measures on countries with historical terrorism and anarchism could spark new forms of politically and economically-driven terrorism.

The sixth challenge I see is dealing with Russia, which remains an aspirational superpower but is hindered by endemic deficiencies. Russia will remain the primary actor of regional concern through 2020 by virtue of its geographic position, natural resource wealth, military forces, and desire for regional influence. However, a number of systemic deficiencies, such as mounting internal stressors—politico-economic, socio-cultural, and demographic—will continue to challenge its aspirations. The U.S. and NATO will need to continue to assure our Allies and partners, who live in the Russian self-declared "sphere of privileged influence," of our resolve.

The seventh challenge I see is the continued risk of conflict in the Caucasus and Balkans. Chronic ethnic enmity, virulent Islamism/Islamist influence coupled with socio-economic privations, and the general intractability of grievances plague the Caucasus and Balkans to varying degrees. Our challenge is to carefully encourage our European Allies and partners to continue their commitments to regional security, while encouraging the development of security capabilities that do not exacerbate local tensions.

Another important issue is improving our comprehensive readiness to face 21st century challenges, specifically the threat of malicious cyber activity. Our primary focus here should be assisting our Allies and partners in the defense of their critical information systems, and to develop and mature their cyber defense capabilities, programs, and processes.

The last significant challenge I see is maintaining our force laydown in today's austere environment. While combat forces receive the bulk of attention during force restructuring, the capabilities garnered from critical enablers (i.e., medical, police, intelligence, logistics) are equally as important. The challenge we have is balancing our strategic pivot to the East while highlighting the critical role our European force structure plays in assuring Allies and guaranteeing continued U.S. access to a critical region of the world. This access will remain important to U.S.-led global operations across multiple theaters, and cannot be guaranteed if we abdicate our European footprint.

If confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges and problems?

Despite budget reductions, EUCOM must be at the forefront of revitalizing and supporting NATO, highlighting the critical role the U.S. partnership plays to ensure the Alliance's credibility, particularly with regard to our Article 5 commitments. A significant component of this effort will be our role in a renewed commitment to the NATO Response Force. This commitment will ensure our NATO allies continue to meet high standards for interoperability and readiness. We can also incorporate NATO Smart Defense initiatives into our planning process, to guide our engagement and help ensure that NATO forces maintain a credible mix of expeditionary forces.

Next, we must recognize the unique opportunity the economic downturn presents to help European nations examine defense and force structure inefficiencies. Stark fiscal realities leave political room for serious force structure and capability changes consistent with the vision of Smart Defense. We must also continue to coordinate our efforts across a broad spectrum of actors, specifically with the interagency and other geographic and functional commands. This cooperation can be expanded, as we leverage NATO training and standardization as a global benchmark for interoperability.

As a command, we must continue to invest in interagency cooperation and collaboration to reinforce a whole-of-government approach to numerous challenges. We must also look for ways to enhance security cooperation planning by working with those allies who conduct security cooperation consistent with our interests.

Next, we will emphasize civilian-military opportunities for nation engagement, particularly in the areas of disaster preparedness and foreign consequence management by leveraging private entities. This will encourage regional approaches to collaboration within areas like the Balkans and Caucasus in order to bolster stability.

We must also emphasize technology and innovation to provide a backstop to decreasing resources, while diminishing our vulnerabilities to new asymmetric threats. The growing cyber threat must be addressed, while seeking ways to mitigate the loss of valuable border protections within the European theater. These physical border protections in many cases no longer exist. Technological solutions to tracking illicit materials, such as biological, chemical and radiological agents, must be found.

Finally, we must continue to seek zones of cooperation with Russia. Successful avenues to date have included the Arctic Council, health and bio-surveillance arenas, combating terrorism, and counter-piracy. We must encourage Russia to play a more constructive role in European and global security and foreign policy.

Defense Department Strategic Guidance

The January 2012 Department of Defense (DOD) Strategic Guidance, entitled "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," discusses the importance of Europe as "our principal partner in seeking global and economic security."

At the same time, the DOD Strategic Guidance calls for a rebalancing of U.S. military posture toward the Asia-Pacific and Middle East regions.

Do you agree with the strategy outlined in the January 2012 DOD Strategic Guidance?

Yes, I do.

In your view what will be the major impact of that strategy on EUCOM and what changes, if any, would EUCOM need to make to implement that strategy?

The January 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance mentions Europe and NATO prominently, and with good reason. As it says on page 2, “Europe is home to some of America’s most stalwart allies and partners, many of whom have sacrificed alongside U.S. forces in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere.” Europe is primarily a security producer, rather than a consumer, and EUCOM’s strategy must endeavor to bolster this ability and commitment to providing security. To this end, one of EUCOM’s key priorities is sustaining the U.S. relationship with its highly capable allies, as well as the sustainment of those allies who have recently developed capabilities and interoperability with U.S. forces. EUCOM will also look to grow its links to NATO, bolstering the viability of this vital Alliance, which will serve to ensure that European nations continue to approach global security issues through the NATO Alliance, and ensure that European and U.S. viewpoints are weighed together in the decision-making process. By bringing attention to the deep and valuable contributions of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance to U.S. national security and global security efforts, EUCOM supports the unique and valuable role that these contributions make, and the strategic access and global reach they provide.

In order to implement this strategy, EUCOM must look to develop low-cost, innovative ways to emphasize force interoperability, while encouraging European allies to conserve resources by adopting the NATO “Smart Defense” program. One of these new methods will be the reinvigorated U.S. contribution to the NATO Response Force (NRF), which will mitigate force structure reductions in Europe by sustaining and improving interoperability. Over the long term, the NRF will be a vital asset for post-ISAF interoperability and NATO’s Connected Forces Initiative. The NRF will also serve as a valuable tool for evaluating the status of European forces. As the most likely companions in any security effort, from humanitarian assistance to full-spectrum conflict, the U.S. must have confidence in the interoperability and readiness of European forces.

The planned reduction of NATO forces supporting ISAF, combined with U.S. reinvigoration in the NRF, provides a unique opportunity for EUCOM to support NATO’s Connected Forces Initiative and make adjustments to both commands’ exercise programs, committing to exercising high-end capabilities and training. Conducting exercises that test these high-end capabilities, once common, have reduced markedly in the face of operational commitments. Exercises that bring together several NATO nations, focused on advanced training objectives that exercise a joint force across a broad spectrum of threats, will ensure NATO force relevance and flexibility. After ten years of combat deployments against an asymmetric enemy, NATO will need to dedicate itself to flexible training that emphasizes underutilized skill sets (for example, naval and

air warfare), while incorporating lessons learned from recent conflicts. Additionally, a small EUCOM investment in some of these exercises provides the opportunity for newer (i.e. Eastern European) members of the Alliance, as well as other NATO partners, to pair with more mature Allies, continuing to burden-share security cooperation while raising the overall quality of NATO forces.

In response to shared environments of fiscal austerity, NATO has embraced the idea of collective resource pooling through the Smart Defense initiative. Alignment of EUCOM engagement with NATO capability targets will ensure U.S. bilateral efforts complement NATO's multilateral efforts. Through this improved cooperation, EUCOM can reinforce NATO's efforts to maintain a credible mix of expeditionary forces available for burden-sharing in conflicts that would otherwise be shouldered by U.S. forces alone. Supporting an initiative such as Smart Defense should not come at the expense of jeopardizing NATO's Article 5 commitments and defense spending requirements. EUCOM must ensure waste or unnecessary capabilities are trimmed and strengths are retained. EUCOM should engage with the Smart Defense structure to ensure a holistic approach to future NATO capability requirements.

Finally, EUCOM has an opportunity to enhance its security cooperation planning by reaching out to Allies who are themselves conducting some level of security cooperation in the theater. EUCOM can work together with these nations to openly discuss mutual goals and plans and gain efficiencies from knowing what engagements other nations are performing in various regions, what effects are desired in these regions, and what partnering possibilities exist for theater-wide security cooperation. Fiscal reality drives this consideration, but so does strategic sense. Such cooperation can help to smooth future operational interaction and pair high-end allies with developing nations to establish theater relationships that will bolster European security and reduce U.S. resource commitments.

NATO Commitments on Afghanistan Transition

At the NATO Summit in Chicago in May, NATO members committed to promoting a stable and secure Afghanistan and to “preventing Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven for terrorists that threaten Afghanistan, the region, and the world.” NATO members also reaffirmed their commitment to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan through 2014, when the transition to Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) having the security lead throughout Afghanistan will be completed and the NATO combat mission will end.

Do you agree with the goals and transition plan for the ISAF mission endorsed at the NATO Chicago Summit?

Yes, I do.

What are the major challenges you foresee, if confirmed as the next Commander, EUCOM and SACEUR, in implementing the transition plan for Afghanistan?

Over the next 20 months, we must fully recruit, field and ensure the sustainment of the ANSF while we shift the main effort for security lead to the Afghans in 2013. We must prepare for the

Afghan Presidential election, while redeploying thousands of ISAF forces and restructuring our basing posture so that we are ready for the post-2014 mission.

How would you address these challenges, if confirmed?

I would continue the work in progress, and ensure that redeployment mechanisms and routes are feasible and practical for ISAF forces.

Building and Sustaining the Afghan National Security Forces

The NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan (NTM-A) is responsible for building the ANSF to an end strength of 352,000 by this fall, consisting of 195,000 Afghan National Army soldiers and 157,000 Afghan National Police personnel.

What is your assessment of the NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan, and what changes, if any, would you recommend for the NTM-A, if confirmed?

The NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan or NTM-A is truly a success story. It has changed over time as the ANSF capability has developed, and will continue to do so.

In your assessment, are the current target end strengths for the ANA and ANP sufficient for Afghan security forces to assume full responsibility for security and stability in Afghanistan by 2014?

Yes, they are. The target strengths are important, but so are the quality, capabilities, and competence of the force. Improving these aspects will be a significant part of the Security Force Assistance Teams work from now until the end of 2014, and beyond in the post-2014 mission.

At the NATO Chicago Summit, the ISAF participating countries called for future reductions in the size of the ANSF after 2014 to be “conditions-based.” At the same time, the ISAF participating countries discussed a “preliminary model” for the future size of the ANSF of around 230,000, with an estimated annual cost of \$4.1 billion, which would be subject to regular review in light of security developments.

Do you agree that any reductions in the ANSF after 2014 from an end strength of 352,000 need to be conditions-based in light of the security situation in Afghanistan at the time the reductions would occur?

The size and balance of capabilities across the ANSF after 2014 will ultimately be a decision for the sovereign Government of Afghanistan. The financial contributions by the current ISAF nations and other countries need to be channeled through a transparent and accountable mechanism that is open to audit by those contributing Nations.

What should be NATO’s role in assessing the security conditions in Afghanistan for purposes of determining future force requirements for the ANSF after 2014?

The future force requirements for the ANSF after 2014 will be a decision for the sovereign Government of Afghanistan, with assistance and advice from the post-2014 NATO led International Training, Advisory, and Assistance Mission.

NATO Training Mission in Afghanistan Post-2014

In your view, what should be the objectives and priorities for a possible NATO training mission in Afghanistan post-2014?

The objectives and priorities were agreed by NATO Nations and partners in the North Atlantic Council (NAC) Initiating Directive at the Defense Ministerial meeting last October and reaffirmed in the February Defense Ministerial meeting. The NATO-led post-2014 engagement will train, advise, and assist the Afghan National Security Forces in line with the NATO-Afghanistan Enduring Partnership declaration.

If confirmed, what recommendations, if any, would you have for modifying the NATO training mission in Afghanistan after 2014?

There is still much work to be completed on the post-2014 mission. In particular, the Concept of Operations is currently being developed for endorsement by the Military Committee and subsequent approval by the North Atlantic Council. Once this is approved, the Operation Plan will be developed.

Insider Threat in Afghanistan

The recent rise in the number of attacks by individuals in Afghan uniform on U.S. and coalition soldiers, so-called “green-on-blue” attacks, has raised concerns about the safety of our soldiers and the success of the transition plans in Afghanistan. ISAF and Afghan military leaders have announced a number of new or expanded precautions to address the insider threat, including increased Afghan counterintelligence efforts to identify Taliban infiltrators, additional cultural sensitivity training, and expanding the “Guardian Angel” program to protect against the insider threat in meetings between coalition and Afghan forces.

To what do you attribute the recent increase in the number of green-on-blue attacks?

These attacks are an insurgent tactic, just like the threat of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs).

What is your assessment of the measures that have been taken to address the insider threat?

We have analyzed these attacks, and developed tactics, techniques, and procedures to counter them. The measures we have taken to mitigate these attacks in conjunction with the Afghans are working. (20 incidents JUL-SEP 12, 10 incidents OCT-DEC 13, 3 incidents JAN-MAR 13)

If confirmed, what additional steps, if any, would you recommend?

It is important to recognize that the number of insider attacks has decreased since the Summer of last year (20 incidents JUL-SEP, 10 Incidents OCT-DEC, 3 incidents JAN-MAR). The measures taken across the force are having a positive impact, and I want to ensure we continue to aggressively implement those measures while maintaining the strong personal bonds that have proven effective at the tactical level.

What is your assessment of the impact of these insider attacks on morale among U.S. and allied forces in theater?

These attacks do have the potential to damage trust between coalition and Afghan forces, however close cooperation and our strong relationship with the ANSF have been invaluable to tackling this common threat.

In light of the insider threat, do you believe ISAF should reconsider its plan to embed small units of U.S. and coalition military personnel with Afghan military units to advise and assist those units as the Afghan forces transition to the security lead?

No. The plan is correct and will ensure the ANSF continue to advance their military capability. The security of U.S. and coalition military personnel is improved by building close personal relationships with the ANSF they advise and assist.

EUCOM's Strategic Missions

In your view, what are the key strategic missions of U.S. European Command?

We derive our key strategic missions from the Command's formal mission statement: "U.S. European Command conducts military operations, international military engagement, and interagency partnering to enhance transatlantic security and defend the United States forward." Given this mission statement, as well as the *Guidance for Employment of the Force* issued by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, EUCOM's key strategic missions are:

- Posture EUCOM forces to execute high-priority contingency operations;
- Sustain the trust, relationships and interoperability forged over the past decade with our Allies and partners; aligning our efforts with NATO Targets and Partnership Goals;
- Contribute EUCOM forces and enable European force generation to support an effective and responsible transition in Afghanistan, ensuring Afghanistan's security while assuring our NATO Allies and partner nations of the U.S. commitment;
- Nurture strategic relationships and maintain the necessary force posture to enable continued access - thereby ensuring United States freedom of action and global reach;
- Prevent violent extremist organizations (VEOs) from establishing footholds in Europe or obtaining or using weapons of mass destruction; through close coordination with the

other global and functional combatant commands, minimize the seams that these VEO's often operate in;

- Advance NATO European Ballistic Missile Defense through an integrated approach built on balanced contributions;
- Ensure secure cyber access to enable our other missions and improve collaborative information sharing across all security levels;
- Combat transnational organized crime to reduce the effects of trafficking and the monies available to fund illicit activities;
- Support continued defense reform and prevent the escalation of local crises into regional conflicts, particularly in the Balkans and Caucasus.

Considering these missions in the context of near-term challenges, EUCOM derives the following Command priorities:

- Ensure readiness to execute EUCOM's high-priority contingency operations;
- Preserve our strategic partnerships to include;
 - Sustain our relationship with high-end Allies ensuring a strong NATO Alliance;
 - Preserve the recently developed partner capability and interoperability;
 - Maintain regional stability and security;
- Enable a successful ISAF transition;
- Counter transnational threats, focusing on missile defense, weapons of mass destruction, counter-terrorism, illicit trafficking, counter-piracy and threats from cyberspace;
- Maintain United States' strategic access across Europe in support of global operations;
- Focus on four key countries:
 - Israel, to maintain a strong partnership;
 - Russia, to encourage areas of cooperation;
 - Turkey, to reinvigorate our relationship;
 - Poland, to enhance the realization of its potential.

U.S. Force Structure in Europe

The January 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance stated that there is a strategic opportunity to “rebalance the U.S. military investment in Europe.” Currently there are approximately 70,000 U.S. military personnel stationed in the European area of responsibility. In January the Department of Defense announced additional reductions in U.S. forces in Europe, including the drawdown of 2 of the 4 Army Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) stationed in Europe by the end of 2013 and the inactivation of one A-10 squadron from Germany in 2013. In addition, U.S. Army Europe has plans to consolidate and reduce its footprint from 16 garrisons today to 7 garrisons by 2017.

In answer to questions in advance of the hearing in July on his nomination to be Chief of Staff of the Air Force, then-U.S. Air Forces Europe Commander General Mark

Welsh said that he would support further consideration of reductions and consolidation opportunities in the Air Force posture in Europe.

Do you support the reductions in U.S. force posture in Europe announced earlier this year?

Yes. The risk posed by the force reductions announced in 2012 is manageable, and can be reasonably mitigated by employing rotational forces, to include a CONUS-based brigade fully dedicated to NATO, as well as implementing the posture initiatives described below. Our successful efforts to revitalize the transatlantic link, our unwavering commitment to the defense of Europe, and 65 years of transatlantic cooperation have lowered threat levels on the continent, and continue to serve the United States as a vital geostrategic platform to support our enduring global security requirements. Combined with the drawdown of operations in Afghanistan, this creates a strategic opportunity to modernize the U.S. military investment in Europe, moving from a focus on current conflicts toward a focus on future capabilities. While maintaining our enduring relationships and security commitments, our force structure in Europe is evolving to meet a broad range of 21st century challenges, including missile defense, cyber security, counterterrorism, and countering weapons of mass destruction. To that end, as announced previously, the plan is to enhance EUCOM's ability to address ballistic missile threats by forward stationing four Aegis-Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) capable ships in Spain and establishing land-based SM-3 BMD sites in Romania and Poland, which adds to the capabilities already provided by the AN/TPY-2 radar in Turkey. Additionally, we will enhance the responsiveness of special operations forces in the region (increasing our overall air and ground capabilities in Europe). We also recently established an aviation detachment in Poland, enhancing their fixed wing training opportunities.

Do you believe that additional reductions in U.S. forces stationed in Europe, including the Army and the Air Force, should be considered consistent with EUCOM's key strategic missions?

We must ensure that our posture adapts and evolves in ways that respond to, and anticipate, changes in the international security environment. The persistence of conflict, the diffusion of power around the world, the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons technologies, and rising pressures on the freedom of the global commons pose new security challenges that require innovative adjustments to our defense posture. To this end, we will seek a new cooperative architecture, one that generates opportunities to work together with Allies and partners on shared regional and global security opportunities and challenges. We'll continue to align our posture to achieve our national strategy goals and objectives.

If confirmed, would you agree to undertake a review of the U.S. force posture in Europe to determine whether additional reductions are appropriate?

Yes. EUCOM is currently supporting an internal DoD European infrastructure consolidation analysis. I look forward to reviewing the recommendations of this effort and working with the

Department and the Congress to ensure our military presence in Europe continues to effectively and efficiently support our national strategy.

Use of Rotational Forces in Europe

The January 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance stresses the importance of a U.S. rotational presence for building partner capacity and promoting interoperability.

What role do you foresee for U.S.-based forces in maintaining a rotational presence in Europe and promoting interoperability with our NATO and other European partners?

EUCOM leverages the Global Force Management system to meet force requirements in order to build partner capacity and promote interoperability with Allies and partners that cannot be addressed by our assigned forces. This includes employing U.S.-based Navy and Marine Corps forces for NATO exercises and our annual Black Sea Rotational Force program of training and military-to-military activities with Allies and partners in the Black Sea/Caucasus region. The reinvigoration of U.S. participation in the NATO Response Force and rotation of U.S.-based battalion task forces to Europe will create additional opportunities to build partner capacity and promote interoperability that complement the activities of U.S. Army Europe. These efforts, by our assigned and rotational forces, are critical to preserving the gains in interoperability and Ally/partner nation expeditionary capability that have been forged over the past decade of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

U.S. Commitment under Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty

A cornerstone of the NATO alliance is the principle of collective self-defense as codified in Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty.

In your view, how important to U.S. strategic interests is the U.S. commitment to its obligations under Article V?

The United States is unquestionably committed to its Article 5 obligations. The formal, demonstrated, and sustained commitment to Article 5 collective defense by the United States has provided the backbone for the most successful Alliance in history. For the past 64 years, this commitment has contributed to an unprecedented period of peace and prosperity in Europe and North America. But the strategic value of the U.S. commitment is not a win/lose proposition. Both sides of the Atlantic have benefited from America's unwavering commitment. While Europeans have enjoyed the benefit of a powerful security guarantee, the United States has gained a voice in European security affairs and an economically strong trading partner resulting in a Transatlantic Alliance that represents 50% of the world's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Moreover, it is our Allies commitment to NATO which has enabled interoperable European and Canadian forces to deploy alongside the United States in Afghanistan, to stay the course in Kosovo, to take the lead in Libya (enabled by the U.S.), and to conduct maritime missions in the Mediterranean as well as counter-piracy in the Indian Ocean. Today, NATO remains the world's premier security organization and an essential component of the transatlantic security bridge. It provides a forum for political and military combined action, and is exhibiting an increasingly

global perspective. It has become a hub to cooperate with like-minded partners such as Australia, South Korea, Singapore, New Zealand and Japan. All of this is made possible because of how seriously the United States takes its Article 5 obligations. In my view, the U.S. commitment to Article 5 is a strategic imperative.

Russia

U.S. European Command has responsibility for the Russian Federation in its area of responsibility.

How do you see the NATO-Russia relationship evolving in the future?

Our goal for building NATO-Russia relations is to find ways we can collaborate to address areas where our interests intersect in the complex security environment of the 21st century. We continue to believe that NATO-Russian cooperation can enhance the security of the United States, our allies in Europe, and Russia. However, differences remain, and we look to the NATO-Russia Council as a forum to discuss both our differences as well as our shared interests. The NATO Russia Council has achieved much through political dialogue over the last few years. There remains a robust military to military cooperation program between NATO and Russia. If confirmed, I look forward to working with my Russian counterparts and furthering these important relationships.

What do you believe are appropriate objectives for U.S.-Russian security relations, and what do you believe are the areas of common interest between the United States and Russia in the security sphere?

We continue to seek cooperation with Russia in zones of mutual interest and benefit, particularly in the military-to-military areas of combating terrorism, counter-piracy, peacekeeping in unstable regions, and maritime interoperability. Additionally, we look for ways to support interagency efforts in areas beyond direct Russian Defense Ministry oversight, particularly in counternarcotics, humanitarian assistance/disaster response, and support to capacity-building for Afghanistan security forces through 2014 and beyond, such as the Afghanistan Helicopter Maintenance Trust Fund.

European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense

In September 2009, President Obama announced that he had accepted the unanimous recommendation of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to implement the European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense, designed to provide capability against the existing and emerging missile threat from Iran. Phase 1 was successfully deployed by the end of 2011, including an Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense-capable ship on patrol in the Mediterranean, an early-warning missile defense radar in Turkey, and a command and control center in Germany. Future phases will include Standard Missile-3 interceptors based at sea and on land in Romania and Poland.

Do you agree that the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) will provide the capability needed to protect U.S. forces in Europe and our NATO European allies against existing and emerging Iranian missile threats?

Yes. EPAA Phases 1-3 are designed to address the increasing missile threat. The U.S. remains firmly committed to Phases 1-3 which is the United States' contribution to NATO missile defense. In the words of Secretary Hagel: "Let me emphasize the strong and continued commitment of the United States to NATO missile defense. That commitment remains ironclad." EUCOM has already deployed Phase 1 capability including a radar to Turkey, which is now under NATO Command and Control, and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense-capable ships to the Mediterranean.

The United States' commitment to Phases 2 and 3 includes the development of missile defense sites in Romania (2015) as part of Phase 2 and in Poland (2018) as part of Phase 3. Both deployments remain on schedule and on budget, and coordinated with both countries. Construction on the Romanian site is scheduled to begin this year in addition to equipment purchases for the Phase 3 site in Poland. The goal of Phase 4 of the EPAA was to defend the United States against an ICBM attack from the Middle East. Though we are no longer planning for Phase 4, we will achieve its intended effect sooner by additional GBIs deployed in Alaska, which will also enhance protection of the United States against the growing threat from North Korea.

Do you believe that it is important to develop the Standard Missile III, Block IIB interceptor in order to have the capability to defend against potential future long-range Iranian missiles that could reach all of Europe as well as the United States?

We support the SECDEF's decision and we believe the solution that has been described is the most technologically sound decision at this time.

Missile Defense Cooperation with Russia

The United States and NATO are seeking options to cooperate with Russia on missile defense against common missile threats from nations such as Iran. President Obama has announced that such cooperation would not limit U.S. or NATO missile defense capabilities.

Do you agree that such cooperation could enhance the security of the United States, NATO, and Russia against common missile threats from nations such as Iran?

Yes. Constructive cooperation with Russia in fields of mutual interest, such as missile defense, is a EUCOM goal. If confirmed, I would look to continue supporting U.S. interagency efforts to increase cooperation and transparency with Russia. Cooperation with Russia demonstrates our transparency and develops trust between nations. In turn this trust underpins and enhances our security.

Do you believe that such cooperation could send a powerful signal to Iran and help in our efforts to dissuade Iran from pursuing nuclear weapons and long-range ballistic missiles?

Yes. Strategic cooperation between Russia and NATO has many benefits that strengthen our security. We have seen how coordination with Russia on topics of mutual interest can send powerful messages. However, our work at EUCOM is closely aligned with the progress of the NATO-Russia Council in defining and aligning our interests in Missile Defense.

In response to a Committee question to General Martin Dempsey, then-nominee to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey stated that missile defense cooperation with Russia “could result in tangible benefits to the U.S., Europe, and Russia in the form of a more robust common defense against missile threats, which could strengthen strategic stability and transparency. U.S. cooperation with Russia along the lines of shared early warning of missile launches, technical exchanges, operational cooperation and planning, and joint exercises would be mutually beneficial.”

Do you agree with General Dempsey’s assessment?

Yes. Both the U.S. and NATO Russia Council are working on constructive engagements with Russia on Missile Defense, to include joint technical studies and exercises when Russia is ready.

NATO Missile Defense Contributions

The United States is deploying the EPAA as its contribution to NATO missile defense capability. As part of its decision to develop such a capability, NATO has agreed to develop and pay for a missile defense command and control network, the Active Layered Theater Ballistic Missile Defense system. Various NATO nations, including Turkey, Poland, Romania, Germany, and Spain, have agreed to host elements of NATO missile defense, and they and others are making additional national contributions to NATO missile defense.

Do you agree that this current NATO approach to missile defense contributions is reasonable and appropriate?

Yes, I do. And, if confirmed, I am looking forward to continuing to emphasize the efforts already underway, as well as increasing allied coordination and cooperation during my time as EUCOM Commander in order to facilitate and enable additional allied contributions to the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) mission.

EUCOM is observing that the NATO response to the ballistic missile threat is increasing, and we are actively working with our allies to explore additional capabilities that complement and are interoperable with the United States’ EPAA contribution to NATO. For instance, EUCOM just hosted (in September 2012) an Allied BMD Upgrade Conference in Berlin, Germany, with eight allies (NLD, DEU, DEN, NOR, ESP, FRA, GBR, ITA) that already possess advanced land-based

and maritime air defense assets that could be upgraded for BMD capability. I look forward to continuing and expanding such engagement activities with our allies.

Additionally, EUCOM has aligned our exercise program to provide increased opportunities to work with our NATO allies on the non-technical aspects of interoperability, including the ability to execute missile defense.

I think it is also important to keep in mind that the Chicago Summit called for “voluntary national contributions to NATO missile defense.” Several of the allies are already stepping up in this regard, to include: our basing allies (Spain, Romania, Poland, Turkey, Germany); allies that possess lower tier BMD capabilities, such as the Netherlands and Germany (with their Patriot PAC-3 systems); as well as allies that are considering or already upgrading existing maritime and land-based air defense systems to provide upper tier surveillance and interceptor capacity to the Alliance. For example, the Netherlands recently announced the signing of a contract to upgrade all four of their Air Defense Command Frigates for BMD surveillance capability that could be used to cue U.S. Aegis BMD ships or other allied BMD assets, and provide air defense escort for U.S. BMD ships. Poland and Turkey are considering the purchase of lower tier BMD systems, such as the Patriot PAC-3. In short, many allies are already providing support to various aspects of the BMD mission in Europe, and could potentially provide additional contributions across the full spectrum of the missile defense mission, including: basing; passive defense; active defense; theater missile warning; command and control; attack operations; and consequence management. All of these are important contributions to NATO’s ballistic missile defense mission.

NATO-Russia Council

The NATO-Russia Council (NRC) has served as an important venue for discussions and cooperation between NATO and Russia, including missile defense cooperation such as the Theater Missile Defense exercise program. Recent NATO communiqués have expressed support for expanded cooperation through the NATO-Russia Council, including on missile defense.

Do you believe the NATO-Russia Council has potential as a forum for NATO-Russian cooperation, including cooperation on missile defense?

Yes, I do.

The NATO-Russia Council Work Program provides for multiple agreed areas of cooperation with Russia, including not only missile defense, but also the Afghanistan Helicopter Maintenance Trust Fund, counter-narcotics training for South and Central Asia, combating terrorism, crisis management, logistics, maritime search and rescue, counter-piracy, and others. Although missile defense remains a point of contention between NATO and Russia, discussions on possible cooperation continue. NATO has held active discussions with Russia through the NATO-Russia Council Missile Defense Working group. We continue to believe that cooperation with Russia on missile defense can enhance the security of both NATO and Russia.

Do you support continuation of the Theater Missile Defense exercise program within the NATO-Russia Council?

Yes, I do.

Both the U.S. and NATO-Russia Council are working on constructive engagements with Russia on Theater Missile Defense, to include cooperative technical studies and exercises when Russia is ready. The effectiveness of these efforts will ultimately depend on Russia's willingness to engage.

EUCOM Role in Coordinating Missile Defense with Israel

U.S. European Command has Israel in its area of responsibility (AOR) and, among other missions, has the mission of coordinating and integrating U.S. missile defense capabilities and operations with those of Israel. To this end, EUCOM has sponsored a number of previous missile defense exercises with Israel. In addition, the United States has deployed a EUCOM missile defense radar (known as an AN/TPY-2 radar) to enhance defense against missiles from Iran.

Do you agree that this EUCOM mission of coordination and integration of U.S. and Israeli missile defense capabilities and operations is a critical component of our security posture in the EUCOM AOR?

Yes, I do. Cooperation between the U.S. and Israel is important to the security of the Middle East, and reflects a common understanding of the global security environment. Periodic missile defense exercises such as Exercise AUSTERE CHALLENGE 12 provided an excellent opportunity to train our military forces to respond to a regional crisis. This training is essential to building and maintaining defense interoperability and ensures Israel's qualitative military edge.

If confirmed, would you continue to make this mission a high priority as Commander of EUCOM?

Yes. EUCOM has a robust program to support co-development, integration, and exercises focused on the missile defense of Israel. If confirmed, the defense of Israel will continue to remain a EUCOM high-priority mission under my command.

NATO-led Kosovo Force

Approximately 5,600 troops from 30 contributing nations, including nearly 900 U.S. troops, are deployed as part of the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR). KFOR's mission is to assist in maintaining a safe and secure environment in Kosovo consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 and to support the development of the Kosovo Security Force (KSF). NATO has sought to gradually draw down the KFOR presence as the security situation has improved.

What do you see as the major challenges in Kosovo, including in connection with the establishment of the Kosovo Security Force?

The principle challenge facing Kosovo is solidifying the gains of independence and continuing to build the institutions of a modern democratic state. Much progress has been made, but more work remains. A key to allow Kosovo the space to undertake key reforms is the quest for and implementation of an acceptable political agreement with Belgrade that will resolve the long-standing impasse over northern Kosovo. Setting the stage for successful negotiations and peaceful resolution remains the top priority. Resolution of this impasse is critical for Kosovo's and the region's long-term stability.

Subsequently, the Kosovo Security Force (KSF) has matured, under its limited mandate, into a professional, multi-ethnic, civil response focused, security organization. However, the KSF does not yet possess the capabilities to replace KFOR as Kosovo's enduring security and defense organization. Our goal is to start building these additional capabilities with the KSF early next year after Kosovo legislative restrictions are lifted this summer. It is essential that NATO is an active partner in shaping the future KSF with US support, so that the future KSF contributes to, not detracts from, regional security and is not viewed as a threat to its neighbors. Some Allies who do not recognize Kosovo's independence are slow to support increasing competencies of the KSF which could pose additional challenges in the future.

If confirmed, what additional steps, if any, would you recommend to enhance the ability of KFOR to carry out and complete its mission in Kosovo?

KFOR must act within its mandate and mission and we must not allow KFOR's role to include the realm of law enforcement, yet this is the predominate capability required to maintain peace in Kosovo. KFOR's most effective role is to deter violence through a strong presence, and to respond as a third provider to unrest that exceeds Kosovo Police and EULEX capabilities. Within this context, our best approach includes: (1) strong support for continued dialogue; (2) urging Europe to maintain or increase their contributions to EULEX and encourage EULEX to robustly fulfill its mandate; (3) urging allies to fully meet force commitments to KFOR to present a strong and unified KFOR presence; and (4) maintain the US plan to provide a timely military response after NATO response forces become committed in the event of crisis.

NATO Enlargement

What are your views on whether NATO would benefit from further rounds of enlargement?

The policy on enlargement is set out in Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty. NATO has an "Open Door" policy of further enlargement that was agreed to by the Alliance Heads of States and Government at the Lisbon Summit in 2010 and reaffirmed at the Chicago Summit this year. The decision of which Nations are offered, and when they join, is political and will be ultimately decided by the 28 member states of NATO.

What criteria should the United States apply in evaluating candidates for future NATO enlargement?

The criteria are well established in the Membership Action Plan mechanism, which I support. It supports stable, democratic, and reform-driven Nations who wish to contribute to security.

In your view, is there a limit on the extent to which NATO can be enlarged and still be an effective military organization capable of making decisions and acting in a timely fashion?

NATO has gone through several rounds of enlargement, and has continued to prove itself effective.

Georgia

In your view, how should the United States and NATO proceed on the issue of NATO membership for Georgia?

This is a political issue and outside the role and responsibilities of SACEUR. As I stated previously, Article 10 of the Washington Treaty, and the agreed Open Door policy for further NATO enlargement, allow for stable, democratic and reform-driven Nations to be considered for NATO membership.

That said, I believe the U.S. and NATO should continue to reaffirm support for Georgia's territorial integrity, sovereignty, and the Bucharest decision regarding Georgia's eventual NATO membership. Georgia's democratic reform progress, exemplified by the successful October Parliamentary elections and transition of leadership between democratic parties, their unwavering and substantive support to ISAF operations, and commitment to the Geneva talks and a peaceful resolution of the South Ossetia and Abkhazia territorial disputes are all very encouraging signs that we commend. Likewise, Georgia continues to demonstrate itself as a strong partner of NATO through its contributions to our ISAF mission, where its two infantry battalions serve with no operational caveats, shoulder to shoulder with U.S. Marines, in one of the most dangerous regions of Afghanistan. We will continue to encourage the new Georgian government in its reform efforts. EUCOM is committed to assisting the new government through close partnership and continued engagement just as we have in the past.

Section 1242 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 requires the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to develop a plan for normalized U.S. defense cooperation with Georgia, including the sale of defensive arms.

What is your assessment of current U.S. defense cooperation with Georgia?

The U.S. currently has a vigorous defense cooperation program with Georgia. We conduct hundreds of events annually in a wide-range of areas to include: cyber defense; border security; professional military education development; and counterinsurgency operations training, to name

a few. Georgia has one of the most robust Foreign Military Financing programs in EUCOM, with funding at approximately \$14 million.

In January 2012, President Obama offered six enhanced engagement areas to President Saakashvili, which will help the Georgians improve their national defense. Those areas are:

1. Operational air surveillance/air defense training and education;
2. Coastal surveillance training and education;
3. Tactical level train-the-trainer instruction for Junior Officers and Non-Commissioned Officers;
4. Brigade command and staff training and education;
5. Defensive combat engineer training and education;
6. Utility helicopter aviation training support.

U.S. EUCOM has already conducted or has planned initial engagements with Georgia in all these areas. We are aggressively using our International Military Education and Training funding to fulfill many of the educational requirements in these areas. These new areas of cooperation, which are in addition to continuing cooperation in defense institution building efforts, focus on Georgia's self-defense capabilities and NATO interoperability.

What opportunities, if any, do you see for enhanced U.S. defense cooperation with Georgia, including defensive arms?

With regard to defensive equipment, the Obama Administration has agreed to consider favorably the sale of air surveillance radars, coastal surveillance acoustic systems, and small arms ammunition.

NATO- European Union

How would you characterize the NATO-EU relationship today?

It is a strong partnership. This is reflected in the Strategic Concept from the Lisbon Summit, which determined to strengthen the strategic partnership between NATO and the European Union (EU).

That said, the characterization of the NATO-EU relationship is largely a political issue outside the purview of the role of the SACEUR. However, from a military perspective, the two organizations can be complementary partners in a comprehensive approach addressing complex crisis, and I believe the relationship is improving. NATO and the EU are now coordinating efforts to improve capabilities and the EU is using NATO Defense Planning baseline information to help establish priorities.

In your view, what should be NATO's position with regard to European efforts to strengthen the European Security and Defense Policy and build military capacity within the European Union?

NATO's position regarding the strengthening of European Security and Defense Policy will be decided at the political level by its 28 member nations. However, from a purely military perspective there is no question that within Europe the military capabilities are derived from a single pool of forces which are made available to either NATO or the EU based on a political decision. Of the 27 EU member nations, 21 are in NATO. The building of the capacity and capability of forces within the EU is also the building of military capacity and capability for NATO. In a resource constrained environment it makes sense to leverage the capabilities of all NATO and EU members to ensure the best return on a limited defense investment. If confirmed, this is an area in which I would seek to develop complementary activities in coordination with my counterpart, General Jean-Paul Palomeros of Allied Command Transformation, in Norfolk, who is leading the military effort to develop capabilities in NATO.

France

What is your assessment of the impact of France rejoining the integrated military structure?

I strongly welcome the significant contributions across the Alliance made by France. France is one of the most militarily capable members of NATO, and is a critical ally of the United States. We believe France's decision to reintegrate into the NATO integrated military structure has been mutually beneficial. The alliance is stronger militarily, the transatlantic link is more solid, and our own bilateral relationship with France is strengthened along with it. We appreciate France's leadership in the alliance – in terms of capabilities, defense investment, and contributions to operations.

Unified Command Plan Changes

It has been reported that Admiral McRaven, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), is seeking changes to the Unified Command Plan (UCP) that he believes would allow USSOCOM to better support the requirements of the Theater Special Operations Commands (TSOCs). Reportedly, such changes would give the Commander of USSOCOM combatant command authority over the TSOCs – including responsibilities for resourcing – and provide for more rapid deployment of special operations forces to and between Geographic Combatant Commands without the requirement for approval by the Secretary of Defense in every case. Operational control of deployed special operations forces would reportedly remain with the respective Geographic Combatant Commander.

Some have expressed concern that such changes could raise problems related to civilian control of the military, infringe upon the traditional authorities of the Geographic Combatant Commanders, and make it more difficult for Ambassadors and Geographic Combatant Commanders to know what military personnel are coming into their areas of responsibility and what they are doing while they are there.

Please provide your assessment of whether such UCP changes are appropriate.

The UCP changes to SOCOM are designed to provide a greater measure of flexibility in responding to the fluid and global nature of counterterrorism. Along with the approved changes in our assigned forces document called 'Forces for', they provide a level of global perspective to the counter-terror fight that is currently lacking within DoD. By altering the command relationship slightly, SOCOM gains abilities that have been in use in Operation ENDURING FREEDOM since 2005 (under SOCOM 121 authorities). These authorities have allowed for rapid deployment of U.S.-based special operations forces to and between the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) and U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) areas of responsibility. They are appropriate, as long as caveats relating to minimum force levels discussed between EUCOM and SOCOM are implemented.

Please address any concerns that such UCP changes may raise, including whether such changes would conflict with civilian control of the military, infringe upon authorities provided to the Geographic Combatant Commanders, or raise concerns with the State Department?

The UCP and 'Forces for' changes do not conflict with civilian control of the military as, fundamentally, the changes require and defer to civilian authority. This is a bedrock principle of the U.S. military's constitutional obligation to fully abide by civilian authority. Additionally, these changes, with the agreed-upon caveat suggested by EUCOM, do not infringe upon the authority of the Geographic Combatant Commanders (GCC) in any way. Forces assigned to a GCC remain under the operational control (OPCON) of that GCC, and therefore require GCC concurrence prior to being assigned outside the theater. This arrangement fundamentally supports Geographic Combatant Commander authority. The same would be true of forces entering the theater. This will allay State Department concerns about the UCP change, as it maintains the current notification and permissions relationship between the GCC and Ambassadors, ensuring that foreign policy concerns continue to be addressed in the same manner as before. The caveat mentioned above is that EUCOM requested an identified baseline of special operations forces assigned to the GCC. This would allow EUCOM to make long-term plans for the engagement of partners and Allies in theater with confidence that the forces assigned against those engagements are not withdrawn from the theater without an informed discussion of the costs and disruptions that might be incurred.

Interagency Collaboration

The collaboration between U.S. Special Operations Forces, general purpose forces, and other U.S. Government departments and agencies has played a significant role in the success of counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations in recent years. However, much of this collaboration has been ad hoc in nature.

What do you believe are the most important lessons learned from the collaborative interagency efforts in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere?

I believe working in a collaborative manner with representatives from other federal partners is essential to achieving success for any Combatant Commander. The value provided by representatives from other agencies cannot and should not be duplicated within the Defense

Department. That is why every Geographic Combatant Command now has some organizational entity designed to facilitate collaborative interagency efforts. At EUCOM Headquarters, that organization is the J9-Interagency Partnering Directorate established through the vision and wisdom of ADM Stavridis in November 2009. EUCOM's J9 model has been emulated at other geographic Combatant Commands, including U.S. Pacific Command; U.S. Southern Command, under the leadership of ADM Stavridis; U.S. Africa Command; and, most recently, U.S. Northern Command. At EUCOM, the J9 Interagency Partnering Directorate hosts 12 federal agency partners from U.S. Government Departments and Agencies, including: the Departments of State, Justice, Treasury, Homeland Security, Energy; and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). EUCOM utilizes a broad definition of "interagency partnering" to include collaboration with non-governmental, academic and private sector partners.

In another compelling whole-of-government initiative, EUCOM installed a career foreign service officer and senior State Department leader to serve as the "Civilian Deputy to the Commander." The creation of that position, the Command's most senior "interagency representative" was also an initiative developed by Jim Stavridis. The position is presently filled by Ambassador Larry Butler.

In my mind, the key to successful interagency partnering is to properly identify and engage partners early in the planning process in order to capture the expertise these organizations can bring to the effort at hand. Once engaged, we must maintain open and continuous communications with each other throughout operations to fully realize the benefit of everyone's unique experiences, expertise, and contributions.

How do you believe these efforts can be improved?

Our environment is characterized by decreasing resources and an atmosphere of multiple distributed threats. Given this setting, it makes both fiscal and strategic sense to continue advocating for an interagency, whole-of-government, collaborative approach as a fundamental modus operandi. I believe this is the most effective and efficient method for us to safeguard and advance U.S. and Theater priorities.

If confirmed, what role would you seek to play in encouraging greater interagency collaboration between U.S. Special Operations Forces, general purpose forces, and other U.S. Government departments and agencies?

If confirmed, I would seek to continue the innovative interagency efforts underway at EUCOM Headquarters through initiatives like the Civilian Deputy Commander, the J9 Interagency Partnering Directorate, and the Joint Interagency Counter-Trafficking Center. These offices help ensure the Combatant Command continues to engage in early and continuous interagency coordination, planning, and collaboration. They foster a mindset that encourages linking U.S. Government agency representatives to relevant DoD headquarters and component staffs. These efforts have ensured the expertise, capabilities, and priorities of twelve hosted partner agencies are coordinated with critical EUCOM and Component planning and execution efforts. If confirmed, I would continue to support this important 21st century way of thinking; strengthening existing relationships among federal and non-governmental partners and the command. I would

also look for opportunities to expand their participation across the Command to capitalize on the capabilities, authorities, and reach-back abilities present in their parent organizations.

Special Operations Personnel in Embassies

U.S. Special Operations Command deploys personnel to work with country teams in a number of priority countries where the United States is not engaged in direct action operations but rather trying to stop the spread of violent extremism. Their mission is to support the priorities of the Ambassador and the Geographic Combatant Commander's theater campaign plan against terrorist networks. At times, Ambassadors have complained that they have not been adequately informed of activities by special operations forces in their country.

If confirmed, what do you intend to do to make sure the goals of special operations personnel deployed to these countries are aligned closely with those of the Ambassadors they are working with?

If confirmed, I will promote an interagency approach as we assess the deployment of military forces within the EUCOM AOR. U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) must have flexibility to respond to the fluid and global nature of counterterrorism. However, the Ambassadors must be notified of these deployments to ensure foreign policy concerns are addressed adequately.

What is your assessment of the value of these special operations personnel to their respective Geographic Combatant Commands and the country teams they are supporting?

Special operations forces are an invaluable resource to the Geographic Combatant Commander. From my experience in Afghanistan, these forces provide a unique capability that is indispensable to global counterterrorism efforts.

Marine Security Guards in Embassies

Due to the attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya, which resulted in the death of of a U.S. ambassador and three other Americans, many are conveying concern about the safety of U.S. diplomatic personnel around the world.

Do you share this concern?

I do share this Committee's concern for the safety of our diplomatic colleagues stationed around the world.

The Marine Security Guard Program was established in 1946, and its mission, to provide internal security at designated embassies of classified information and equipment, remains unchanged to this day.

In light of increasing threats to U.S. diplomatic personnel by terrorists throughout the world, do you believe it is time to re-examine the Program's mission and protocols?

The Marine Corps Embassy Security Group does not fall under the authority of the Combatant Commands. EUCOM does not have the expertise to comment on the Marine Security Guard Program's mission and protocols.

If so, should it be broadened to provide additional protection to U.S. diplomatic personnel?

Although the primary mission of the Marine Security Guard Program is to provide internal security services at designated U.S. diplomatic and consular facilities to prevent the compromise of classified information and equipment vital to the national security of the United States, a secondary mission is to provide protection for U.S. citizens and U.S. government property located within designated U.S. diplomatic and consular premises during exigent circumstances (urgent temporary circumstances which require immediate aid or action).

In your opinion, what additional steps, if any, should be taken to reduce the risk of attacks on U.S. embassies and consulates and diplomatic personnel by terrorist organizations throughout the world and in the EUCOM area of responsibility, in particular?

The risk of attack to our diplomatic facilities can never be completely eliminated. Working closely with my Department of State colleagues, I will seek to reduce the risk by leveraging the expertise of our interagency partners in order to strengthen our comprehensive counter-terrorism strategy. In an era of decreasing resources and increased threats, we must utilize a whole of government approach to reduce the risk to our diplomatic facilities and personnel in the EUCOM area of responsibility and beyond.

NATO Special Operations Headquarters

The NATO Special Operations Forces Headquarters (NSHQ) was created in 2007 to enhance the capabilities of and promote interoperability between the special operations forces (SOF) of NATO member nations. Admiral McRaven, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM), has credited the NSHQ with bringing about "a generational leap forward in NATO Allied and Partner SOF capabilities."

What do you see as the value of NSHQ to ISAF operations in Afghanistan?

Since its establishment in 2007, the NATO Special Operations Force Head Quarters (NSHQ) has quietly made an immense behind the scenes impact on operations in Afghanistan, and more broadly, in the development of a wider Allied and Partner SOF. In an ISAF context, one of the over arching achievements has been the establishment of a coherent framework for Allied and Partner SOF operations under the ISAF mandate that was non-existent prior to the inception of the NSHQ. This crucial framework has not only brought a greater capability to ISAF, but has

also served to underpin a more effective and relevant and inter-operable SOF capability through the creation of doctrine, training, and common standards. Moreover, the NSHQ has also been instrumental in supporting increased SOF contributions by Allies and Partners to ISAF operations. Allied and Partner SOF contributions on the ground have increased by some 500% since 2007.

The NSHQ has also closed a number of operational gaps identified in Afghanistan by developing and conducting a comprehensive purpose built training and education program at the NATO SOF School. This effort has included combined joint SOF staff operations and procedures, technical exploitation, threat network analysis, imagery analysis, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) full motion video employment. Additionally, the NSHQ has enabled NATO Allied and Partner SOF through the reciprocal sharing of classified information leveraging both the NATO SOF communications network and the NSHQ's the Special Operations Forces Fusion Cell (SOFFC) in Kabul that serves more than 2200 Allied and Partner SOF personnel operating under ISAF. These enhancements include enabling Allied and Partner SOF task forces to receive ISR video feeds in support of partnered advise and assist operations with their Afghan counterparts in the Provincial Response Companies (PRC).

What role do you believe the NSHQ should play in future contingencies involving NATO SOF?

Operations in Afghanistan have led to significant gains in SOF capabilities and capacities across Allied and Partner SOF. Let me also point out that the benefits realized from the enhancement of SOF within the Alliance by the NSHQ also impact bi-lateral and multilateral SOF operations outside of a NATO context. In response to operational requirements, the NSHQ has successfully established a NATO Allied and Partner SOF community where none existed previously. This human SOF network transcends the Alliance and habitually includes non-NATO SOF partners from Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, Finland, Austria, and Switzerland. Looking ahead to future challenges, we need to transfer the synergy, effectiveness, and efficiency acquired as a result of operational drivers in Afghanistan, to counter-piracy, and from NSHQ activities, and orient them towards emerging Alliance security challenges. In many instances SOF will play an instrumental role in mitigating threats. The NSHQ role will be crucial in developing a more responsive and agile series of SOF capabilities including scaled force packages with organic plug and play capabilities. NSHQ coordination and focus will ensure greater utility to the Alliance with an assured full spectrum SOF capability.

How do you believe the NSHQ can most effectively support NATO SOF capabilities and interoperability?

The NSHQ role, with its specific and focused advocacy of SOF initiatives, is a crucial driver of Alliance SOF capability and interoperability. Moreover, as highlighted at the February NATO Defense Ministers meeting, NATO SOF interoperability will be key to supporting NATO's Connected Forces initiative. It is important to recognize that there is no more efficient or effective means to develop SOF capabilities, capacities, and interoperability than through an enduring Alliance with a dedicated SOF advocate hence the reason the NATO SOF Transformation Initiative was launched following the North Atlantic Council endorsement at the

Riga Summit in 2006. As mentioned, the NSHQ has made unprecedented strides in the development of SOF capabilities and capacities across a range of disciplines and functional areas. Significant improvements include the areas of command, control, communications, information sharing, policy making, doctrine and standard operating procedures. A robust SOF community of interest in SOF medicine has enabled the development of this critical capability across the Alliance. A well-documented Alliance and National SOF capability gap is in SOF air which was painfully evident in Afghanistan and in many cases affected our operational tempo. The NSHQ is working to gain similar momentum to promote enhanced capability, capacity and interoperability in the air domain. Success will be the integration of these capabilities that will eventually allow for a more responsive employment of SOF in a NATO context and among National SOF.

What do you believe are the appropriate roles for EUCOM and SOCOM in providing guidance and resources to the NSHQ?

The NATO Special Operations Headquarters is under the daily operational command of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, so in terms of guidance, if confirmed, I would oversee all operational issues related to the NSHQ. As Commander, USEUCOM I am delegated authority from the Joint Staff to execute U.S. Lead Agent and framework nation representative responsibilities, including managing NSHQ manpower and strength with support from the Army to manage fiscal resourcing. The Commander of U.S. SOCOM is designated as the Lead Component charged with Executive Agent responsibilities within the U.S. Department of Defense. In that capacity, Admiral McRaven exercises SOF custodianship of U.S. framework nation related activities.

Mass Atrocities Prevention

President Obama identified the prevention of mass atrocities and genocide as a core U.S. national security interest, as well as a core moral interest, in August 2011 under Presidential Study Directive 10.

Among interagency partners, what is EUCOM's role in addressing atrocity threats, and what tools does EUCOM have for preventing or responding to atrocities in its AOR?

EUCOM has been one of the DoD leaders in the development of an analytical framework to shape the military's role within the interagency community to focus on the unique aspects of preventing and responding to mass atrocities. EUCOM has developed detailed operational level tools to prevent and respond to atrocity threats along three broad lines of effort. These lines of effort include operational integration to transform evolving concepts into practicable/executable tactics, techniques, and procedures; doctrine development to institutionalize already accepted practices; and policy development/refinement to foster interagency integration. A year ago, EUCOM co-hosted a conference with AFRICOM to catalyze a broad discussion on mass atrocity prevention and response operations as well as address the requirements of Presidential Study Directive 10. Attendees included senior representatives from the National Security Staff,

Department of State, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Joint Staff, and Dr. Sarah Sewall, Director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard University.

Has EUCOM developed planning processes toward this effort so that it will be able to respond quickly in emergency situations?

Yes. EUCOM has a level-two contingency plan for conducting peace operations in the EUCOM area of responsibility with the focus to contain conflict, redress the peace, and intervene to either prevent or respond to mass atrocities. The plan provides the staff with tools to facilitate a rapid response to include: a mass atrocity specific commander's critical information requirement; a joint operations center checklist to alert key leaders and initiate crisis action planning; a playbook that delineates critical events in the interagency response process; and a detailed mass atrocity response operation annex that will enable the command to collaboratively plan and execute a mass atrocity response operation.

Counter Threat Finance

A number of officials in DoD and the Intelligence Community have called for investing additional resources in identifying and tracking the flow of money associated with terrorist networks and illicit trafficking.

What are your views on the role of DoD in counter threat finance activities?

I completely agree. Of course, Treasury has lead and a great deal of expertise. The United States Government, and in this case the Department of Defense, must invest the required resources to identify and track the revenue flow derived from illicit activities. These funds, increasing by trillions of dollars, are key enablers in challenging security, creating instability, and undermining good governance on a worldwide scale. Through close interagency partnership with U.S. law enforcement agencies, DoD support to counter threat finance serves a critical role in disrupting narco-trafficking and transnational organized crime.

What do you believe is the appropriate role, if any, of EUCOM in supporting counter threat finance activities?

Again, acknowledging that Treasury has lead, I believe that EUCOM, and all of the regional Combatant Commands, have a critical role in supporting counter threat finance (CTF) activities. Illicit trafficking organizations operate on a global scale. As a result, attacking these networks requires a comprehensive, synchronized, interagency, and international effort. Currently, EUCOM has an organic CTF team that works collaboratively with U.S. Government interagency and international partners in support of the National Transnational Organized Crime Strategy (TOC) and U.S. national security objectives.

National Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime

Criminal networks are not only expanding their operations, but they are also diversifying their activities, resulting in a convergence of transnational threats that has

evolved to become more complex, volatile, and destabilizing. In July 2011, the President released the Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime: Addressing Converging Threats to National Security. One of the priority action areas designated in the strategy is “enhancing Department of Defense support to U.S. law enforcement.”

What is your understanding of the President’s strategy to combat transnational criminal organizations?

The President’s strategy to combat transnational organized crime (TOC) is organized around a single, unifying principle—to build, balance, and integrate the tools of American power to combat transnational organized crime and related threats to our national security, and to urge our partners to do the same. The National TOC strategy will achieve this end state by pursuing five key policy objectives:

1. Protect Americans and our partners from the harm, violence, and exploitation of transnational criminal networks.
2. Help partner countries strengthen governance and transparency, break the correlative power of transnational criminal networks, and sever state-crime alliances.
3. Break the economic power of transnational criminal networks and protect strategic markets and the U.S. financial system from TOC penetration and abuse.
4. Defeat transnational criminal networks that pose the greatest threat to national security by targeting their infrastructures, depriving them of their enabling means, and preventing the criminal facilitation of terrorist activities.
5. Build international consensus, multilateral cooperation, and public-private partnerships to defeat transnational organized crime.

What is your assessment of the threat to the United States posed by transnational organized crime operating in the EUCOM AOR?

Transnational organized crime networks use sophisticated business models and operations to perpetuate their illicit activities. They are highly adaptable, bold in their techniques, and ruthless in their execution. These networks are expanding and diversifying their activities at an alarming rate. The result is a convergence of well-funded transnational organized crime networks that can destabilize entire economies, undermine good governance, and create national security threats to our Homeland and our allies. TOC networks with links to narcotics and arms smuggling, trafficking in persons, and a variety of other revenue generating commodities operate throughout the EUCOM AOR. These entities, with their exceptional destabilizing influence, threaten our Theater and national security interests, the security and stability of our allies and partners, and U.S. interests both at home and abroad.

What role does EUCOM play in combating transnational organized crime and in training and equipping partner security forces that have been tasked with

combating it?

In Europe, EUCOM's new Joint Interagency Counter Trafficking Center (JICTC), is focused on facilitating and implementing the National TOC Strategy in conjunction with U.S. interagency organizations and international partners. JICTC's mission is to support U.S. Interagency and Country Team efforts, and collaborate with similar international organizations, to counter transnational illicit trafficking and other associated threats. JICTC also assists partner nations to build self-sufficient counter- trafficking skills, competencies, and capacity to defend the Homeland forward from the rising threats posed by global transnational illicit trafficking. It is important to emphasize that EUCOM does not seek to become the lead U.S. Government agency for combating organized crime. Rather, EUCOM and its JICTC provide support to U.S. agencies to help synchronize their counter-trafficking efforts in a collaborative, whole of government approach. JICTC's focus areas include: narcotics trafficking; terrorism; weapons trafficking (illicit weapons, as well as WMD); human trafficking; and threat financing.

DoD Counter-narcotics Activities

DoD serves as the single lead agency for the detection and monitoring of aerial and maritime foreign shipments of drugs flowing toward the United States. On an annual basis, DoD's counter-narcotics (CN) program expends approximately \$1.5 billion to support the Department's CN operations, including to build the capacity of U.S. Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, and certain foreign governments, and provide intelligence support on CN-related matters and a variety of other unique enabling capabilities. EUCOM's AOR is a receiving market for much of the world's illegal narcotics.

In your view, what is the appropriate role of DoD – and by extension EUCOM – in counterdrug efforts in the EUCOM AOR?

The appropriate DoD role in counterdrug efforts inside the EUCOM AOR is to contribute directly and meaningfully to the U.S. Interagency development of international, comprehensive, synchronized, and proactive drug control strategies. Additionally, EUCOM must work with U.S. Country Teams to help build the capacity of partner-nations to detect, interdict, and prosecute transnational organized criminals before their activities adversely impact the United States or U.S. interests. Those interests include stemming the illicit revenues raised by the drug trade, revenue which poses a direct threat to U.S. interests and security in Afghanistan and along our Nation's southern borders.

Given that the vast majority of illegal drugs arriving in Europe are not destined for the United States, should DoD invest resources in countering the flow of illegal drugs to or through Europe?

Yes. There is a clear financial and logistical illicit trafficking nexus in Europe. This nexus, rooted in the drug trade, sustains increasingly global illicit trafficking networks that pose a direct and growing threat to U.S. security and interests, for it is not only drugs that can move across these networks. For an extraordinarily modest investment, EUCOM and its Joint Interagency

Counter Trafficking Center (JICTC) are playing a critical role in the forward defense of the United States from this growing 21st century threat. EUCOM's path-breaking work in this arena is playing a vital role in the support, facilitation, and synthesis of a variety of efforts among U.S. Government interagency and international partners to implement the National TOC Strategy, and take some degree of effective action against this multi-billion dollar security challenge. The alternative—providing no funding and eliminating this important work—will allow global illicit traffickers to continue working in and through Europe unchecked, with direct and indirect consequences for U.S. security efforts and interests.

Building Partner Capacity within the EUCOM Area of Responsibility (AOR)

In the past several years, Congress has provided a number of new authorities requiring the Departments of Defense and State to work collaboratively to provide security assistance to partner nations. These include the global train and equip authority (“Section 1206”) and the Global Security Contingency Fund.

In your view, what should be our strategic objectives in building the capacities of partner nations?

In my view, the principal strategic objective of building partner capacity is to be able to share more of the burden of protecting our vital national security interests with our Allies and partners. This involves assisting our Allies and partners so that they can participate in and/or lead multilateral military operations, contribute to regional stability, counter transnational threats, and provide for their own internal security. At EUCOM, our focus is shifting to preserving the partner nation capabilities that have been developed through a decade of combined operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya, as well as our building partner capacity efforts, to meet the challenges of a post 2014 environment.

How would you define our strategic objectives for building the capacity of partner nations in the European Command area of responsibility and in what ways, if any, do those objectives differ from other geographic combatant commands?

The strategic objectives for building partner capacity in the EUCOM area of responsibility are defined in the *Guidance for Employment of the Force*. One of these strategic objectives is that U.S. Allies and partners in the theater have the capability and capacity for regional security, to conduct military operations with the United States and NATO, and to contribute to operations worldwide. This objective is of special significance to the European theater because of NATO, and because the majority of countries in the theater are stable democracies with skilled, capable military forces across the joint spectrum. As a result, Europe is far more of a security provider than a security consumer. The foremost examples of this reality are in Afghanistan, where European Allies and partners account for 92% of the non-U.S. forces in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF); and in Libya where, within weeks, NATO quickly assumed leadership of the mission and conducted 75% of all sorties and 100% of maritime operations.

What is the relationship of the global train and equip authority and the Global Security Contingency Fund to other security assistance authorities, such as DOD counternarcotics assistance and foreign military financing?

Extension of the global train and equip (“Section 1206”) authority, which is currently set to expire on September 30, 2014, is essential for EUCOM to enable Allies and partners to support NATO’s post-ISAF train, advise, and assist mission in Afghanistan. The 1206 authority and the Global Security Contingency Fund complement other security assistance authorities. For example, Section 1206 authority has enabled EUCOM to provide pre-deployment training and equipment to Allies and partners deploying forces to Afghanistan. Prior to FY10, EUCOM’s had minimal capability to provide this type of support to our Allies and partners due to insufficient authorities and/or funding from other programs.

What should be done to ensure that the global train and equip authority and the Global Security Contingency Fund do not duplicate the efforts of these other assistance programs?

A number of safeguards are already in place to avoid duplication of effort among the global train and equip authority, the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF), and other security assistance programs. First, DoD and State Department guidance on Section 1206 and GSCF clearly identifies the purpose and scope of these programs. Second, proposals for these programs are fully coordinated within DoD and with the State Department. Third, under EUCOM’s Theater Campaign Plan construct, we develop Country Cooperation Plans and work to align the appropriate resources and authorities to requirements down at the activity level. Fourth, program managers and authorities experts at EUCOM headquarters, the Joint Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense work with our planners to ensure that we are using the right programs in the right circumstances, and are not duplicating efforts across programs.

NATO Transformation

What is your assessment of the role of Allied Command Transformation in effecting positive change among NATO member nations?

NATO Allied Command Transformation (ACT) makes a significant contribution to training, education, doctrine, and concept development across the Alliance.

NATO Members’ Spending on Defense

According to then-Secretary Gates, in 2011 only 5 of 28 NATO members, including the United States, met the Alliance target of spending at least 2 percent of GDP on defense.

What is your assessment of the impact on NATO of the failure of the majority of NATO allies to meet agreed targets for defense spending?

This is a political issue, and a decision for member states. The Secretary General recognizes the difficulty of delivering defense for the Alliance in times of economic austerity. The Smart Defence program, Connected Forces Initiative, and NATO 2020 aim to fill capability gaps, but are inadequate without sufficient spending on defense by NATO members.

If confirmed, what steps would you take to encourage NATO allies to increase their defense spending and enhance the military capabilities that they can contribute to NATO operations?

If confirmed, I would see my interaction with NATO members at the strategic military level as a major tenet during my tenure as SACEUR. This interaction would include discussions on how we can improve military capabilities across the Alliance. It should be noted that although many NATO members are not currently meeting their mandated 2% of GDP for defense spending, this is not the only measure of a country's military capability. Some countries, such as the Netherlands, are developing specific niche BMD capabilities.

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

What are your views on U.S. accession to UNCLOS?

Like former Secretary Clinton, former Secretary Panetta, the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Commanders of U.S. Transportation Command, U.S. Northern Command, and U.S. Pacific Command, and the current Commander of U.S. European Command, I support U.S. accession to the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

From a national security standpoint, what do you see as the advantages and disadvantages to being a party to UNCLOS?

As former Secretary Panetta has testified, the Law of the Sea Convention provides a robust legal regime for global operations by U.S. Armed Forces. It codifies navigation and overflight rights and high seas freedoms that are necessary for the mobility of our forces. It is completely in line with, and supports, the U.S. Defense Strategic Guidance. To date, 165 states have ratified the convention, and I believe that it is in our national security interests to do the same. Our current non-party status constrains our efforts to develop enduring maritime relationships with partner nations. It also inhibits our efforts to expand the Proliferation Security Initiative, and elevates the level of risk for our Sailors as they undertake operations to preserve navigation rights and freedoms. In EUCOM's area of Arctic interest, which is significant, the Law of the Sea Convention will strengthen our arguments for freedom of navigation through the Northern Sea Route and provide stronger moral standing for the United States in our extensive cooperative efforts with all of the Arctic states. We need to eliminate seams as much as possible when we operate in difficult circumstances in the maritime environment with our like-minded partners. The Law of the Sea Convention would allow us to do that.

Quality of Life Programs for Military Families

Three of the top quality of life issues in the EUCOM AOR include predictable access to quality health care, including family member dental support; ensuring high-quality dependent education programs provided by the DOD Dependent Schools; and quality living accommodations for military families. Commanders in the EUCOM region have emphasized their support for and reliance on EUCOM resources to provide crucial morale programs, enhance retention, and foster esprit de corps.

What do you see as the most significant long-term challenges for EUCOM in preserving and enhancing the quality of life for assigned personnel while force redeployments to the United States proceed?

In a resource constrained environment, it is imperative to keep faith with, and maintain an enduring commitment to, our forces and their families, to include those stationed in Europe, by continuing our proven quality of life programs, even as we seek new and innovative ways to provide Force and Family Readiness support to those who choose to serve.

If confirmed, what steps would you take to ensure the adequacy of support services for military families during the transition to ensure that vital support mechanisms, such as Department of Defense Schools, morale, welfare and recreation services, family housing, and commissary and exchange facilities continue to serve military personnel?

If confirmed, I will actively support the initiatives currently underway to upgrade and improve existing medical, educational, and recreational facilities, while continuing to develop and expand on partnerships with supporting agencies and services who can offer effective and efficient alternatives for the future. EUCOM Force and Family Readiness priorities clearly reflect those outlined in the President's 2011 report "Strengthening our Military Families." If confirmed, I will work with the Services and component commanders to ensure we remain steadfastly committed to those priorities.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in EUCOM

In recent years, the Department of Defense has developed comprehensive policies and procedures to improve the prevention of and response to incidents of sexual assaults, including providing appropriate resources and care for victims of sexual assault. Numerous cases of sexual assault and misconduct involving military personnel continue to be reported. Many victims and their advocates contend that they are victimized twice: first by attackers in their own ranks and then by unresponsive or inadequate investigations and emotional support for the victim.

Secretary Panetta has recently announced several new initiatives to curb sexual assaults in the military and to improve support for victims.

What is your assessment of the Secretary of Defense's recently announced initiatives, and, if confirmed, how would you implement them in EUCOM?

I support the Former Secretary's recent initiatives to combat sexual assault and think they demonstrate the Department's commitment to eradicating sexual assault from our ranks. These initiatives ensure commanders have the resources they need to investigate and prosecute sexual assault cases, and provide additional support for victims to ensure they are fully protected and receive the care they need. If confirmed, I will continue to ensure commanders have the resources they need to investigate accusations of sexual assault, provide care and support for victims and fairly adjudicate each case. Lastly, I will promote a climate that encourages reporting without fear and holds perpetrators accountable.

What is your understanding of the resources and programs in place in EUCOM to offer victims of sexual assault the medical, psychological, investigative, and legal help that they need?

I am not aware of any shortfalls or deficiencies in command leadership, personnel, or training to prevent or respond to sexual assault in the EUCOM Area of Responsibility.

It is my understanding the entire EUCOM AOR has resources and programs in place to offer victims of sexual assault the medical, psychological, investigative, and legal help required. If confirmed, I will work with Service Component commanders to ensure they continue to have appropriate resources and support to implement effective sexual assault prevention and response programs. In addition, I will ensure every measure is in place to support victims.

What is your view of steps the Command has taken to prevent sexual assaults in EUCOM?

The EUCOM leadership closely monitors Command climate indicators and reports of sexual assault, and responds with effective Command messages and directives that foster a zero tolerance environment for sexual assault. If confirmed, I will promote a climate that encourages reporting without fear and holds perpetrators appropriately accountable.

What is your view of the adequacy of the training and resources in EUCOM to investigate and respond to allegations of sexual assault?

The Services recently enhanced their resources for investigating and responding to allegations of sexual assault. If confirmed, I will review the Command's sexual assault prevention and response program to evaluate its effectiveness and ensure adequate resources are available. I will also work with Service Component commanders to ensure we continue to emphasize the importance of training and educating service members on the program, their rights and the command's commitment to safeguard them from predatory behavior in the ranks.

What is your view of the willingness and ability of military leaders to hold assailants accountable for their actions?

The Department's policy emphasizes the command's role in an effective response. Special training is provided to commanders, investigators and prosecutors to ensure they are prepared to

address incidents of sexual assault. Our policies seek to balance victim care and appropriate command action against offenders in order to build victim confidence to assist in investigations. As military leaders, we must be vigilant to our duties to hold those assailants accountable for their actions. I take this obligation very seriously.

Do you consider the current sexual assault policies and procedures, particularly those on confidential reporting, to be effective?

Overall, the Department has put considerable effort into developing policies and procedures designed to address sexual assault. In fact, the department faces the same challenges that society faces in dealing with incidents of sexual assault – balancing care to victims with prosecuting offenders. Restricted reporting allows victims who wish to remain anonymous to come forward and obtain the support they need following an assault. I consider these policies and procedures to be effective.

What problems, if any, are you aware of regarding the manner in which the confidential reporting procedures have been put into effect?

I am not aware of any problems with confidential reporting.

Mental Health of Servicemembers and Stress on the Force

The Committee is concerned about the stress on military personnel resulting from lengthy and repeated deployments and their access to mental health care to deal with this increased stress. Increased suicide rates are clear reminders that servicemembers, particularly those who have been deployed multiple times, are under tremendous stress and need access to mental health care.

In your view, are there sufficient mental health assets in EUCOM to address the mental health needs of the military personnel and their families?

Across the EUCOM AOR, I understand there currently exists an identified shortage of mental health providers available to treat servicemembers and their families. The service components have done much to improve this situation over the past three years and continue to push ongoing initiatives to close the gap. If confirmed, I will work with the service components to ensure any remaining gap in behavioral health services is adequately addressed.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force medical facilities in Europe are actively involved in addressing the behavioral health needs of its beneficiaries. Some of the major efforts include:

Integrated Behavioral Health Consultants in Primary Care: Research has demonstrated that the primary health care setting is optimal for identifying behavioral health difficulties in the general population. This is specifically true for the identification of depression and post-traumatic stress disorder. By integrating behavioral health professionals into the primary care clinics, these issues are quickly identified and receive treatment or appropriate coordination and referral for further care by a specialized behavioral health clinic. These providers are also available to

provide behavioral health consultation to the primary health care providers as well as provide behavioral health educational modification interventions for patients with complicated conditions or low compliance with medical treatment. Moreover electronically secure communication to mental health services have been better marketed and implemented.

Community Outreach: USAFE and Army Installation Management Command-Europe adopted toll-free, confidential, anonymous, telephonic crisis hotline access for servicemembers, veterans, and family members in Europe to information, with Veterans Affairs counselors available 24/7 that performed over 500 direct crisis contact interventions in 2012. Other expansion efforts by Army, Navy and Air Force teams have included broadened mental health consultation in DoD Dependent Schools, and nearly 600 separate prevention events in 2012 aimed at 12,100 students that resulted in 230 students being enrolled in counseling sessions. More Military and Family Life Consultants have been hired, and overall closer linkages have been also fostered with Family Advocacy, and additional teamwork have succeeded with community organizations.

Additionally, the Army Medical Department in Europe is actively involved in addressing the behavioral health needs of its soldiers in two ways:

Embedded Behavioral Health (EBH) Teams: The Army directed the implementation of multi-disciplinary EBH for all operational units. This modality assigns an EBH team with each brigade-sized element, and empanels all battalion-sized unit Soldiers to the same provider. Further, the EBH team is located within the brigade-sized elements' footprint. The Army Public Health Command conducted a number of evaluations of this model and found that it decreases the stigma associated with seeking behavioral health treatment and improves access to care, continuity of care, Commanders' satisfaction, and treatment outcomes. This initiative will continue to be rolled out through FY 16 to all operational units in U.S. Army Europe.

Behavioral Health Data Portal (BHDP): The Army directed the use of the BHDP with all active duty Soldiers receiving treatment in outpatient behavior health clinics. The BHDP is a set of validated survey instruments that Soldiers fill out at intake, and at follow-up appointments as appropriate. This initiative powerfully impacts Soldier treatment in two important ways. First, the BHDP creates the ability to quantify treatment outcomes across the enterprise. Second, it displays for both the provider and the Soldier evidence of improvement or lack of improvement, which can be addressed during treatment sessions. Research demonstrates the positive influence of incorporating evidence of patient progress into treatment.

If confirmed, what actions will you take to address the mental health needs of military personnel and their families in EUCOM?

If confirmed, I will work with the component Commanders to ensure continued adequate resourcing as well as emphasis on evidence-based mental health treatments proven to improve the mental health of our servicemembers. I will demand that leaders at all levels work to decrease the stigma associated with seeking mental health treatment, and work to increase access to mental health treatment for military personnel and their families.

What is your assessment of suicide prevention programs and resources available to support these programs in EUCOM?

Through leadership, I will continue to support activities that reduce the stigma associated with seeking behavioral health treatment. A very successful technique is encouraging Senior leaders to reveal, as appropriate, their own positive interaction with behavioral health treatment and acknowledge that behavioral health issues can be a direct outcome of military service. I will emphasize the importance of AOR-wide Exceptional Family Member Program Family (EFMP) travel decisions. The identification and assessment of Family Members' behavioral health needs prior to PCS to EUCOM remains an important risk mitigation process. The EFMP family travel decision process: a) supports Family Members' health overseas; b) supports the servicemembers' ability to focus on his/her mission; and c) reduces the likelihood of an "Early Return of Dependents" (ERD) to more robust Behavioral Health services in CONUS. I will also engage in strong, dynamic Command messaging that emphasizes behavioral health issues are treatable, and that the majority of servicemembers improve when they engage in behavioral health services and stick with treatment until completion.

It is also worth noting that our Army component within EUCOM, U.S. Army Europe, has fewer Soldier suicides than Army posts of comparable size in the United States. There are good prevention programs at work within Europe, and I will continue to identify and expand those programs that work, while transitioning away from those that do not.

Congressional Oversight

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

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

Yes, I do.

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

Yes, I do.

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Commander, U. S. EUCOM and Supreme Allied Commander, Europe?

Yes, I do.

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

Yes, I do.

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

Yes, I do.