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Summary

The Navy for several years has carried out a variety of irregular warfare (IW) and counterterrorism (CT) activities. Among the most readily visible of the Navy’s recent IW operations have been those carried out by Navy sailors serving ashore in Afghanistan and Iraq. Many of the Navy’s contributions to IW operations around the world are made by Navy individual augmentees (IAs)—individual Navy sailors assigned to various DOD operations.

The May 1-2, 2011, U.S. military operation in Abbottabad, Pakistan, that killed Osama bin Laden reportedly was carried out by a team of 23 Navy special operations forces, known as SEALs (an acronym standing for Sea, Air, and Land). The SEALs reportedly belonged to an elite unit known unofficially as Seal Team 6 and officially as the Naval Special Warfare Development Group (DEVGRU).

The Navy established the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC) informally in October 2005 and formally in January 2006. NECC consolidated and facilitated the expansion of a number of Navy organizations that have a role in IW operations. The Navy established the Navy Irregular Warfare Office in July 2008, published a vision statement for irregular warfare in January 2010, and established “a community of interest” to develop and advance ideas, collaboration, and advocacy related to IW in December 2010.

The Navy’s riverine force is intended to supplement the riverine capabilities of the Navy’s SEALs and relieve Marines who had been conducting maritime security operations in ports and waterways in Iraq.

The Global Maritime Partnership is a U.S. Navy initiative to achieve an enhanced degree of cooperation between the U.S. Navy and foreign navies, coast guards, and maritime police forces, for the purpose of ensuring global maritime security against common threats.

The Southern Partnership Station (SPS) and the Africa Partnership Station (APS) are Navy ships, such as amphibious ships or high-speed sealift ships, that have deployed to the Caribbean and to waters off Africa, respectively, to support U.S. Navy engagement with countries in those regions, particularly for purposes of building security partnerships with those countries and for increasing the capabilities of those countries for performing maritime-security operations.

The Navy’s IW and CT activities pose a number of potential oversight issues for Congress, including the definition of Navy IW activities and how much emphasis to place on IW and CT activities in future Navy budgets.
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Introduction

This report provides background information and potential issues for Congress on the Navy’s irregular warfare (IW) and counterterrorism (CT) operations. The Navy’s IW and CT activities pose a number of potential oversight issues for Congress, including the definition of Navy IW activities and how much emphasis to place on IW and CT activities in future Navy budgets. Congress’s decisions regarding Navy IW and CT operations can affect Navy operations and funding requirements, and the implementation of the nation’s overall IW and CT strategies.

Background¹

Navy Irregular Warfare (IW) Operations

Shift in Terminology from IW to Confronting Irregular Challenges (CIC)

Use of the term irregular warfare has declined within DOD since 2010. DOD’s report on the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review, for example, avoids the term and instead uses the phrase counterinsurgency, stability, and counterterrorism operations. Consistent with DOD’s declining use of the term irregular warfare, the Navy increasingly is using the phrase confronting irregular challenges (CIC) instead of the term irregular warfare. For purposes of convenience, this report continues to use the term irregular warfare and the abbreviation IW.

Navy IW Operations in Afghanistan and Iraq

Among the most readily visible of the Navy’s recent IW operations have been those carried out by Navy sailors serving ashore in Afghanistan and Iraq, which include or have included the following:

- **close air support (CAS)** operations, of which Navy carrier strike groups account for 30% in Afghanistan;
- **expeditionary electronic warfare** operations, including operations to defeat improvised explosive devices (IEDs), electronic attack operations (of which Navy and Marine Corps aircraft account for almost 60% in Afghanistan), and operations to counter insurgent and extremist network communications;
- **intelligence and signals intelligence** operations, including operations to identify, map, and track extremist activity, and operations involving tactical intelligence support teams that are deployed with special operations forces (SOF);
- **explosive ordnance disposal (EOD)** operations, including defusing IEDs, clearing land mines, destroying captured weapon and explosive caches, and investigating blast scenes so as to obtain evidence for later prosecution;

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, information in this section is taken from a Navy briefing to CRS on July 31, 2009, on Navy IW activities and capabilities.
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- **riverine warfare** operations to secure waterways such as the Tigris and Euphrates rivers and the Haditha dam in Iraq;

- **maritime security** operations, including operations to intercept smugglers and extremists going to Iraq and Kuwait, and operations to guard Iraqi and U.S. infrastructure, facilities, and supply lines, such as ports and oil and gas platforms and pipelines;

- **medical and dental** services;

- **logistics** operations, including transporting of 90% of military equipment for Afghanistan and Iraq on military sealift ships, operating ports in Iraq and Kuwait, and providing contracting services and reconstruction using Iraqi firms;

- **engineering and construction** operations, such as rebuilding schools, repairing roads, reconstructing electrical, water and sewer systems, and training and equipping Iraqi engineers;

- **provincial reconstruction** operations in Afghanistan and Iraq; and

- **legal** operations, including prosecution of special-group criminals and assisting Iraqis in drafting governing documents.

**Navy IW Operations Elsewhere**

In addition to participating in U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Navy states that its IW operations also include the following:

- **security force assistance operations**, in which forward-deployed Navy ships exercise and work with foreign navies, coast guards, and maritime police forces, so as to improve their abilities to conduct maritime security operations;

- **civic assistance operations**, in which forward-deployed Navy units, including Navy hospital ships, expeditionary medical teams, fleet surgical teams, and naval construction units provide medical and construction services in foreign countries as a complement to other U.S. diplomatic and development activities in those countries;

- **disaster relief operations**, of which Navy forces have performed several in recent years; and

- **counter-piracy operations**, which have increased since 2008.²

The Navy states that enduring areas of focus for the Navy’s role in IW include the following:

- **enhancing regional awareness**, which enables better planning, decision making, and operational agility;

- **building maritime partner capability and capacity**, so as to deny sanctuaries to violent extremists; and

² For more on counter-piracy operations, see CRS Report R40528, Piracy off the Horn of Africa, by Lauren Ploch et al.
• **outcome-based application of force**, so as to maintain continuous pressure on extremist groups and their supporting infrastructure.

**Navy Individual Augmentees (IAs)**

Many of the Navy’s contributions to IW operations around the world are made by Navy individual augmentees (IAs)—individual Navy sailors assigned to various DOD operations. The Department of the Navy (DON) states that:

The Navy provides sailors in the form of IAs, including personnel in the training pipeline, to fulfill the OCO mission requirements of the Combatant Commanders (COCOMs). As IAs, they fulfill vital roles, serving in non-core missions such as provincial reconstruction teams, detainee operations, civil affairs, training teams, customs inspections, counter Improvised Explosive Device (IED), and combat support. IAs also support adaptive core and maritime missions including base operations, military police, combat support, counter IED, maritime and port security, airlift support, and Joint Task Force (JTF)/COCOM staff support. IAs are making a significant impact in more than 20 countries around the world providing COCOMS with mission-tailored, globally distributed forces. In FY 2012, the funding for 3,836 Navy non-core IAs has been shifted from the OCO budget to the base budget.²

**November 2011 Navy Testimony**

The Navy outlined its IW activities in its prepared statement for a November 3, 2011, hearing on the services’ IW activities before the Emerging Threats and Capabilities subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee. For the text of the Navy’s prepared statement, see Appendix A.

**Navy Counterterrorism (CT) Operations**

**In General**

Navy CT operations include the following:

- Operations by Navy special operations forces, known as SEALs (an acronym standing for Sea, Air, and Land), that are directed against terrorists;⁴
- Tomahawk cruise missile attacks on suspected terrorist training camps and facilities, such as those reportedly conducted in Somalia on March 3 and May 1,

---

² Department of the Navy, *Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2012 Budget*, February 2011, pp. 1-10 and 1-11.

surveillance by Navy ships and aircraft of suspected terrorists overseas;

- maritime intercept operations (MIO) aimed at identifying and intercepting terrorists or weapons of mass destruction at sea, or potentially threatening ships or aircraft that are in or approaching U.S. territorial waters—an activity that includes Navy participation in the multilateral Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI);;

- working with the Coast Guard to build maritime domain awareness (MDA)—a real-time understanding of activities on the world’s oceans;

- assisting the Coast Guard in port-security operations;

- protection of forward-deployed Navy ships, an activity that was intensified following the terrorist attack on the Navy Aegis destroyer Cole (DDG-67) in October 2000 in the port of Aden, Yemen; and

- protection of domestic and overseas Navy bases and facilities;

- developing Global Maritime Intelligence Integration (GMII) as part of Joint Force Maritime Component Command (JFMCC) and Maritime Domain Awareness (MDA);

- engaging with the U.S. Coast Guard to use the National Strategy for Maritime Security to more rapidly develop capabilities for Homeland Security, particularly in the area of MDA; and

- operations by the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), for which combating terrorism is a core mission area.


7 For more on the PSI, see CRS Report RL34327, Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), by Mary Beth Nikitin.


10 NCIS states on its website that “the NCIS mission is to investigate and defeat criminal, foreign, and terrorist intelligence threats to the United States Navy and Marine Corps, wherever they operate: ashore, afloat, or in cyberspace,” and that combating terrorism is a core mission area for NCIS. Regarding this mission, the website states that

The May 1-2, 2011, U.S. military operation in Abbottabad, Pakistan, that killed Osama bin Laden—reportedly called Operation Neptune’s Spear—reportedly was carried out by a team of 23 Navy special operations forces, known as SEALs (an acronym standing for Sea, Air, and Land). The SEALs reportedly belonged to an elite unit known unofficially as Seal Team 6 and officially as the Naval Special Warfare Development Group (DEVGRU). The SEALs reportedly were flown to and from Abbottabad by Army special operations helicopters. Bin Laden’s body reportedly was flown by a U.S. military helicopter from Abbottabad to a base in Afghanistan, and from there by a Marine Corps V-22 tilt-rotor aircraft to the aircraft carrier *Carl Vinson* (CVN-70), which was operating at the time in the Northern Arabian Sea. A few hours later, in the same general area, bin Laden’s body reportedly was buried at sea from the ship. Differing accounts have emerged regarding certain details of the operation.\(^{11}\)

Press reports in July 2010 stated that U.S. forces in Afghanistan included at that time a special unit called Task Force 373, composed of Navy SEALs and Army Delta Force personnel, whose mission is “the deactivation of top Taliban and terrorists by either killing or capturing them.”\(^{12}\)

Another CRS report provides additional background information on the SEALs,\(^ {13}\) and another provides further discussion of the operation that killed Osama bin Laden.\(^ {14}\)

Detention of Terrorist Suspects on Navy Ships

On July 6, 2011, it was reported that
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The U.S. military captured a Somali terrorism suspect [named Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame] in the Gulf of Aden in April and interrogated him for more than two months aboard a U.S. Navy ship before flying him this week to New York, where he has been indicted on federal charges....

Other U.S. officials, interviewed separately, said Warsame and another individual were apprehended aboard a boat traveling from Yemen to Somalia by the U.S. military's Joint Operations Command. The vessel was targeted because the United States had acquired intelligence that potentially significant operatives were on board, the officials said. Court documents said the capture took place April 19.

One of the senior administration officials who briefed reporters said that the other suspect was released “after a very short period of time” after the military “determined that Warsame was an individual that we were very much interested in for further interrogation.”

According to court documents, Warsame was interrogated on “all but a daily basis” by military and civilian intelligence interrogators. During that time, officials in Washington held a number of meetings to discuss the intelligence being gleaned, Warsame’s status and what to do with him.

The options, one official said, were to release him, transfer him to a third country, keep him prisoner aboard the ship, subject him to trial by a military commission or allow a federal court to try him. The decision to seek a federal indictment, this official said, was unanimous.

Administration officials have argued that military commission jurisdiction is too narrow for some terrorism cases - particularly for a charge of material support for terrorist groups - and the Warsame case appeared to provide an opportunity to try to prove the point.

But some human rights and international law experts criticized what they saw as at least a partial return to the discredited “black site” prisons the CIA maintained during the Bush administration....

Warsame was questioned aboard the ship because interrogators “believed that moving him to another facility would interrupt the process and risk ending the intelligence flow,” one senior administration official said.

The official said Warsame “at all times was treated in a manner consistent with all Department of Defense policies” - following the Army Field Manual - and the Geneva Conventions.

Warsame was not provided access to an attorney during the initial two months of questioning, officials said. But “thereafter, there was a substantial break from any questioning of the defendant of four days,” court documents said. “After this break, the defendant was advised of his Miranda rights” - including his right to legal representation – “and, after waiving those rights, spoke to law enforcement agents.”

The four-day break and separate questioning were designed to avoid tainting the court case with information gleaned through un-Mirandized intelligence interrogation, an overlap that has posed a problem in previous cases. The questioning continued for seven days, “and the defendant waived his Miranda rights at the start of each day,” the documents said....

U.S. Navy Vice Adm. William H. McRaven alluded to the captures in testimony before a Senate committee last week in which he lamented the lack of clear plans and legal approvals for the handling of terrorism suspects seized beyond the war zones of Iraq and Afghanistan.
At one point in the hearing, Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, referred to “the question of the detention of people” and noted that McRaven had “made reference to a couple, I think, that are on a ship.”

McRaven replied affirmatively, saying, “It depends on the individual case, and I'd be more than happy to discuss the cases that we've dealt with.”

Another press report on July 6, 2011, stated:

In a telephone briefing with reporters, senior administration officials said Mr. Warsame and another person were captured by American forces somewhere “in the Gulf region” on April 19. Another official separately said the two were picked up on a fishing trawler in international waters between Yemen and Somalia. That other person was released.

Mr. Warsame was taken to a naval vessel, where he was questioned for the next two months by military interrogators, the officials said. They said his detention was justified by the laws of war, but declined to say whether their theory was that the Shabab are covered by Congress’s authorization to use military force against the perpetrators of the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks; whether the detention was justified by his interactions with Al Qaeda’s Yemen branch; or something else.

The officials also said interrogators used only techniques in the Army Field Manual, which complies with the Geneva Conventions. But they did not deliver a Miranda warning because they were seeking to gather intelligence, not court evidence. One official called those sessions “very, very productive,” but declined to say whether his information contributed to a drone attack in Somalia last month.

After about two months, Mr. Warsame was given a break for several days. Then a separate group of law enforcement interrogators came in. They delivered a Miranda warning, but he waived his rights to remain silent and have a lawyer present and continued to cooperate, the officials said, meaning that his subsequent statements would likely be admissible in court.

Throughout that period, administration officials were engaged in deliberations about what to do with Mr. Warsame’s case. Eventually, they “unanimously” decided to prosecute him in civilian court. If he is convicted of all the charges against him, he would face life in prison.

Last week, Vice Adm. William H. McRaven, who was until recently in charge of the military’s Joint Special Operations Command, told a Senate hearing that detainees are sometimes kept on Navy ships until the Justice Department can build a case against them, or they are transferred to other countries for detention.

Another senior administration official said Tuesday that such detentions are extremely rare, and that no other detainees are now being held on a Navy ship.

A July 7, 2011, press report stated:

In interrogating a Somali man for months aboard a Navy ship before taking him to New York this week for a civilian trial on terrorism charges, the Obama administration is trying out a new approach for dealing with foreign terrorism suspects.

---

The administration, which was seeking to avoid sending a new prisoner to Guantánamo Bay, Cuba, drew praise and criticism on Wednesday [July 6] for its decisions involving the Somali suspect, Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame, accused of aiding Al Qaeda’s branch in Yemen and the Shabab, the Somali militant group.17

A July 6, 2011, entry in a blog that reports on naval-related events stated that the U.S. Navy ship to which Warsame was taken was the amphibious assault ship Boxer (LHD-4).18

Navy Summary of Its IW and CT Operations

DON summarized Navy IW and CT activities in early 2011 as follows:

Beyond the 20,000 participating in counterinsurgency, security cooperation, and civil-military operations in Afghanistan, on any given day there are approximately 12,000 Sailors ashore and another 10,000 afloat throughout U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM). These Sailors are conducting riverine operations, maritime infrastructure protection, explosive ordnance disposal, combat construction engineering, cargo handling, combat logistics, maritime security, customs inspections, detainee operations, civil affairs, base operations and other forward presence activities. In collaboration with the U.S. Coast Guard, the Navy also conducts critical port operations, port and oil platform security, and maritime interdiction operations. Included in our globally sourced forces are IAs [individual augmentees] serving in a variety of joint or coalition billets, either in the training pipeline or on station. As these operations unfold, the size and type of naval forces committed to them will likely evolve, thereby producing changes to the overall force posture of naval forces. Long after the significant land component presence is reduced, naval forces will remain forward.

While forward, acting as the lead element of our defense-in-depth, naval forces will be positioned for increased roles in combating terrorism. They will also be prepared to act in cooperation with an expanding set of international partners to provide humanitarian assistance and disaster response, as well as contribute to global maritime security. Expanded Maritime Interdiction Operations (EMIO) are authorized by the President and directed by the Secretary of Defense to intercept vessels identified to be transporting terrorists and/or terrorist-related materiel that poses an imminent threat to the United States and its allies.

Strike operations are conducted to damage or destroy objectives or selected enemy capabilities. Recent examples include simultaneous close air support missions that are integrated and synchronized with coalition ground forces to protect key infrastructure, deter and disrupt extremist operations or hostile activities, and provide oversight for reconstruction efforts in support of Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation New Dawn (OND). Additionally, we have done small, precise attacks against terrorist cells and missile attacks against extremist sanctuaries. Among the various strike options, our sea-based platforms are unique and provide preeminent capabilities that will be maintained.

This versatility and lethality can be applied across the spectrum of operations, from destroying terrorist base camps and protecting friendly forces involved in sustained counterinsurgency or stability operations, to defeating enemy anti-access defenses in support

of amphibious operations. We are refocusing this strategic capability more intensely in Afghanistan in an effort to counter the increasing threat of a well-armed anti-Coalition militia including Taliban, al Qaeda, criminal gangs, narcotics traffickers, and any other anti-government elements that threaten the peace and stability of Afghanistan. Our increased efforts to deter or defeat aggression and improve overall security and counter violent extremism and terrorist networks advance the interests of the U.S. and the region. The FY 2012 contingency operations request supports sufficient capabilities to secure Afghanistan and prevent it from again becoming a haven for international terrorism and associated militant extremist movements.

The Navy has over 40,000 active and reserve sailors continually deployed in support of the contingency operations overseas serving as members of carrier strike groups, expeditionary strike groups, Special Operating Forces, Seabee units, Marine forces, medical units, and as IAs. Our Sailors and Marines are fully engaged on the ground, in the air, and at sea in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. All forces should be withdrawn from OND by the end of 2011. Navy Commanders are leading seven of the thirteen U.S.-lead Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan. A significant portion of the combat air missions over Afghanistan are flown by naval air forces. Our elite teams of Navy SEALs are heavily engaged in combat operations, Navy Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) platoons are defusing IEDs and landmines. Our SEABEE construction battalions are rebuilding schools and restoring critical infrastructure. Navy sealift is delivering the majority of heavy war equipment to CENTCOM, while Navy logisticians are ensuring materiel arrives on time. Our Navy doctors are providing medical assistance in the field and at forward operating bases. Navy IAs are providing combat support and combat service support for Army and Marine Corps personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan. As IAs they are fulfilling vital roles by serving in traditional Navy roles such as USMC support, maritime and port security, cargo handling, airlift support, Seabee units, and as a member of joint task force/Combatant Commanders staffs. On the water, Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC) Riverine forces are working closely with the Iraqi Navy to safeguard Iraqi infrastructure and provide maritime security in key waterways. Navy forces are also intercepting smugglers and insurgents and protecting Iraqi and partner nation oil and gas infrastructure. We know the sea lanes must remain open for the transit of oil, the lifeblood of the Iraqi economy, and our ships and sailors are making that happen.19

**Navy Initiatives to Improve Its IW and CT Capabilities**

The Navy in recent years has implemented a number of organizational and program initiatives intended to improve its IW and CT capabilities and activities, including those discussed below.

**Navy Irregular Warfare Office**

The Navy in July 2008 established the Navy Irregular Warfare Office, which is intended, in the Navy’s words, to “institutionalize current ad hoc efforts in IW missions of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency and the supporting missions of information operations, intelligence operations, foreign internal defense and unconventional warfare as they apply to [CT] and [counterinsurgency].” The office works closely with U.S. Special Operations Command, and reports to the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for information, plans, and strategy.20

---

19 Department of the Navy, *Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2012 Budget*, February 2011, pp. 2-1 to 2-4.

Navy Vision Statement for Countering Irregular Challenges

The Navy in January 2010 published a vision statement for countering irregular challenges, which states in part:

The U.S. Navy will meet irregular challenges through a flexible, agile, and broad array of multi-mission capabilities. We will emphasize Cooperative Security as part of a comprehensive government approach to mitigate the causes of insecurity and instability. We will operate in and from the maritime domain with joint and international partners to enhance regional security and stability, and to dissuade, deter, and when necessary, defeat irregular forces.21

The full text of the vision statement is reproduced in the Appendix B.

Navy Community of Interest for Countering Irregular Challenges

The Navy in December 2010 established “a community of interest to develop and advance ideas, collaboration and advocacy related to confronting irregular challenges (CIC).” The community, which includes a number of Navy organizations, is to be the Navy’s “standing authority to facilitate: implementation of the U.S. Navy Vision for Confronting Irregular Challenges (Vision); promotion of increased understanding of confronting irregular challenges; and synchronization of CIC-related initiatives within the navy and with its external partners.”22

Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC)

The Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC), headquartered at Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA, was established informally in October 2005 and formally on January 13, 2006. NECC consolidated and facilitated the expansion of a number of Navy organizations that have a role in IW operations. Navy functions supported by NECC include the following:

- riverine warfare;
- maritime civil affairs;
- expeditionary training;
- explosive ordnance disposal (EOD);
- expeditionary intelligence;
- naval construction (i.e., the naval construction brigades, aka CBs or “Seabee”);
- maritime expeditionary security;
- expeditionary diving;


22 Source: Memorandum dated December 22, 2010, from S. M. Harris, Director, Navy Irregular Warfare Office, on the subject, “Confronting Irregular Challenges Community of Interest (COI) Charter.” A copy of the memorandum was posted at InsideDefense.com (subscription required). For an article discussing the Navy’s establishment of this community of interest, see Christopher J. Castelli, “Navy Taps Other Services, Elite Forces For Irregular Warfare Advice,” Inside the Navy, January 17, 2011.
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- combat camera;
- expeditionary logistics;
- guard battalion; and
- expeditionary combat readiness.

DON states that:

Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC) is a global force provider of expeditionary combat service support and force protection capabilities to joint warfighting commanders, centrally managing the current and future readiness, resources, manning, training, and equipping of a scalable, self-sustaining and integrated expeditionary force of active and reserve sailors. Expeditionary sailors are deployed from around the globe in support of the new “Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower.” NECC forces and capabilities are integral to executing the maritime strategy which is based on expanded core capabilities of maritime power: forward presence, deterrence, sea control, power projection, maritime security, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. To enable these, NECC provides a full spectrum of operations, including effective waterborne and ashore anti-terrorism force protection; theater security cooperation and engagement; and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. NECC is also a key element of the Navy’s operational Irregular Warfare (IW) efforts in the area of operational support to the Navy forces in OIF and OEF.

NECC provides our most highly integrated force, smoothly combining active and reserve forces, highlighted by the seamlessly integrated operational forces of naval construction (Seabees), maritime expeditionary security (formerly coastal warfare), navy expeditionary logistics (Cargo Handling Battalions), and the remaining mission capabilities throughout the command. Beginning in FY2012 three Seabee Battalions and two Mobile Expeditionary Security Force Squadrons are converting from Active units to Reserve units.

NECC is not a standalone or combat force, but rather a force protection and combat service force of rapidly deployable mission specialists that fill the gaps in the joint battle space and compliment joint and coalition capabilities.23

DON also states that:

The Reserve Component expeditionary forces are integrated with the Active Component forces to provide a continuum of capabilities unique to the maritime environment within the NECC. Blending the AC and RC brings strength to the force and is an important part of the Navy’s ability to carry out the Naval Maritime Strategy from blue water into green and brown water and in direct support of the Joint Force. The Navy Reserve trains and equips over half of the Sailors supporting NECC missions, including naval construction and explosive ordnance disposal in the CENTCOM AOR, as well as maritime expeditionary security, expeditionary logistics (cargo handling battalions), maritime civil affairs, expeditionary intelligence, and other mission capabilities seamlessly integrated with operational forces around the world.24

23 Department of the Navy, Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2012 Budget, February 2011, p. 4-15.
24 Department of the Navy, Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2012 Budget, February 2011, p. 4-25.
Global Maritime Partnership

The Global Maritime Partnership is a U.S. Navy initiative to achieve an enhanced degree of cooperation between the U.S. Navy and foreign navies, coast guards, and maritime police forces, for the purpose of ensuring global maritime security against common threats. The Navy states that

The creation and maintenance of maritime security is essential to mitigating threats short of war, including piracy, terrorism, weapons proliferation, drug trafficking, and other illicit activities. Countering these threats far from our nation’s shores protects the American homeland, enhances global stability and secures freedom of navigation for all nations. While our FY 2012 budget supports meeting this challenge, the future of maritime security depends more than ever on international cooperation and understanding. Piracy is an international problem and requires an international solution. The U. S. Navy will continue to function as part of a larger international endeavor combining efforts of governments, militaries and maritime industry to stop piracy on the high seas. The Navy remains engaged in counterpiracy operations, utilizing surface ships as well as long range P-3 Maritime Surveillance aircraft, as part of longstanding efforts to combat crime on the high seas. Disruptions to the global system of trade, finance, law, information, and immigration can produce cascading and harmful effects far from their sources. The increase in piracy off the Somali coast is a good example. The Navy is leading a multinational effort to patrol the waters near the Horn of Africa. A combined task force has been established to deter, disrupt and suppress piracy in support of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1851, protect the global maritime environment, enhance maritime security and secure freedom of navigation for all nations.

There is no one nation that can provide a solution to maritime security problems alone. A global maritime partnership is required that unites maritime forces, port operators, commercial shippers, and international, governmental and nongovernmental agencies to address our mutual concerns. This partnership increases all of our maritime capabilities, such as response time, agility and adaptability, and is purely voluntary, with no legal or encumbering ties. It is a free-form, self-organizing network of maritime partners – good neighbors interested in using the power of the sea to unite, rather than to divide.25

Partnership Stations

The Southern Partnership Station (SPS) and the Africa Partnership Station (APS) are Navy ships, such as amphibious ships or high-speed sealift ships, that have deployed to the Caribbean and to waters off Africa, respectively, to support U.S. Navy engagement with countries in those regions, particularly for purposes of building security partnerships with those countries, and for increasing the capabilities of those countries for performing maritime-security operations. The SPS and APS can be viewed as specific measures for promoting the above-discussed global maritime partnership. A July 2010 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report discusses the APS.26

25 Department of the Navy, Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2012 Budget, February 2011, pp. 1-5 and 1-6. For more on the Navy’s contribution to multinational antipiracy operations near the Horn of Africa, see CRS Report R40528, Piracy off the Horn of Africa, by Lauren Ploch et al.

Riverine Force

The riverine force is intended to supplement the riverine capabilities of the Navy’s SEALs (the Navy’s Sea-Air-Land special operations forces) and relieve Marines who had been conducting maritime security operations in ports and waterways in Iraq. The riverine force currently consists of three active-duty squadrons of 12 boats each, and includes a total of about 900 sailors. The Navy established Riverine Group 1 (which oversees the three squadrons) at the Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, VA, in May 2006. The three current riverine squadrons were established in 2006-2007.

The Navy’s proposed FY2011 budget requested funding for “the establishment of a new RC [reserve component] riverine training squadron which will compliment the three existing AC [active component] riverine squadrons. The fourth riverine squadron will increase the riverine capacity to conduct brown water training and partnership activities in order to meet COCOM demands.”27 The Navy stated that the creation of the fourth riverine squadron is to involve the realignment of 238 Full Time Support and Selected Reservist billets, and that the new squadron is to be the first-ever reserve component riverine training squadron within NECC.28

Other Organizational Initiatives

Other Navy initiatives in recent years for supporting IW and CT operations include establishing a reserve civil affairs battalion, a Navy Foreign Area Officer (FAO) community consisting of officers with specialized knowledge of foreign countries and regions, a maritime interception operation (MIO) intelligence exploitation pilot program, and an intelligence data-mining capability at the National Maritime Intelligence Center (NMIC).

IW-Related Programs in FY2012 Navy Budget

The FY2012 DON budget highlights books29 states the following regarding elements of the proposed FY2012 DON budget that support Navy IW capabilities and operations:

The request [for FY2012 funds to cover the incremental costs of military operations] continues support for the fighting force in Afghanistan and the refurbishment costs associated with equipment returning from theater. Operational realities have maintained the demand signal for Departmental assets in theater for irregular capabilities as well as outside of the more traditional boots-on-the-ground support. ISR, airborne electronic attack, combat support missions flown from carrier decks with long transit times, and expanded counter-piracy missions are all areas that have shown persistent high demand signals from CENTCOM. (page 2-7)

The wide range of goods and services provided by NWCF [Navy Working Capital Fund] activities are crucial to the DON’s conventional and irregular warfare capabilities as well as its ongoing roles in OCO [overseas contingency operations]. (page 6-8)

27 Department of the Navy, Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2011 Budget, February 2010, p. 4-24.
28 Department of the Navy, Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2011 Budget, February 2010, p. 3-7.
29 Department of the Navy, Highlights of the Department of the Navy FY 2012 Budget, February 2011.
The FY 2012 budget continues investment in platforms and systems that maintain the advantage against future threats and across the full spectrum of operations. Procurement of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR), Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and other programs that support irregular warfare and capacity building also continue to be emphasized. (page 5-1)

The Navy’s shipbuilding budget increases since the FY 2011 FYDP and procures 55 battle force ships from FY 2012 to FY 2016 and one Oceanographic Research Ship. The budget funds a continuum of forces ranging from the covert Virginia class submarine, the multi-mission DDG-51 destroyer, the multi-role Landing Platform Dock (LPD 27), to the LCS and the Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV) with its greater access to littoral areas. This balance continues to pace future threat capabilities while fully supporting current irregular warfare operations and supporting maritime security and stability operations in the littorals. (page 5-2)

We continue to examine options for the LCS [Littoral Combat Ship] to help address emerging and ever evolving irregular threats. While naval forces are conducting combat and combat-support missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Navy and the Marine Corps also stand ready to answer our nation’s call across the full spectrum of military operations through sustained pre-deployment training and enhanced Irregular Warfare (IW) training capabilities. (page 1-9)

Sustainment of the missions performed by the fatigued P-3 Orion fleet remains a priority for the Department. The P-8A Multi-Mission Maritime Aircraft (MMA), based on the Boeing 737 platform, begins replacing the P-3, with an Initial Operating Capability (IOC) in 2013. The P-8A’s ability to perform undersea warfare, surface warfare and ISR missions make it a critical force multiplier for the joint task force commander. Additionally, the P-8A, which is authorized by the Defense Acquisition Board to have a Full Rate Production (FRP) award of eleven aircraft in FY 2012, will have increased capabilities over the P-3 as it addresses emerging technologies and ever evolving irregular threats. (page 5-9)

RDT&E, N [research, development, test and evaluation] initiatives support both traditional and irregular warfare demands in several aviation programs. (page 5-13)

The FY 2012 S&T [science and technology] portfolio [for DON] is aligned to support 13 discrete naval S&T focus areas composed of:… 4) asymmetric and irregular warfare…. (page 5-31)

**Potential Oversight Issues for Congress**

**Definition of Navy IW Activities**

Potential oversight questions for Congress regarding the definition of Navy IW activities include the following:

- Should security force assistance operations, civic assistance operations, disaster relief operations, and counter-piracy operations be included in the definition of Navy IW operations?
- Should operations to build partnerships, and to build partner capacities for conducting maritime security operations, be included in the definition of Navy IW operations?
Has the Navy included the kinds of operations listed in the two previous points in its definition of Navy IW operations in part to satisfy a perceived requirement from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) to show that the Navy is devoting a certain portion of its personnel and budgets to irregular warfare?

Should the Navy’s CT operations be considered a part of its IW operations? What is the relationship between the navy’s IW and CT operations?

Degree of Emphasis on IW and CT in Future Navy Budgets

Another potential oversight issue for Congress is how much emphasis to place on IW and CT activities in future Navy budgets.

Supporters of placing increased emphasis on IW and CT activities in future Navy budgets could argue that the experience of recent years, including U.S. operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, suggests that the United States in coming years will likely need to be able to conduct IW and CT operations, that the Navy has certain specialized or unique IW and CT capabilities that need to be supported as part of an effective overall U.S. IW or CT effort, and that there are programs relating to Navy IW and CT activities that could be funded at higher levels, if additional funding were made available.

Opponents of placing an increased emphasis on IW and CT activities in future Navy budgets could argue that these activities already receive adequate emphasis on Navy budgets, and that placing an increased emphasis on these activities could reduce the amount of funding available to the Navy for programs that support the Navy’s role in acting, along with the Air Force, as a strategic reserve for the United States in countering improved Chinese maritime military forces and otherwise deterring and if necessary fighting in potential conventional inter-state conflicts.

Potential oversight questions for Congress include the following:

- To what degree can or should Navy IW and CT activities be used to reduce the burden on other services for conducting such activities?
- Are the Navy’s steps to increase its role in IW and CT partly motivated by concerns about its perceived relevance, or by a desire to secure a portion of IW and CT funding?
- Is the Navy striking an appropriate balance between IW and CT activities and other Navy concerns, such as preparing for a potential future challenge from improved Chinese maritime military forces?30

Additional Oversight Questions

In addition to the issues discussed above, the Navy’s IW and CT activities pose some additional potential oversight issues for Congress, including the following:

---

30 For additional discussion of this issue, see CRS Report RL33153, China Naval Modernization: Implications for U.S. Navy Capabilities—Background and Issues for Congress, by Ronald O'Rourke.
• How many Navy personnel globally are involved in IW and CT activities, and where are they located? How much funding is the Navy expending each year on such activities?

• Is the Navy adequately managing its individual augmentee (IA) program?31

• Is the Navy devoting sufficient attention and resources to riverine warfare?32

• Aside from the establishment of the riverine force and a reserve civil affairs battalion, what implications might an expanded Navy role in IW and CT have for Navy force-structure requirements (i.e., the required size and composition of the Navy)?

• Is the Navy adequately coordinating its IW and CT activities and initiatives with other organizations, such as the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) and the Coast Guard?

• Are the Navy’s recent IW and CT organizational changes appropriate? What other Navy organizational changes might be needed?

Legislative Activity for FY2012


House

Section 1099 of H.R. 1540 as reported by the House Armed Services Committee (H.Rept. 112-78 of May 17, 2011) states:

SEC. 1099. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE KILLING OF OSAMA BIN LADEN.

(a) Findings- Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Osama bin Laden was responsible for ordering the attacks of September 11, 2001, that killed almost 3,000 American citizens.

(2) Osama bin Laden and his terrorist organization, al-Qaeda, have been responsible for carrying out attacks on innocent men and women around the world.

(3) The United States Special Operations Command organizes, trains, and equips Special Operations Forces and is providing those forces to the United States Central Command under whose operational control they serve.

31 For a discussion of the Navy’s management of the IA program, see Andrew Scutro, “Fleet Forces Takes Charge of IA Program,” NavyTimes.com, July 7, 2008.

32 For an article that discusses this question from a critical perspective, see Daniel A. Hancock, “The Navy’s Not Serious About Riverine Warfare,” U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, January 2008: 14-19.
(4) Special Operations forces were able to complete the mission to kill Osama bin Laden without United States casualties.

(5) The killing of Osama bin Laden represents a milestone victory in bringing to justice the mastermind of September 11, 2001.

(b) Sense of Congress- It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Special Operations Forces provide a tremendous service to the Nation; and

(2) the killing of Osama bin Laden is a major victory for international justice and for the United States in the war against terrorism and radical extremists.

The committee’s report recommends increasing by $60.0 million DOD’s request for $6.9 million in FY2012 funding in the Procurement, Defense-wide account for SOF combatant craft systems (page 371).

The committee’s report states:

U.S. Special Operations Command Undersea Mobility Strategy

The committee supports the recent program and strategy shift in the Undersea Mobility Program by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and U.S. Naval Special Warfare Command (WARCOM). The committee is pleased and supports recent reprogramming requests by USSOCOM and WARCOM to consolidate and shift Joint-Multi-Mission Submersible (JMMS) and Advance SEAL Delivery System (ASDS)33 program funds into a consolidated Undersea Mobility Way Ahead program designed to deliver more platforms sooner and at less cost across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee recognizes the critical operational importance of this program to provide technologically advanced undersea mobility platforms and address capability gaps for operating in denied maritime areas from strategic distances. The committee therefore stresses the need for continued communication with the congressional defense committees to ensure programmatic success and prevent previous program shortfalls in undersea mobility platform strategies. (Page 206)

Senate (S. 1867)

S. 1867, an original measure reported by Senator Levin on November 15, 2011, without written report, in effect supersedes S. 1253 (see below). Section 155 of S. 1867 states:

SEC. 155. DESIGNATION OF UNDERSEA MOBILITY ACQUISITION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND AS A MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) Designation- The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall designate the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command as a major defense acquisition program (MDAP).

33 SEALS for many years have used dry deck shelters (DDSs) to covertly deploy ashore from submarines. A DDS attaches to a hatch on the top surface of a submarine. The ASDS and JMMS programs were intended to provide improved replacements for the aging DDSs. The ASDS program encountered difficulties and was terminated after producing one ASDS. The successor JMMS program was terminated before producing any JMMS units.
(b) Elements- The major defense acquisition program designated under subsection (a) shall consist of the elements as follows:

(1) The Dry Combat Submersible-Light program.

(2) The Dry Combat Submersible-Medium program.

(3) The Shallow Water Combat Submersible program.

(4) The Next-Generation Submarine Shelter program.

The bill as reported recommends reducing by $4 million the Navy’s FY2012 funding request for research and development work in the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program,\textsuperscript{34} with the reduction being for “Defer Development of Irregular Warfare mission package” (see §4201; in the printed version of the bill, the relevant table appears on page 631).

\textbf{Senate (S. 1253)}

S. 1253 has been, in effect, superseded by S. 1867 (see above). Section 155 of S. 1253 as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee (S.Rept. 112-26 of June 22, 2011) states:

SEC. 155. DESIGNATION OF UNDERSEA MOBILITY ACQUISITION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND AS A MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) Designation- The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall designate the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command as a major defense acquisition program (MDAP).

(b) Elements- The major defense acquisition program designated under subsection (a) shall consist of the elements as follows:

(1) The Dry Combat Submersible-Light program.

(2) The Dry Combat Submersible-Medium program.

(3) The Shallow Water Combat Submersible program.

(4) The Next-Generation Submarine Shelter program.

Regarding this section, the committee’s report states:

\textbf{Designation of undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command as a Major Defense Acquisition Program (sec. 155)}

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to designate the undersea mobility program, including the Dry Combat Submersible-Light (DCL), Dry Combat Submersible-Medium (DCSM), Shallow Water Combat Submersible (SWCS), and Next-Generation Submarine

\textsuperscript{34} For more on the LCS program, see CRS Report RL33741, \textit{Navy Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Program: Background, Issues, and Options for Congress}, by Ronald O'Rourke.
Shelter acquisition programs under U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) as an Acquisition Category (ACAT) ID Major Defense Acquisition Program.

Combat submersibles are used for shallow water infiltration and exfiltration of special operations forces, reconnaissance, resupply, and other missions. As demonstrated by previous combat submersible acquisition programs, these systems and associated support equipment are inherently complicated and expensive to develop and procure.

According to the Government Accountability Office, approximately $677.5 million was expended to develop and procure the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) to fill USSOCOM’s requirement for a dry combat submersible for special operations personnel. The ASDS program suffered from ineffective contract oversight, technical challenges, and reliability and performance issues. The first and only ASDS platform reached initial operating capability in 2003, approximately 6 years behind schedule. Unfortunately, the ASDS was rendered inoperable by a catastrophic battery fire in November 2008 and was deemed too costly to repair by the Commander of USSOCOM. The Joint Multi-Mission Submersible (JMMS) program was initiated in fiscal year 2010 to fill the requirement for a dry combat submersible, but cancelled later that year due to unacceptably high total program costs. Both the ASDS and JMMS programs were designated ACAT ID programs by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

In August 2010, USSOCOM announced a new acquisition strategy to meet its undersea mobility requirements consisting of the DCSL, DCSM, SWCS, and Next-Generation Submarine Shelter programs. USSOCOM also announced that these individual programs would be managed by USSOCOM, with milestone decision authority vested in the USSOCOM Acquisition Executive. The committee recognizes the enduring requirement for undersea mobility capabilities for special operations forces and supports USSOCOM’s efforts to acquire a family of wet and dry submersibles at a lower unit cost relative to previous programs by utilizing mature and commercial off the shelf technologies where available. However, the committee believes that the total acquisition costs, potential risks, and past history of undersea mobility acquisition programs necessitates the program oversight of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

The committee’s report also states:

**High Speed Assault Craft**

The budget request included $6.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for maritime combatant craft systems, but no funding for High Speed Assault Craft (HSAC) for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). Theater Naval Special Warfare (NSW) forces currently utilize a rapidly aging fleet of Mk V Special Operations Craft (SOC) and Rigid Inflatable Boats (RIB) to perform a range of functions ranging from maritime interdiction to infiltration/exfiltration of personnel to partner nation engagement and training. The combination of Mk V SOC and RIB retirements and unexpected program delays for the follow-on platform known as the Combatant Craft Medium are expected to create a maritime combatant craft capability gap in the 2013 to 2015 timeframe. As a result, the Commander of USSOCOM has identified a $15.0 million shortfall in funding for six HSACs. The HSAC is currently in the NSW inventory and has been identified as the only existing maritime surface platform that meets Theater NSW requirements in the near-term.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for HSACs for USSOCOM. The committee also recommends USSOCOM consider service life extension options for existing Mk V SOC and RIB platforms to mitigate any additional maritime combatant craft capability gaps. (Page 25)
Conference

The conference report (H.Rept. 112-329 of December 12, 2011) on H.R. 1540 recommends increasing by $60.0 million DOD’s request for $6.9 million in FY2012 funding in the Procurement, Defense-wide account for SOF combatant craft systems, with the increase being for “HSAC [High Speed Assault Craft] Unfunded Requirement” (page 835).

The report recommends reducing by $4 million the Navy’s FY2012 funding request for research and development work in the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program, with the reduction being for “Defer Development of Irregular Warfare mission package” (page 864).

Section 144 of the conference report states:

SEC. 144. ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE UNDERSEA MOBILITY ACQUISITION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.

(a) Limitation on Milestone B Decision- The Commander of the United States Special Operations Command may not make any milestone B acquisition decisions with respect to a covered element until a 30-day period has elapsed after the date on which the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics—

(1) conducts the assessment and determination under subsection (b) for the covered element; and

(2) submits to the congressional defense committees a report including—

(A) the determination of the Under Secretary with respect to the appropriate acquisition category for the covered element; and

(B) the validated requirements, independent cost estimate, test and evaluation master plan, and technology readiness assessment described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (b), respectively.

(b) Assessment and Determination- With respect to each covered element, the Under Secretary shall conduct an assessment and determination of whether to treat the covered element as a major defense acquisition program. Such assessment shall include—

(1) a requirements validation by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council;

(2) an independent cost estimate prepared by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation;

(3) a test and evaluation master plan reviewed by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation; and

(4) a technology readiness assessment reviewed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering.

(c) Covered Element Defined- In this section, the term ‘covered element’ means any of the following elements of the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command:
(1) The dry combat submersible-light program.

(2) The dry combat submersible-medium program.

(3) The next-generation submarine shelter program.

(4) Any new dry combat submersible developed under the undersea mobility acquisition program of the United States Special Operations Command after the date of the enactment of this Act.

FY2012 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (H.R. 2055)

Conference

In final action, H.R. 2055 became a “megabus” appropriations vehicle incorporating nine appropriations bills, including the FY2012 DOD appropriations bill, which was incorporated as Division A. The conference report (H.Rept. 112-331 of December 15, 2011) on H.R. 2055 increases by $64 million DOD’s request for $6.9 million in FY2012 funding in the Procurement, Defense-wide account for SOF combatant craft systems, with the increase being for “Program Increase—HSAC [High Speed Assault Craft] unfunded requirement” (page 669). The report reduces by $4 million the Navy’s FY2012 funding request for research and development work in the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program for “Defer Development of Irregular Warfare mission package” (page 698).

The report also states:

SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND UNDERSEA MOBILITY CONCEPTS

The fiscal year 2012 budget request includes $92,242,000 for several programs that are designed to collectively fill the capability gap that remains following termination of the Advanced SEAL Delivery System and its successor, the Joint Multi-Mission Submersible. The conferees note that unobligated prior year appropriations, combined with funds provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2012, would allow the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to award several commercial contracts to develop a Family of Systems to meet its requirement. The conferees direct the Commander, SOCOM to provide separate cost estimates for the Technology Development and Engineering and Manufacturing Development phases for each of the projects in support of Undersea Mobility, as well as the estimated procurement costs, with the fiscal year 2013 budget submission. (Page 729)

FY2012 DOD Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2219)

House

The House Appropriations Committee, in its report (H.Rept. 112-110 of June 16, 2011) on H.R. 2219, recommends increasing by $64.0 million DOD’s request for $6.9 million in FY2012 funding in the Procurement, Defense-wide account for SOF combatant craft systems, with the increase being for “HSAC [High Speed Assault Craft] unfunded requirement” (pages 197 and 199).
Senate

The Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report (S.Rept. 112-77 of September 15, 2011) on H.R. 2219, recommends transferring from the Navy’s Title II (i.e. base budget) operations and maintenance account to its Title IX (Overseas Deployments and Other Programs) operations and maintenance account $192.8 million in combat support forces funding for NECC and $9 million in in-service weapons systems support funding for NECC (page 47, lines 1C6C and 1D3D, and page 251, lines 1C6C and 1D3D).

The report recommends approving DOD’s request for $6.9 million in FY2012 funding in the Procurement, Defense-wide account for SOF combatant craft systems (page 154). The report recommends reducing by $4 million the Navy’s FY2012 request for research and development funding for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS), with the reduction being for “Defer development of Irregular Warfare mission package” (page 187).

Conference

For the conference report on the FY2012 DOD Appropriations Act, see the above discussion of H.R. 2055.
Chairman Thornberry, Congressman Langevin, and distinguished members of the House Armed Services Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, it is an honor for me to be here with you today to address the U.S. Navy’s efforts to institutionalize and develop proficiency in irregular warfare mission areas. These efforts are vital to our national interests and, as part of a comprehensive approach for meeting complex global challenges, remain relevant in a time of uncertainty and constant change. To meet these challenges Admiral Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations, recently provided his Sailing Directions to our Navy emphasizing the mission to deter aggression and, if deterrence fails, to win our Nation’s wars. Today, the Navy is engaged around the world conducting preventive activities that stabilize, strengthen, and secure our partners and allies providing regional deterrence against state and non-state actors, while at the same time fighting, and winning, our Nation’s wars. We expect the demand for these activities to increase in the future security environment as a capacity constrained Navy seeks to maintain access and presence. Emphasis on increased training and education will enable our continued readiness to effectively meet global demand.

As demand for our Navy continues to grow, we continue to leverage our Maritime Strategy with our partners, the Marine Corps and Coast Guard. The maritime domain supports 90% of the world’s trade and provides offshore options to help friends in need, and to confront and defeat aggression far from our shores as part of a defense in depth approach to secure our homeland. CNO’s Sailing Directions, coupled with an enduring Maritime Strategy, underscore the Navy’s focus on multi-mission platforms and highly trained Sailors that conduct activities across the operational spectrum. Key tenets of the force are readiness to fight and win today while building the ability to win tomorrow; to provide offshore options to deter, influence, and win; and to harness the teamwork, talent and imagination of our diverse force. While the Maritime Strategy spans the spectrum of warfare, the Navy’s Vision for Confronting Irregular Challenges (CIC), released in January 2010, addresses mission areas of irregular warfare as well as maritime activities to prevent, limit, and interdict irregular threats and their influence on regional stability through, insurgency, crime, and violent extremism.

The CIC Vision is derived from our Maritime Strategy with the intention to implement steps towards increasing the Navy’s proficiency in supporting direct and indirect approaches that dissuade and defeat irregular actors who exploit uncontrolled or ungoverned spaces in order to employ informational, economic, technological, and kinetic means against civilian populations to achieve their objectives. The CIC Vision is guiding the alignment of organizations, investments, innovation, procedures, doctrine, and training needed to mainstream CIC capabilities within the Fleet. These efforts are focused on outcomes of increased effectiveness in stabilizing and strengthening regions, enhancing regional awareness, increasing regional maritime partner capacity, and expanding coordination and interoperability with joint, interagency, and international partners. These outcomes support promoting regional security and stability and advancing the rule of law allowing good governance and promoting prosperity by helping partners better protect their people and resources. In addition to preventive activities, the Vision guides efforts to inhibit the spread
of violent extremism and illicit, terrorist, and insurgent activities. To achieve these outcomes, the Navy is actively reorienting doctrine and operational approaches, rebalancing investments and developmental efforts, and refining operations and partnerships to better support a comprehensive approach to U.S. efforts. These efforts will provide a Navy capable of confronting irregular challenges through a broad array of multi-mission capabilities and a force proficient in the CIC missions of security force assistance, maritime security, stability operations, information dominance, and force application necessary to support counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and foreign internal defense missions.

In line with its strategy for confronting irregular challenges the Navy has leveraged key force providers, such as the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command, and established Maritime Partnership Stations, and Maritime Headquarters with Maritime Operations Centers to meet the demands and missions consistent with its strategy and vision. The evolution of intelligence and strike capabilities has enabled the Navy to meet urgent Combatant Commander requirements for counterterrorism and counterinsurgency operations and highlighted further opportunities for the Navy as an important joint partner. While these operational organizations and activities deliver Navy capabilities in theater, the Navy Irregular Warfare Office, established by the CNO in July 2008, has guided the implementation and institutionalization of the CIC Vision. The Navy Irregular Warfare Office, working closely with USSOCOM, other Combatant Commanders, Services, interagency and international partners, has rapidly identified and deployed Navy capabilities to today’s fight, and is institutionalizing confronting irregular challenges concepts in the Navy’s planning, investment, and capability development.

The Navy Irregular Warfare Office operates under three primary imperatives consistent with the Maritime Strategy, CNO’s Sailing Directions, and the Navy’s Vision for Confronting Irregular Challenges. They provide integration and institutionalization in CIC mission areas and are; (1) improve the level of understanding concerning the maritime contribution to the joint force; (2) increase proficiency of the whole of Navy to confront irregular challenges; and (3) drive maritime and special operations forces to seamless integration in addressing irregular challenges. These three imperatives focus the Navy’s implementation efforts and mainstream the concept that preventing wars is as important as winning them. Our Navy must be ready to transition seamlessly between operational environments, with the capability and training inherent in the Fleet.

Department of Defense Directive 3000.07 directs the services to “improve DoD proficiency for irregular warfare, which also enhances its conduct of stability operations” and directs reporting to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff annually. Navy efforts to institutionalize and provide proficiency in confronting irregular challenges, includes proficiency in irregular warfare missions along with missions of maritime security operations and information dominance, a key enabler for CIC. Currently, the Navy leverages its access and persistent presence to both better understand and respond to irregular challenges and is actively evolving its proficiency to prevent and counter irregular threats while maintaining its ability to conduct the full spectrum of naval warfare. Its access, presence, and emphasis on maritime partnerships enable broader government efforts to address underlying conditions of instability that enhance regional security. Through its mix of multi-mission capabilities, the Navy provides political leaders with a range of offshore options for limiting regional conflict through assurance, deterrence, escalation and de-escalation, gaining and maintaining access, and rapid crisis response. In addition to its inherent ability to protect the maritime commons, its effectiveness in building maritime partner capability and capacity contributes to achieving partner security and economic objectives. Operating in and from the maritime domain with joint and international partners, the Navy is enhancing regional security while dissuading, deterring, and when necessary, defeating irregular threats.
The Navy acknowledges the complexity of the future security environment and continues to explore balanced approaches. Following are the Navy’s current focus areas:

Fleet-SOF Integration: Navy’s afloat basing support to special operations forces has extended their reach into denied or semi-permissive areas enabling highly successful counterterrorism missions. Navy provides inherent combat capabilities, multi-mission ships and submarines collecting mission critical information, approval for 1052 support billets for Naval Special Warfare, two dedicated HCS squadrons, and shipboard controlled UAV orbits supporting counterterrorism operations. The Navy is aligned to improve this integration through pre-deployment training, mission rehearsals, improvements to fleet bandwidth allocation, shipboard C4I enhancements, and C2 relationships needed to prosecute time sensitive targets.

Maritime Partnerships: Establishing enduring maritime partnerships is a long-term strategy for securing the maritime commons. Legal, jurisdictional, and diplomatic considerations often complicate efforts to secure the maritime commons, especially from exploitation by highly adaptive irregular actors. In recognition of these considerations, the Navy is emphasizing partnership engagements with U.S. and international maritime forces to strengthen regional security.

Information Sharing Initiatives: In an information dominated environment, initiatives that link joint warfighters, the technology community, and academia are crucial to rapidly fielding solutions to emerging irregular challenges. These initiatives are the basis for longer-term efforts to adapt and improve proficiency of Navy platforms to address irregular challenges.

Doctrine: Development of Tri-Service (Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) Maritime Stability Operations doctrine that will enable a more effective response to instability in the littorals.

Organization: Navy Expeditionary Combat Command, which continues to provide in-demand capabilities such as Maritime Civil Affairs Teams, Riverine Forces, Maritime Security Forces, Explosive Ordnance Disposal Teams, and Expeditionary Intelligence Teams.

Today, the Navy continues to meet planned global operational commitments and respond to crises as they emerge. Overseas Contingency Operations continue with more than 12,000 active and reserve Sailors serving around the globe and another 15,000 at sea in Central Command. Navy’s Carrier Strike Groups provide 30 percent of the close air support for troops on the ground in Afghanistan and our Navy and Marine Corps pilots fly almost 60% of electronic attack missions. Yet, as our national interests extend beyond Iraq and Afghanistan, so do the operations of our Navy. Over the last year, more than 50 percent of our Navy has been underway daily; globally present, and persistently engaged. Last year, our Navy conducted counter-piracy operations in the Indian Ocean and North Arabian Sea with a coalition of several nations, trained local forces in maritime security as part of our Global Maritime Partnership initiatives in Europe, South America, Africa and the Pacific and forces in the Sixth Fleet supported NATO in complex operations in Libya. Navy responded with humanitarian assistance and disaster relief to the earthquake in Haiti, the flooding in Pakistan, and the earthquake and tsunami in Japan; and, conducted the world’s largest maritime exercise, Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC), which brought together 14 nations and more than 20,000 military personnel, to improve coordination and trust in multi-national operations in the Pacific. Our Sailors continue to deploy forward throughout the world, projecting US influence, responding to contingencies, and building international relationships that enable the safe, secure, and free flow of commerce that underpins our economic prosperity and advances the mission areas that address irregular challenges.
The future vision of the Navy in meeting the uncertain challenges around the globe remains a force forward, present, and persistent in areas critical to the national interests of the United States. CNO, in previous testimony, stated: *Our Navy continues to conduct a high tempo of global operations, which we expect to continue even as forces draw down in Afghanistan. Global trends in economics, demographics, resources, and climate change portend an increased demand for maritime presence, power, and influence. America’s prosperity depends on the seas... and as disruption and disorder persist in our security environment, maritime activity will evolve and expand. Seapower allows our nation to maintain U.S. presence and influence globally and, when necessary, project power without a costly, sizeable, or permanent footprint ashore. We will continue to maintain a forward-deployed presence around the world to prevent conflict, increase interoperability with our allies, enhance the maritime security and capacity of our traditional and emerging partners, confront irregular challenges, and respond to crises.* To continue as a global force in the preventive and responsive mission areas that confront irregular challenges, including those of irregular warfare, the Navy will be faced with increasing demand in a fiscally induced capacity constrained environment. Constrained capacity requires a prioritization of areas requiring persistent presence, to include those regions of current or forecast instability. Also required is an understanding of the risk incurred to mission, and to force, if we do not get that priority correct. We must ensure our Navy remains the finest, best trained, and most ready in the world to sustain key mission areas that support confronting irregular challenges, and has the ability to face a highly capable adversary. The Navy looks forward to working with Congress to address our future challenges and thank you for your support of the Navy’s mission and personnel at this critical crossroads in U.S. history.

---

35 At this point, the statement includes a footnote citing the prepared statement of Admiral Jonathan Greenert before the House Armed Services Committee on July 26, 2011. Greenert became the Chief of Naval Operations on September 23, 2011.

36 Statement of Rear Admiral (Lower Half) Sinclair Harris, Director, Navy Irregular Warfare Office, before the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, November 3, 2011. Italics as in original.
Appendix B. Navy Irregular Warfare Vision Statement

This appendix reproduces the Navy’s January 2010 vision statement for irregular warfare.37

CNO Foreword

Our Navy has a history of confronting irregular challenges at sea, in the littorals, and on shore. In the face of significant shifts in the nature and character of the threats our nation faces, this Navy Vision for Confronting Irregular Challenges will guide our efforts to prevent, limit, and interdict irregular threats and adversaries. We will focus on the full range of capabilities the Naval force can uniquely project, in and from the maritime domain, in countering irregular challenges associated with regional instability, insurgency, crime, and violent extremism.

The Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower places as much emphasis on preventing wars as it does on winning wars, and is the cornerstone of our approach to confronting irregular challenges. The six capabilities of our Maritime Strategy, from winning the nation’s wars to stabilizing regions with our partners, draws upon the cooperative and preventive capabilities of maritime and joint forces. Our Navy will realize the broadened and balanced capabilities directed in our Maritime Strategy and Defense guidance by making investments to ensure the agility, flexibility, and adaptability necessary to address the range of emergent challenges to our national security. We will enhance integration and interoperability with our traditional maritime partners, the U.S. Marine Corps and U.S. Coast Guard, along with other joint, interagency, private and non-governmental organizations, and international partners in all stages of this effort.

This Vision emphasizes the importance of the maritime contribution to addressing irregular challenges in a dynamic and evolving global security environment. The steps we take now will ensure our Navy is prepared fully to work with partners to stabilize regions at risk, and when necessary, dissuade, deter, and defeat irregular actors who seek to undermine security, stability, and prosperity.

G. ROUGHHEAD
Admiral, U.S. Navy
I. The Vision for Confronting Irregular Challenges - Pursuing a Capability Balance for 21st Century Operations

Vision Statement

The U.S. Navy will meet irregular challenges through a flexible, agile, and broad array of multi-mission capabilities. We will emphasize Cooperative Security as part of a comprehensive government approach to mitigate the causes of insecurity and instability. We will operate in and from the maritime domain with joint and international partners to enhance regional security and stability, and to dissuade, deter, and when necessary, defeat irregular threats.

Recognizing the strategic impact of global threats associated with regional instability and insecurity, our Navy has instituted this Vision to guide efforts aimed at confronting irregular challenges. In today’s interconnected and technically advanced world, terrorists and criminals prey upon unstable and failing regions and pose an increasing threat to our national interests. With three-quarters of the world’s population, four-fifths of its capital cities, and almost all of its productive capacity located within 200 miles of a coastline, our Navy is uniquely positioned and suited to counter threats to stability, while operating in and from the maritime domain. This includes helping countries at risk build sustainable indigenous capacity to secure their resources, protect their populations, and stabilize their regions.

Our Navy must continue efforts to balance emphasis and investments between countering irregular threats and countering near peer forces to successfully meet today’s and tomorrow’s dynamic and interrelated security challenges. This Vision is derived from our Maritime Strategy and sets a course toward increasing proficiency in supporting direct and indirect approaches to dissuade and defeat irregular challenges -- wherein states and non-state actors leverage uncontrolled or ungoverned space to employ informational, economic, technological, and kinetic methods against civilian populations and targets to achieve their objectives. We will confront irregular challenges by focusing on the following outcomes:

- Increased effectiveness in stabilizing and strengthening regions, by securing and leveraging the maritime domain, with and in support of national and international partners.
- Enhanced regional awareness of activities and dynamics to include a deeper understanding of ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic characteristics and norms.
- Increased regional partner capacity for maritime security and domain awareness.
- Expanded coordination and interoperability with joint, interagency, and international partners.

These outcomes support promoting regional security and stability, advancing the rule of law, promoting good governance and prosperity, and help partners better protect their people and resources. They will inhibit the spread of violent extremism and its associated terrorist, insurgent, and criminal activities.
The Navy will leverage its history of presence, international engagement, and security enforcement, and will ensure our sailors, platforms, and systems are ready to address the hybrid nature of 21st Century challenges. The Navy brings global scope, unique access, and a breadth of capabilities to confront irregular challenges. We will promote Cooperative Security to mitigate instability in regions with limited governance that give rise to irregular challenges. We will enhance proficiency and effectiveness in security force assistance, maritime security, stability operations, information dominance, and other force applications necessary to support U.S. and partner counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and foreign internal defense operations.

II. Opportunity: Leveraging the Maritime Domain to Confront Irregular Challenges

"Covering three-quarters of the planet, the oceans make neighbors of people around the world. They enable us to help friends in need and to confront and defeat aggression far from our shores."

A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower

Our Navy's inherent contribution to the irregular contest is our capacity and ability to leverage access to the maritime domain and cooperate with partner navies and security forces to dissuade, deter, and defeat irregular threats at sea and ashore. While often overlooked in the context of irregular challenges, the maritime domain enables proximate populations to partner and enhance their wealth and well-being, but also provides sanctuary and freedom of movement to criminals, terrorists, and insurgents. The maritime domain provides for over 90% of the flow of information, people, goods, and services that sustain and create opportunities for regional economic prosperity. This economic opportunity promotes stability and helps prevent vulnerable populations from turning to terrorist or criminal enterprises.

The maritime domain similarly provides irregular actors with operating space and the ability to conduct the illicit flow of information, weapons, money, technicians, and cadres upon which much of their income and effectiveness relies. As such they are able to use the maritime environment to exploit, disrupt, or destabilize regions or governments, and to affect the will of civilian populations through insurgency, terrorism, crime, and the proliferation of radical ideologies.

The Navy's global maritime access and sustained presence forward enable U.S. Government-wide partnerships with nations and their forces to provide security and training assistance. At sea and ashore, the Navy works with partners to secure vulnerable maritime approaches and maritime resources, while improving collective capabilities to counter emerging threats such as piracy, trafficking, and weapons proliferation. Partners can appreciate the Navy’s dependable but impermanent presence, which requires neither a footprint ashore nor infringement on their sovereignty. Our partners in turn add capability and capacity to our own through their contributions of forces, technologies, and operating concepts, as well as the understanding and ability to navigate local political, ethnic, and cultural contexts.
Today, the Navy is globally engaged to confront irregular challenges in sustained joint and interagency operations at sea and ashore. This includes support for counter-terrorist and counterinsurgency missions, development, humanitarian assistance, disaster response, and maritime security capacity building with partner militaries. Some examples include:

- Support for Joint Special Operations Task Force – Philippines which provides security force training, anti-terrorist forces, and delivered humanitarian relief and disaster response following storm induced flooding.
- Contributions to Joint Task Force – Horn of Africa whose East African Maritime Center of Excellence, security capacity building, and interagency policy efforts are enhancing indigenous capacities to stabilize the region and counter threats of piracy.
- Counter-piracy operations in the Gulf of Aden and the Horn of Africa which remove financial support to terrorists ashore and reduce instability and criminality at sea.
- Training and equipping partners for maritime security and fisheries enforcement in the Gulf of Guinea that many of the region’s countries depend for economic stability.
- With coalition partners, the protection of oil platforms in the northern Arabian Gulf, that includes training for Iraqi naval personnel to assume this economically critical mission.
- Expeditionary Training Teams and Global Fleet Stations (Africa, South America, Pacific) dedicated to security force training and assistance through multi-mission employment of amphibious ships, tactical aircraft, and helicopters.
- The over 23,000 Navy personnel engaged in CENTCOM, with 14,000 ashore, conducting maritime security, river patrol, ordnance disposal, surveillance and reconnaissance, electronic warfare, and combat support operations, as well as providing non-naval augmentation for detainee affairs, security, and reconstruction.
- The procurement and employment of evolving multi-mission platforms oriented to lower end operations against irregular challenges including: Littoral Combat Ship mission modules, Riverine squadrons tailored for security force assistance, persistent manned and unmanned surveillance platforms, and investments in training capacity for language, cultural, and hybrid mission sets.
- The employment of multi-mission platforms able to work across the spectrum of conflict to include P-3 for surveillance against terrorists and insurgents, tactical aircraft for armed reconnaissance, and submarines and surface combatants in counter-drug operations.

The Navy will continue to pursue balanced approaches to confronting evolving irregular and conventional challenges by maximizing the multi-purpose effectiveness of our Navy’s capabilities, personnel, and platforms. We will emphasize building partner capacity using dedicated training forces, periodic deployments and recurring exercises. In the end we will achieve the greatest effectiveness against the most likely 21st Century threats through an agile, flexible, and adaptable force.
These goals support the outcomes presented in this Vision:

- **Enhance and formalize interoperability** with U.S. government, public and private organizations, allied maritime and land forces, and regional partners.
- **Build partner capacity** by forming enduring, trust-based relationships, promoting shared interests in collective security, and providing training and resources to enhance indigenous security force capacity.
- **Improve our regional awareness and understanding of complex environments and challenges** through intelligence and information systems, training, education, and more culturally adept approaches.
- **Achieve an improved understanding and ability to counter illicit and extremist actors** as they leverage and maneuver in their maritime and shore environments.
- **Enhance and broaden the multi-mission capabilities and applications of today's force** to maximize effectiveness in complex regions and scenarios.
- **Identify necessary and distinct shifts in emphasis and investment to confront irregular challenges**, to include modifications to training, doctrine, and existing forces, and where necessary, new investments in processes, platforms, and systems.

In pursuing these goals for confronting irregular challenges the Navy will employ its broad capabilities to enable partners, improve maritime security, and conduct cooperative and decisive operations at sea and ashore. Specifically, we will operate to deny unregulated actors use of the maritime and littoral environment, assist in securing critical infrastructure to ensure the safe flow of resources, and apply a broad spectrum of maritime and overland capabilities to combat irregular threats while improving the lives of affected populations.

**III. Implementing the Vision**

Implementation will require a Navy-wide organizational approach. This effort demands changes in our thinking, our force and its preparation, and requires clear strategic communications within and outside the organization. We will comprehensively align our organizations, investments, procedures, doctrine, and training with the set of emerging approaches necessary to address these challenges.

Our Navy will pursue the outcomes and goals outlined in this Vision through these supporting implementation objectives.

1. **Advance our Navy's doctrinal, strategic, and operational approaches to addressing irregular challenges.**
   - Increase our Navy's application of related Defense and Joint strategic and operational guidance.
   - Define the strategic and operational tenets and approaches for our Navy to apply across our general purpose and special operation forces.
   - Integrate the desired outcomes, priorities, and capabilities needed to confront irregular challenges into Navy's force development and management processes.
2. Organize, train, and equip our Navy to confront irregular challenges more effectively through balancing shifts in our investments and efforts.
   - Enhance our ability to address, refine, validate, and incorporate urgent and emerging requirements to confront irregular challenges in the Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution process.
   - Identify the advocates and resource sponsors responsible for resource allocation and comprehensive program execution for existing and emerging Navy-unique and joint multi-mission capabilities to confront irregular challenges.
   - Introduce the necessary supporting training and education requirements, to include organizations, curricula, and processes across our manpower enterprise.
   - Institutionalize concepts, processes, and organizations for training and building the capacity of partners through dedicated assistance operations, regular exercises, and the deployments and visits of multi-mission ships and aircraft.

   - Leverage Navy's multi-mission capabilities with other services, interagency and coalitions to build partner security capacity.
   - Integrate and coordinate efforts with the U.S. Marine Corps and U.S. Coast Guard in support of the imperatives and approaches in the Maritime Strategy.
   - Support the development of joint, interagency, and international operational concepts and supporting CONOPS.
   - Support Defense efforts to integrate joint and interagency planning processes.
   - Ensure capabilities to confront irregular challenges are addressed and captured in U.S. Navy and Defense legal policy development.
   - Provide Combatant Commanders with applicable naval capabilities to support critical mission requirements outside the scope of Navy core mission areas.

IV. Conclusion

Our Navy recognizes the importance of developing opportunities while being prepared to address irregular threats. Our general and special purpose forces are immediately applicable to the broad array of capabilities required to achieve regional security and stability. The Navy is uniquely positioned to assist emerging nations and fragile states, and to dissuade, deter, and when necessary, defeat irregular threats. We will build on our inherent strengths to lead and support national and international efforts.

The Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower places as much emphasis on preventing conflicts as on winning conflicts. This underscores the importance of securing and fostering long-term cooperative relationships based on mutual understanding and respect for each party's strategic interests, as well as increasing partners' ability to ensure their own security and stability. It recognizes the value of presence, of "being there," to maintain adequate levels of security and awareness across the maritime domain, and restrain the destabilizing activities of non-state actors. It makes clear our Navy will work alongside other U.S. services and agencies through a comprehensive government approach to advance international partnerships.

This vision will guide and shape our Navy's actions, and will enhance our Navy's proficiency in capabilities to counter irregular challenges, now and in the future.
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