



Updated February 11, 2021

Navy DDG(X) Future Large Surface Combatant Program: Background and Issues for Congress

Introduction

The Navy's DDG(X) program, also known as the Future Large Surface Combatant program or DDG Next program, envisages procuring a class of next-generation guided-missile destroyers (DDGs) to replace the Navy's aging Ticonderoga (CG-47) class Aegis cruisers. The Navy wants to procure the first DDG(X) around FY2028, although that date could change. The Navy's proposed FY2021 budget requested \$46.5 million in research and development (R&D) funding for the program in one R&D line item and some additional funding for the program in another R&D line item. The issue for Congress is whether to approve, reject, or modify the Navy's FY2022 funding request and emerging acquisition strategy for the program.

Terminology

Decades ago, the Navy's cruisers were considerably larger and more capable than its destroyers. In the years after World War II, however, the Navy's cruiser designs in general became smaller while its destroyer designs in general became larger. As a result, since the 1980s there has been substantial overlap in the size and capability of Navy cruisers and destroyers. The Navy's new Zumwalt (DDG-1000) class destroyers, in fact, are considerably larger than the Navy's cruisers. In part for this reason, the Navy now refers to its cruisers and destroyers collectively as *large surface combatants* (LSCs), and distinguishes these ships from the Navy's *small surface combatants* (SSCs), the term the Navy now uses to refer collectively to its frigates, Littoral Combat Ships (LCSs), mine warfare ships, and patrol craft.

Surface Combatant Industrial Base

All LSCs procured for the Navy since FY1985 have been built at General Dynamics/Bath Iron Works (GD/BIW) of Bath, ME, and Huntington Ingalls Industries/Ingalls Shipbuilding (HII/Ingalls) of Pascagoula, MS. Lockheed Martin and Raytheon are major contractors for Navy surface ship combat system equipment. The surface combatant base also includes hundreds of additional component and material supplier firms.

Existing CG-47 Class Aegis Cruisers

The Navy procured a total of 27 Ticonderoga (CG-47) class cruisers (one of which is shown in **Figure 1**) between FY1978 and FY1988. The ships entered service between 1983 and 1994. They are commonly called Aegis cruisers because they are equipped with the Aegis combat system, an integrated collection of sensors and weapons named for the mythical shield that defended Zeus. The first five ships in the class, which were built to an earlier technical standard, were judged by the Navy to be too expensive to modernize and were removed from service in 2004-2005,

leaving the current force of 22 ships. The Navy's FY2020 30-year shipbuilding plan projected that these 22 ships would reach the ends of their service lives and be retired between FY2021 and FY2038.

Figure 1. Existing CG-47 Class Aegis Cruiser
USS *Antietam* (CG-54), commissioned in 1987



Source: Cropped version of U.S. Navy photograph.

DDG(X) Program

Navy's General Concept for the Ship

The Navy approved the top-level requirements for the DDG(X) (i.e., the ship's major required features) in December 2020. The Navy envisages the DDG(X) as using a new hull design evolved from the Navy's existing DDG-51 class and DDG-1000 class destroyer hull designs; a next-generation integrated propulsion system (IPS) that incorporates lessons from the IPSs on the DDG-1000 design and the Navy's new Columbia-class ballistic missile submarine; and, initially, combat system equipment similar to that installed on the Flight III version of the DDG-51 destroyer—the DDG-51 variant that the Navy is currently procuring. (For more on the DDG-51 program, see CRS Report RL32109, *Navy DDG-51 and DDG-1000 Destroyer Programs: Background and Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.)

Navy officials have stated that they envision the DDG(X) as being larger than the 9,700-ton Flight III DDG-51 Flight III design, but smaller than the 15,700-ton DDG-1000 design. The mid-point between those two figures is 12,700 tons, though the DDG(X)'s displacement could turn out to be higher or lower than that. The Navy states that the DDG(X) would

initially integrate nondevelopmental systems into a new hull design that incorporates platform flexibility and growth capabilities to meet projected future fleet system requirements. Initial LSCs will leverage DDG 51 Flight III combat systems as well

as increased flexibility/adaptability features including expanded Space, Weight, Power & Cooling, Service Life Allowances (SWaP-C SLA) to allow for more rapid and affordable upgrades in capabilities over the ships' service life and allow for fielding of future high-demand electric weapons and sensor systems and computing resources.

(Source: *Department of Defense Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 Budget Estimates, Navy, Justification Book, Volume 2 of 5, Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy*, February 2020, p. 518; includes some minor typographic edits by CRS.)

Procurement Date for Lead Ship

As mentioned earlier, the Navy wants to procure the first DDG(X) around FY2028, though the date for procuring the first ship has changed before and could change again. Procurement of Flight III DDG-51s would end at about the time that DDG(X) procurement would begin. The Navy's FY2021 budget submission suggested that the final Flight III DDG-51 would be procured around FY2027.

Potential Procurement Quantities

The Navy has not specified the total number of DDG(X)s that it wants to procure. Procuring 11 would provide one DDG(X) for each of the Navy's 11 large aircraft carriers. Procuring 22 would provide one-for-one replacements for each of the current 22 Aegis cruisers. Keeping the DDG(X) design in production so as to additionally replace at least some of the Navy's older DDG-51s as those ships start to retire in the 2030s could result in a larger total procurement quantity. These numbers, as well as the Navy's FY2020 30-year shipbuilding plan, suggest a potential DDG(X) annual procurement rate of one to two ships per year.

Potential Unit Procurement Cost

Ships of the same general type tend to have unit procurement costs roughly proportional to their displacements. A 12,700-ton DDG(X) would be roughly 30% larger than a Flight III DDG-51. The Flight III DDG-51 Flight III currently has a unit procurement cost of about \$1.9 billion. Increasing that figure by 30% would suggest a potential DDG(X) unit procurement cost of roughly \$2.5 billion in today's dollars, though the cost could be initially higher because the first several DDG(X)s would be at the top of the DDG(X) production learning curve, whereas at least some aspects of the Flight III DDG-51 have been in production for many years and are thus well down the production learning curve. The first DDG(X), moreover, would be considerably more expensive than follow-on ships in the program, because its procurement cost would incorporate the detailed design and nonrecurring engineering (DD/NRE) costs for the class.

Program Funding

The Navy's proposed FY2022 budget will be submitted to Congress later this year.

The Navy's proposed FY2021 budget requested \$46.5 million in R&D funding for the DDG(X) program in Project 0411, Future Surface Combatant Concept, within Program Element (PE) 0603564N, Ship Preliminary Design

& Feasibility Studies, which was line 46 in the Navy's FY2021 R&D account. Additional funding supporting the DDG(X) program was requested in Project 2196, Design, Tools, Plans and Concepts, within PE 0603563N, Ship Concept Advanced Design, which was line 45.

Congressional Action for FY2021

FY2021 National Defense Authorization Act

The conference report (H.Rept. 116-617 of December 3, 2020) on the FY2021 National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 6395/P.L. 116-283 of January 1, 2021) recommended reducing by \$33.3 million the Navy's FY2021 funding request for the program in Project 0411. Section 121(b) of the conference version of H.R. 6395 required a report on, among other things, a plan to fully implement Section 131 of the FY2020 NDAA (S. 1790/P.L. 116-92 of December 20, 2020), including subsystem prototyping efforts and funding by fiscal year.

FY2021 DOD Appropriations Act

The explanatory statement for the FY2021 DOD Appropriations Act (Division C of H.R. 133/P.L. 116-260 of December 27, 2020, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021) reduced by \$33.3 million the Navy's FY2021 funding requests for the program (PDF page 311 of 469). The explanatory statement stated:

Despite repeated delays to the LSC program, the Navy has reduced the acquisition profile for DDG-51 Flight III destroyers in recent budget submissions, and has not delineated a clear acquisition path for large surface combatants following the conclusion of the current DDG-51 Flight III destroyer multi-year procurement contract in fiscal year 2022. Absent a clear understanding of future Navy LSC force structure requirements and acquisition strategies, the proposed increase in funding for LSC, to include \$17,100,000 in preliminary design efforts, is not supported.

Further, it is noted that information provided by the Navy in response to S.Rept. 116-103 regarding the Navy's Surface Capability Evolution Plan (SCEP) was incomplete. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition) is directed to provide to the congressional defense committees, with the fiscal year 2022 President's budget request, the updated acquisition strategies for each element of the Navy's SCEP, as previously requested, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller) is directed to provide, with the fiscal year 2022 President's budget request, updated cost estimates for each element of the SCEP, and to certify full funding in the budget request for each respective acquisition strategy of the SCEP elements (PDF pages 322-323 of 469).

Ronald O'Rourke, Specialist in Naval Affairs

IF11679

Disclaimer

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