

using electronic means for submitting claims under subsection (a), or for transmitting claims and supporting documentation under subsection (b), is unduly burdensome in any category of cases, the Secretary may exempt the cases in that category from the application of the requirement.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—In implementing subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary of Defense shall provide for the following:

(1) Policies, requirements, and procedures for using electronic means for the submission of claims for payment to the Department of Defense and for the transmission, between Department of Defense officials, of claims for payment received in electronic form, together with supporting documentation (such as receiving reports, contracts and contract modifications, and required certifications).

(2) The format in which information can be accepted by the corporate database of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service.

(3) The requirements to be included in contracts regarding the electronic submission of claims for payment by contractors.

(e) CLAIM FOR PAYMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term “claim for payment” means an invoice or any other demand or request for payment.

(Added Pub. L. 106-398, §1 [[div. A], title X, §1008(a)(1)], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-249.)

EFFECTIVE DATE

Pub. L. 106-398, §1 [[div. A], title X, §1008(c)], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-250, provided that:

“(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense shall apply section 2227 of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), with respect to contracts for which solicitations of offers are issued after June 30, 2001.

“(2)(A) The Secretary may delay the implementation of section 2227 to a date after June 30, 2001, upon a finding that it is impracticable to implement that section until that later date. In no event, however, may the implementation be delayed to a date after October 1, 2002.

“(B) Upon determining to delay the implementation of such section 2227 to a later date under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall promptly publish a notice of the delay in the Federal Register. The notice shall include a specification of the later date on which the implementation of that section is to begin. Not later than 30 days before the later implementation date, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register another notice that such section is being implemented beginning on that date.”

[Notice by Department of Defense of delay in the implementation of this section from June 30, 2001, until Oct. 1, 2002, was published on Aug. 21, 2001, at 66 F.R. 43841.]

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Pub. L. 106-398, §1 [[div. A], title X, §1008(b)], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-250, directed the Secretary of Defense, not later than Mar. 30, 2001, to submit to committees of Congress a plan for the implementation of the requirements imposed under this section.

§ 2228. Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight

(a) OFFICE AND DIRECTOR.—(1) There is an Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

(2) The Office shall be headed by a Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight, who shall be assigned to such position by the Under Secretary from among civilian employees of the Department of Defense with the qualifications described in paragraph (3). The Director is responsible in the Department of Defense to the Secretary of Defense (after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense. The Director shall report directly to the Under Secretary.

(3) In order to qualify to be assigned to the position of Director, an individual shall—

(A) have management expertise in, and professional experience with, corrosion project and policy implementation, including an understanding of the effects of corrosion policies on infrastructure; research, development, test, and evaluation; and maintenance; and

(B) have an understanding of Department of Defense budget formulation and execution, policy formulation, and planning and program requirements.

(4) The Secretary of Defense shall designate the position of Director as a critical acquisition position under section 1733(b)(1)(C) of this title.

(b) DUTIES.—(1) The Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (in this section referred to as the “Director”) shall oversee and coordinate efforts throughout the Department of Defense to prevent and mitigate corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department. The duties under this paragraph shall include the duties specified in paragraphs (2) through (5).

(2) The Director shall develop and recommend any policy guidance on the prevention and mitigation of corrosion to be issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(3) The Director shall review the programs and funding levels proposed by the Secretary of each military department during the annual internal Department of Defense budget review process as those programs and funding proposals relate to programs and funding for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion and shall submit to the Secretary of Defense recommendations regarding those programs and proposed funding levels.

(4) The Director shall provide oversight and coordination of the efforts within the Department of Defense to prevent or mitigate corrosion during—

(A) the design, acquisition, and maintenance of military equipment; and

(B) the design, construction, and maintenance of infrastructure.

(5) The Director shall monitor acquisition practices within the Department of Defense—

(A) to ensure that the use of corrosion prevention technologies and the application of corrosion prevention treatments are fully considered during research and development in the acquisition process; and

(B) to ensure that, to the extent determined appropriate for each acquisition program, such technologies and treatments are incorporated into that program, particularly during the engineering and design phases of the acquisition process.

(c) **ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES FOR DIRECTOR.**—The Director is authorized to—

(1) develop, update, and coordinate corrosion training with the Defense Acquisition University;

(2) participate in the process within the Department of Defense for the development of relevant directives and instructions; and

(3) interact directly with the corrosion prevention industry, trade associations, other government corrosion prevention agencies, academic research and educational institutions, and scientific organizations engaged in corrosion prevention, including the National Academy of Sciences.

(d) **LONG-TERM STRATEGY.**—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a long-term strategy to reduce corrosion and the effects of corrosion on the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense.

(2) The strategy under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Expansion of the emphasis on corrosion prevention and mitigation within the Department of Defense to include coverage of infrastructure.

(B) Application uniformly throughout the Department of Defense of requirements and criteria for the testing and certification of new corrosion-prevention technologies for equipment and infrastructure with similar characteristics, similar missions, or similar operating environments.

(C) Implementation of programs, including supporting databases, to ensure that a focused and coordinated approach is taken throughout the Department of Defense to collect, review, validate, and distribute information on proven methods and products that are relevant to the prevention of corrosion of military equipment and infrastructure.

(D) Establishment of a coordinated research and development program for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion for new and existing military equipment and infrastructure that includes a plan to transition new corrosion prevention technologies into operational systems, including through the establishment of memoranda of agreement, joint funding agreements, public-private partnerships, university research and education centers, and other cooperative research agreements.

(3) The strategy shall include, for the matters specified in paragraph (2), the following:

(A) Policy guidance.

(B) Performance measures and milestones.

(C) An assessment of the necessary personnel and funding necessary to accomplish the long-term strategy.

(e) **REPORT.**—(1) For each budget for a fiscal year, beginning with the budget for fiscal year 2009, the Secretary of Defense shall submit, with the defense budget materials, a report on the following:

(A) Funding requirements for the long-term strategy developed under subsection (d).

(B) The return on investment that would be achieved by implementing the strategy, including available validated data on return on investment for completed corrosion projects and activities.

(C) For the fiscal year covered by the report and the preceding fiscal year, the funds requested in the budget compared to the funding requirements.

(D) An explanation if the funding requirements are not fully funded in the budget.

(E) For the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year covered by the report, the amount of funds requested in the budget for each project or activity described in subsection (d) compared to the funding requirements for the project or activity.

(F) For the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year covered by the report, a description of the specific amount of funds used for military corrosion projects, the Technical Corrosion Collaboration pilot program, and other corrosion-related activities.

(2) Each report under this section shall include, in an annex to the report, a copy of the annual corrosion report most recently submitted by the corrosion control and prevention executive of each military department under section 903(b)(5) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 122 Stat. 4567; 10 U.S.C. 2228 note).

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “corrosion” means the deterioration of a material or its properties due to a reaction of that material with its chemical environment.

(2) The term “military equipment” includes all weapon systems, weapon platforms, vehicles, and munitions of the Department of Defense, and the components of such items.

(3) The term “infrastructure” includes all buildings, structures, airfields, port facilities, surface and subterranean utility systems, heating and cooling systems, fuel tanks, pavements, and bridges.

(4) The term “budget”, with respect to a fiscal year, means the budget for that fiscal year that is submitted to Congress by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31.

(5) The term “defense budget materials”, with respect to a fiscal year, means the materials submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Defense in support of the budget for that fiscal year.

(Added Pub. L. 107-314, div. A, title X, §1067(a)(1), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2657; amended Pub. L. 110-181, div. A, title III, §371(a)–(e), Jan. 28, 2008, 122 Stat. 79–81; Pub. L. 110-417, [div. A], title X, §1061(b)(1), Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4612; Pub. L. 111-383, div. A, title III, §331, Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4185; Pub. L. 112-239, div. A, title III, §341, Jan. 2, 2013, 126 Stat. 1699.)

AMENDMENTS

2013—Subsec. (e)(1)(B). Pub. L. 112-239, §341(1)(A), inserted “, including available validated data on return on investment for completed corrosion projects and activities” before period at end.

Subsec. (e)(1)(E). Pub. L. 112-239, §341(1)(B), substituted “For the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year covered by the report” for “For the fiscal year covered by the report and the preceding fiscal year”.

Subsec. (e)(1)(F). Pub. L. 112-239, §341(1)(C), added subpar. (F).

Subsec. (e)(2), (3). Pub. L. 112-239, §341(2), (3), redesignated par. (3) as (2) and struck out former par. (2) which

read as follows: “Within 60 days after submission of the budget for a fiscal year, the Comptroller General shall provide to the congressional defense committees—

“(A) an analysis of the budget submission for corrosion control and prevention by the Department of Defense; and

“(B) an analysis of the report required under paragraph (1), including the annex to the report described in paragraph (3).”

2011—Subsec. (e)(1)(C). Pub. L. 111-383, § 331(1)(A), substituted “For the fiscal year covered by the report and the preceding fiscal year, the” for “The”.

Subsec. (e)(1)(E). Pub. L. 111-383, § 331(1)(B), added subpar. (E).

Subsec. (e)(2)(B). Pub. L. 111-383, § 331(2), inserted before period at end “, including the annex to the report described in paragraph (3)”.

Subsec. (e)(3). Pub. L. 111-383, § 331(3), added par. (3). 2008—Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(a)(1), substituted “Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight” for “Military equipment and infrastructure; prevention and mitigation of corrosion” in section catchline.

Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(a)(1), added subsec. (a) and struck out heading and text of former subsec. (a). Former text read as follows: “The Secretary of Defense shall designate an officer or employee of the Department of Defense, or a standing board or committee of the Department of Defense, as the senior official or organization responsible in the Department to the Secretary of Defense (after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department.”

Subsec. (b)(1). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(a)(2)(A), substituted “Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (in this section referred to as the ‘Director’)” for “official or organization designated under subsection (a)”.

Subsec. (b)(2) to (5). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(a)(2)(B), substituted “Director” for “designated official or organization”.

Subsecs. (c), (d). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(b), added subsec. (c) and redesignated former subsec. (c) as (d). Former subsec. (d) redesignated (f).

Subsec. (d)(2)(D). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(c), as amended by Pub. L. 110-417, inserted “, including through the establishment of memoranda of agreement, joint funding agreements, public-private partnerships, university research and education centers, and other cooperative research agreements” after “operational systems”.

Subsec. (e). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(d), added subsec. (e).

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(b), redesignated subsec. (d) as (f).

Subsec. (f)(4), (5). Pub. L. 110-181, § 371(e), added pars. (4) and (5).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2008 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 110-417 effective Jan. 28, 2008, and as if included in Pub. L. 110-181 as enacted, see section 1061(b) of Pub. L. 110-417, set out as a note under section 6382 of Title 5, Government Organization and Employees.

IMPLEMENTATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTIONS RESULTING FROM CORROSION STUDY OF THE F-22 AND F-35 AIRCRAFT

Pub. L. 112-81, div. A, title III, § 324, Dec. 31, 2011, 125 Stat. 1362, provided that:

“(a) IMPLEMENTATION; CONGRESSIONAL BRIEFING.—Not later than January 31, 2012, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall implement the recommended actions described in subsection (b) and provide to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives] a briefing on the actions taken by the Under Secretary to implement such recommended actions.

“(b) RECOMMENDED ACTIONS.—The recommended actions described in this subsection are the following four recommended actions included in the report of the Gov-

ernment Accountability Office report numbered GAO-11-117R and titled ‘Defense Management: DOD Needs to Monitor and Assess Corrective Actions Resulting from Its Corrosion Study of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter’:

“(1) The documentation of program-specific recommendations made as a result of the corrosion study described in subsection (d) with regard to the F-35 and F-22 aircraft and the establishment of a process for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of the corrective actions taken with respect to such aircraft in response to such recommendations.

“(2) The documentation of program-specific recommendations made as a result of such corrosion study with regard to the other weapon systems identified in the study, specifically the CH-53K helicopter, the Joint High Speed Vessel, the Broad Area Maritime Surveillance Unmanned Aircraft System, and the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle, and the establishment of a process for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of the corrosion prevention and control programs implemented for such weapons systems in response to such recommendations.

“(3) The documentation of Air Force-specific and Navy-specific recommendations made as a result of such corrosion study and the establishment of a process for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of the corrective actions taken by the Air Force and the Navy in response to such recommendations.

“(4) The documentation of Department of Defense-wide recommendations made as a result of such corrosion study, the implementation of any needed changes in policies and practices to improve corrosion prevention and control in new systems acquired by the Department, and the establishment of a process for monitoring and assessing the effectiveness of the corrective actions taken by the Department in response to such recommendations.

“(c) DEADLINE FOR COMPLIANCE.—Not later than December 31, 2012, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in conjunction with the directors of the F-35 and F-22 program offices, the directors of the program offices for the weapons systems referred to in subsection (b)(2), the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy, shall—

“(1) take whatever steps necessary to comply with the recommendations documented pursuant to the required implementation under subsection (a) of the recommended actions described in subsection (b); or

“(2) submit to the congressional defense committees written justification of why compliance was not feasible or achieved.

“(d) CORROSION STUDY.—The corrosion study described in this subsection is the study required in House Report 111-166 accompanying H.R. 2647 of the 111th Congress [Pub. L. 111-84] conducted by the Office of the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and titled ‘Corrosion Evaluation of the F-22 Raptor and F-35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter’.”

CORROSION CONTROL AND PREVENTION EXECUTIVES FOR THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Pub. L. 110-417, [div. A], title IX, § 903, Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4566, as amended by Pub. L. 113-66, div. A, title III, § 334, title X, § 1084(b)(1), Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 740, 871, provided that:

“(a) REQUIREMENT TO DESIGNATE CORROSION CONTROL AND PREVENTION EXECUTIVE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Oct. 14, 2008], the Assistant Secretary of each military department with responsibility for acquisition, technology, and logistics shall designate an employee of the military department as the corrosion control and prevention executive. Such executive shall be the senior official in the department with responsibility for coordinating department-level corrosion control and prevention program activities (including budget programming) with the military department and the Office of

the Secretary of Defense, the program executive officers of the military departments, and relevant major subordinate commands of the military departments.

“(b) DUTIES.—(1) The corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department shall ensure that corrosion control and prevention is maintained in the department’s policy and guidance for management of each of the following:

“(A) System acquisition and production, including design and maintenance.

“(B) Research, development, test, and evaluation programs and activities.

“(C) Equipment standardization programs, including international standardization agreements.

“(D) Logistics research and development initiatives.

“(E) Logistics support analysis as it relates to integrated logistic support in the materiel acquisition process.

“(F) Military infrastructure design, construction, and maintenance.

“(2) The corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department shall be responsible for identifying the funding levels necessary to accomplish the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1).

“(3) The corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department shall, in cooperation with the appropriate staff of the department, develop, support, and provide the rationale for resources—

“(A) to initiate and sustain an effective corrosion control and prevention program in the department;

“(B) to evaluate the program’s effectiveness; and

“(C) to ensure that corrosion control and prevention requirements for materiel are reflected in budgeting and policies of the department for the formulation, management, and evaluation of personnel and programs for the entire department, including its reserve components.

“(4) The corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department shall be the principal point of contact of the department to the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as assigned under section 2228 of title 10, United States Code).

“(5)(A) Not later than December 31 of each year, the corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report containing recommendations pertaining to the corrosion control and prevention program of the military department. Such report shall include recommendations for the funding levels necessary for the executive to carry out the duties of the executive under this section.

“(B) The report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

“(i) provide a clear linkage between the corrosion control and prevention program of the military department and the overarching goals and objectives of the long-term corrosion control and prevention strategy developed and implemented by the Secretary of Defense under section 2228(d) of title 10, United States Code; and

“(ii) include performance measures to ensure that the corrosion control and prevention program is achieving the goals and objectives described in clause (i).”

DEADLINE FOR DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL OR ORGANIZATION; INTERIM REPORT; DEADLINE FOR LONG-TERM STRATEGY; GAO REVIEW

Pub. L. 107-314, div. A, title X, §1067(b)–(e), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2658, 2659, directed the Secretary of Defense to designate a responsible official or organization under subsec. (a) of this section not later than 90 days after Dec. 2, 2002, directed the Secretary to submit to Congress a report setting forth the long-term strategy required under subsec. (c) of this section not later than one year after Dec. 2, 2002, and required the Comptroller General to monitor the implementation of such long-term strategy and, not later than 18 months after

Dec. 2, 2002, to submit to Congress an assessment of the extent to which that strategy had been implemented.

§ 2229. Strategic policy on prepositioning of materiel and equipment

(a) POLICY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall maintain a strategic policy on the programs of the Department of Defense for prepositioned materiel and equipment. Such policy shall take into account national security threats, strategic mobility, service requirements, and the requirements of the combatant commands, and shall address how the Department’s prepositioning programs, both ground and afloat, align with national defense strategies and departmental priorities.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The strategic policy required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements:

(A) Overarching strategic guidance concerning planning and resource priorities that link the Department of Defense’s current and future needs for prepositioned stocks, such as desired responsiveness, to evolving national defense objectives.

(B) A description of the Department’s vision for prepositioning programs and the desired end state.

(C) Specific interim goals demonstrating how the vision and end state will be achieved.

(D) A description of the strategic environment, requirements for, and challenges associated with, prepositioning.

(E) Metrics for how the Department will evaluate the extent to which prepositioned assets are achieving defense objectives.

(F) A framework for joint departmental oversight that reviews and synchronizes the military services’ prepositioning strategies to minimize potentially duplicative efforts and maximize efficiencies in prepositioned materiel and equipment across the Department of Defense.

(3) JOINT OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish joint oversight of the military services’ prepositioning efforts to maximize efficiencies across the Department of Defense.

(b) LIMITATION OF DIVERSION OF PREPOSITIONED MATERIEL.—The Secretary of a military department may not divert materiel or equipment from prepositioned stocks except—

(1) in accordance with a change made by the Secretary of Defense to the policy maintained under subsection (a); or

(2) for the purpose of directly supporting a contingency operation or providing humanitarian assistance under chapter 20 of this title.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not implement or change the policy required under subsection (a) until the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a report describing the policy or change to the policy.

(d) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—(1) Not later than the date of the submission of the President’s budget request for a fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary of Defense shall