

REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION
DIRECTIVES

Pub. L. 110-181, div. A, title IX, §943(b), Jan. 28, 2008, 122 Stat. 289, as amended by Pub. L. 110-417, [div. A], title VIII, §813(e)(2)(A), Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4528, provided that: "Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Jan. 28, 2008], the Secretary of Defense shall review Department of Defense Directive 5000.1 and associated guidance, and the manner in which such directive and guidance have been implemented, and take appropriate steps to ensure that the Department does not commence a technology development program for a major defense acquisition program without Milestone A approval (or Key Decision Point A approval in the case of a space program)."

§ 2366b. Major defense acquisition programs: certification required before Milestone B approval

(a) CERTIFICATION.—A major defense acquisition program may not receive Milestone B approval until the milestone decision authority—

(1) has received a business case analysis and certifies on the basis of the analysis that—

(A) the program is affordable when considering the ability of the Department of Defense to accomplish the program's mission using alternative systems;

(B) appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that the program is affordable when considering the per unit cost and the total acquisition cost in the context of the total resources available during the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made;

(C) reasonable cost and schedule estimates have been developed to execute, with the concurrence of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, the product development and production plan under the program; and

(D) funding is available to execute the product development and production plan under the program, through the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted during the fiscal year in which the certification is made, consistent with the estimates described in subparagraph (C) for the program;

(2) has received a preliminary design review and conducted a formal post-preliminary design review assessment, and certifies on the basis of such assessment that the program demonstrates a high likelihood of accomplishing its intended mission;

(3) further certifies that—

(A) appropriate market research has been conducted prior to technology development to reduce duplication of existing technology and products;

(B) the Department of Defense has completed an analysis of alternatives with respect to the program;

(C) the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has accomplished its duties with respect to the program pursuant to section 181(b) of this title, including an analysis of the operational requirements for the program;

(D) the technology in the program has been demonstrated in a relevant environment, as determined by the Milestone Decision Authority on the basis of an independent review and assessment by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation;

(E) life-cycle sustainment planning, including corrosion prevention and mitigation planning, has identified and evaluated relevant sustainment costs throughout development, production, operation, sustainment, and disposal of the program, and any alternatives, and that such costs are reasonable and have been accurately estimated;

(F) an estimate has been made of the requirements for core logistics capabilities and the associated sustaining workloads required to support such requirements;

(G) there is a plan to mitigate and account for any costs in connection with any anticipated de-certification of cryptographic systems and components during the production and procurement of the major defense acquisition program to be acquired; and

(H) the program complies with all relevant policies, regulations, and directives of the Department of Defense; and

(4) in the case of a space system, performs a cost benefit analysis for any new or follow-on satellite system using a dedicated ground control system instead of a shared ground control system, except that no cost benefit analysis is required to be performed under this paragraph for any Milestone B approval of a space system after December 31, 2019.

(b) CHANGES TO CERTIFICATION.—(1) The program manager for a major defense acquisition program that has received certification under subsection (a) shall immediately notify the milestone decision authority of any changes to the program or a designated major subprogram of such program that—

(A) alter the substantive basis for the certification of the milestone decision authority relating to any component of such certification specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a); or

(B) otherwise cause the program or subprogram to deviate significantly from the material provided to the milestone decision authority in support of such certification.

(2) Upon receipt of information under paragraph (1), the milestone decision authority may withdraw the certification concerned or rescind Milestone B approval if the milestone decision authority determines that such certification or approval is no longer valid.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—(1) The certification required under subsection (a) with respect to a major defense acquisition program shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees with the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted under section 2432 of this title after completion of the certification.

(2) A summary of any information provided to the milestone decision authority pursuant to subsection (b) and a description of the actions

taken as a result of such information shall be submitted with the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted under section 2432 of this title after receipt of such information by the milestone decision authority.

(d) **WAIVER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY.**—(1) The milestone decision authority may, at the time of Milestone B approval or at the time that such milestone decision authority withdraws a certification or rescinds Milestone B approval pursuant to subsection (b)(2), waive the applicability to a major defense acquisition program of one or more components (as specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a)) of the certification requirement if the milestone decision authority determines that, but for such a waiver, the Department would be unable to meet critical national security objectives.

(2) Whenever the milestone decision authority makes such a determination and authorizes such a waiver—

(A) the waiver, the determination, and the reasons for the determination shall be submitted in writing to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after the waiver is authorized; and

(B) the milestone decision authority shall review the program not less often than annually to determine the extent to which such program currently satisfies the certification components specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) until such time as the milestone decision authority determines that the program satisfies all such certification components.

(3) The requirement in paragraph (2)(B) shall not apply to a program for which a certification was required pursuant to section 2433a(c) of this title if the milestone decision authority—

(A) determines in writing that—

(i) the program has reached a stage in the acquisition process at which it would not be practicable to meet the certification component that was waived; and

(ii) the milestone decision authority has taken appropriate alternative actions to address the underlying purposes of such certification component; and

(B) submits the written determination, and an explanation of the basis for the determination, to the congressional defense committees.

(e) **DESIGNATION OF CERTIFICATION STATUS IN BUDGET DOCUMENTATION.**—Any budget request, budget justification material, budget display, reprogramming request, Selected Acquisition Report, or other budget documentation or performance report submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the President regarding a major defense acquisition program receiving a waiver pursuant to subsection (d) shall prominently and clearly indicate that such program has not fully satisfied the certification requirements of this section until such time as the milestone decision authority makes the determination that such program has satisfied all such certification components.

(f) **NONDELEGATION.**—The milestone decision authority may not delegate the certification requirement under subsection (a) or the authority to waive any component of such requirement under subsection (d).

(g) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) The term “major defense acquisition program” means a Department of Defense acquisition program that is a major defense acquisition program for purposes of section 2430 of this title.

(2) The term “designated major subprogram” means a major subprogram of a major defense acquisition program designated under section 2430a(a)(1) of this title.

(3) The term “milestone decision authority”, with respect to a major defense acquisition program, means the individual within the Department of Defense designated with overall responsibility for the program.

(4) The term “Milestone B approval” has the meaning provided that term in section 2366(e)(7) of this title.

(5) The term “core logistics capabilities” means the core logistics capabilities identified under section 2464(a) of this title.

(Added Pub. L. 109-163, div. A, title VIII, §801(a), Jan. 6, 2006, 119 Stat. 3366, §2366a; amended Pub. L. 109-364, div. A, title VIII, §805, Oct. 17, 2006, 120 Stat. 2314; Pub. L. 110-181, div. A, title VIII, §812, Jan. 28, 2008, 122 Stat. 219; renumbered §2366b, Pub. L. 110-417, [div. A], title VIII, §813(a), (b), Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4527; Pub. L. 111-23, title I, §101(d)(4), title II, §§201(f), 205(a), May 22, 2009, 123 Stat. 1710, 1720, 1724; Pub. L. 111-383, div. A, title VIII, §§813(d)(1), 814(c), title IX, §901(j)(4), title X, §1075(k)(1), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4265, 4266, 4324, 4378; Pub. L. 112-81, div. A, title VIII, §§801(b), (e)(2), 819(b), Dec. 31, 2011, 125 Stat. 1483, 1484, 1501; Pub. L. 112-239, div. A, title III, §322(e)(2), title IX, §904(e)(2), Jan. 2, 2013, 126 Stat. 1695, 1867; Pub. L. 113-66, div. A, title VIII, §§821(a), 822(a), title X, §1091(b)(1), Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 809, 876.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 2366b was renumbered section 2366a of this title.

AMENDMENTS

2013—Subsec. (a)(3)(D). Pub. L. 112-239, §904(e)(2), substituted “the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in consultation with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation” for “the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering”.

Subsec. (a)(3)(F). Pub. L. 112-239, §322(e)(2), as amended by Pub. L. 113-66, §1091(b)(1), substituted “core logistics capabilities” for “core depot-level maintenance and repair capabilities, as well as the associated logistics capabilities”.

Subsec. (a)(3)(G), (H). Pub. L. 113-66, §821(a), added subpar. (G) and redesignated former subpar. (G) as (H). Subsec. (a)(4). Pub. L. 113-66, §822(a), added par. (4).

2011—Pub. L. 112-81, §801(e)(2)(A), struck out “or Key Decision Point B” after “Milestone B” in section catchline.

Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 112-81, §801(e)(2)(B), struck out “, or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program,” after “Milestone B approval” in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (a)(3)(D). Pub. L. 111-383, §901(j)(4), substituted “Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering” for “Director of Defense Research and Engineering”.

Subsec. (a)(3)(E) to (G). Pub. L. 112-81, §801(b)(1), added subpars. (E) and (F) and redesignated former subpar. (E) as (G).

Subsec. (b)(1). Pub. L. 111-383, §814(c)(1)(A), substituted “any changes to the program or a designated

major subprogram of such program” for “any changes to the program” in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (b)(1)(B). Pub. L. 111-383, §814(c)(1)(B), substituted “otherwise cause the program or subprogram” for “otherwise cause the program”.

Subsec. (b)(2). Pub. L. 112-81, §801(e)(2)(C), struck out “(or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program)” after “Milestone B approval”.

Subsec. (d)(1). Pub. L. 112-81, §801(e)(2)(C), struck out “(or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program)” after “Milestone B approval” in two places.

Pub. L. 111-383, §813(d)(1)(A), substituted “(as specified in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a))” for “(as specified in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a))”.

Subsec. (d)(2)(B). Pub. L. 111-383, §1075(k)(1), which directed amendment of directory language of Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(1)(B), resulting in substitution of “paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)” for “paragraphs (1) and (2)” in text, was not executed because of the prior identical amendment by Pub. L. 111-383, §813(d)(1)(B). See below.

Pub. L. 111-383, §813(d)(1)(B), substituted “specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a)” for “specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a)”.

Subsec. (d)(3). Pub. L. 112-81, §819(b), added par. (3).

Subsec. (g)(2) to (4). Pub. L. 111-383, §814(c)(2), added par. (2) and redesignated former pars. (2) and (3) as (3) and (4), respectively. Former par. (4) redesignated (5).

Subsec. (g)(5). Pub. L. 112-81, §801(b)(2), added par. (5) and struck out former par. (5) which read as follows: “The term ‘Key Decision Point B’ means the official program initiation of a National Security Space program of the Department of Defense, which triggers a formal review to determine maturity of technology and the program’s readiness to begin the preliminary system design.”

Pub. L. 111-383, §814(c)(2)(A), redesignated par. (4) as (5).

2009—Subsec. (a)(1)(B). Pub. L. 111-23, §201(f), inserted “appropriate trade-offs among cost, schedule, and performance objectives have been made to ensure that” before “the program is affordable”.

Subsec. (a)(1)(C). Pub. L. 111-23, §101(d)(4), inserted “, with the concurrence of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation,” before “the product”.

Subsec. (a)(1)(D). Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(3)(A), struck out “and” at end.

Subsec. (a)(2), (3). Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(3)(B), (C), added par. (2) and redesignated former par. (2) as (3).

Subsec. (a)(3)(D). Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(3)(D)(i), substituted “, as determined by the Milestone Decision Authority on the basis of an independent review and assessment by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering; and” for semicolon.

Subsec. (a)(3)(E), (F). Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(3)(D)(ii), (iii), redesignated subpar. (F) as (E) and struck out former subpar. (E) which read as follows: “the program demonstrates a high likelihood of accomplishing its intended mission; and”.

Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(1), designated existing provisions as par. (1) and substituted par. (2) for “Whenever the milestone decision authority makes such a determination and authorizes such a waiver, the waiver, the determination, and the reasons for the determination shall be submitted in writing to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after the waiver is authorized.”

Subsecs. (e) to (g). Pub. L. 111-23, §205(a)(2), added subsec. (e) and redesignated former subsecs. (e) and (f) as (f) and (g), respectively.

2008—Pub. L. 110-417, §813(a), (b), renumbered section 2366a of this title as this section.

Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 110-181, §812(1), amended subsec. (a) generally. Prior to amendment, subsec. (a) consisted of pars. (1) to (10) relating to required certifications by milestone decision authority for major defense acquisition program to receive Milestone B approval, or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 110-181, §812(3), added subsec. (b). Former subsec. (b) redesignated (c).

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 110-181, §812(4), designated existing provisions as par. (1) and added par. (2).

Pub. L. 110-181, §812(2), redesignated subsec. (b) as (c). Former subsec. (c) redesignated (d).

Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 110-181, §812(5), substituted “authority may, at the time of Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program) or at the time that such milestone decision authority withdraws a certification or rescinds Milestone B approval (or Key Decision Point B approval in the case of a space program) pursuant to subsection (b)(2), waive” for “authority may waive” and “paragraph (1) or (2)” for “paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), or (9)”.

Pub. L. 110-181, §812(2), redesignated subsec. (c) as (d). Former subsec. (d) redesignated (e).

Subsec. (e). Pub. L. 110-181, §812(6), substituted “subsection (d)” for “subsection (c)”.

Pub. L. 110-181, §812(2), redesignated subsec. (d) as (e). Former subsec. (e) redesignated (f).

Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 110-181, §812(2), redesignated subsec. (e) as (f).

2006—Subsec. (a)(1) to (7). Pub. L. 109-364, §805(a)(1)–(3), added par. (1) and redesignated former pars. (1) to (6) as (2) to (7), respectively. Former par. (7) redesignated (10).

Subsec. (a)(8), (9). Pub. L. 109-364, §805(a)(4), (5), added pars. (8) and (9).

Subsec. (a)(10). Pub. L. 109-364, §805(a)(1), redesignated par. (7) as (10).

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 109-364, §805(b), substituted “(5), (6), (7), (8), or (9)” for “(5), or (6)”.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2013 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 113-66, div. A, title VIII, §821(b), Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 809, provided that: “The amendments made by subsection (a) [amending this section] shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 26, 2013], and shall apply with respect to major defense acquisition programs which are subject to Milestone B approval on or after the date occurring six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.”

Pub. L. 113-66, div. A, title X, §1091(b), Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 876, provided in part that the amendment made by section 1091(b)(1) is effective as of Jan. 2, 2013, and as if included in Pub. L. 112-239 as enacted.

Amendment by section 322(e)(2) of Pub. L. 112-239 effective Dec. 31, 2011, immediately after enactment of Pub. L. 112-81, see section 322(f) of Pub. L. 112-239, set out as a note under section 2366a of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2011 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 111-383, div. A, title VIII, §813(d)(1), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4265, provided that the amendment made by section 813(d)(1) is effective as of May 22, 2009.

Amendment by section 901(j)(4) of Pub. L. 111-383 effective Jan. 1, 2011, see section 901(p) of Pub. L. 111-383, set out as a note under section 131 of this title.

Pub. L. 111-383, div. A, title X, §1075(k), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4378, provided that the amendment made by section 1075(k)(1) is effective as of May 22, 2009, and as if included in Pub. L. 111-23 as enacted.

CERTIFICATION AND REVIEW OF PROGRAMS ENTERING DEVELOPMENT PRIOR TO ENACTMENT OF SECTION 2366B OF TITLE 10

Pub. L. 111-23, title II, §205(b), May 22, 2009, 123 Stat. 1725, as amended by Pub. L. 111-383, div. A, title VIII, §813(d)(2), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4266, which related to certification and review of programs entering development prior to enactment of section 2366b of this title, was repealed by Pub. L. 112-239, div. A, title VIII, §814, Jan. 2, 2013, 126 Stat. 1830.

FORMAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR BANDWIDTH REQUIREMENTS

Pub. L. 110-417, [div. A], title X, §1047(d), Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4603, as amended by Pub. L. 111-84, div. A, title X, §1033, Oct. 28, 2009, 123 Stat. 2449, provided that:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall, as part of the Milestone B or Key Decision Point B approval process for any major defense acquisition program or major system acquisition program, establish a formal review process to ensure that—

“(A) the bandwidth requirements needed to support such program are or will be met; and

“(B) a determination will be made with respect to how to meet the bandwidth requirements for such program.

“(2) REPORTS.—Not later than January 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence shall each submit to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives], the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on any determinations made under paragraph (1) with respect to meeting the bandwidth requirements for major defense acquisition programs and major system acquisition programs during the preceding fiscal year.”

§ 2367. Use of federally funded research and development centers

(a) LIMITATION ON USE OF CENTERS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may not place work with a federally funded research and development center unless such work is within the purpose, mission, and general scope of effort of such center as established in the sponsoring agreement of the Department of Defense with such center.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR APPLIED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.—This section does not apply to a federally funded research and development center that performs applied scientific research under laboratory conditions.

(c) LIMITATION ON CREATION OF NEW CENTERS.—(1) The head of an agency may not obligate or expend amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for purposes of operating a federally funded research center that was not in existence before June 2, 1986, until—

(A) the head of the agency submits to Congress a report with respect to such center that describes the purpose, mission, and general scope of effort of the center; and

(B) a period of 60 days beginning on the date such report is received by Congress has elapsed.

(2) In this subsection, the term “head of an agency” has the meaning given such term in section 2302(1) of this title.

(d) IDENTIFICATION TO CONGRESS OF FFRDC WORKLOAD EFFORT.—After the close of a fiscal year, and not later than January 1 of the next year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the actual obligations and the actual man-years of effort expended at each federally funded research and development center during that fiscal year.

(Added Pub. L. 99-500, §101(c) [title X, §912(a)(1)], Oct. 18, 1986, 100 Stat. 1783-82, 1783-146, and Pub. L. 99-591, §101(c) [title X, §912(a)(1)], Oct. 30, 1986, 100 Stat. 3341-82, 3341-146; Pub. L. 99-661, div. A, title IX, formerly title IV, §912(a)(1), Nov. 14,

1986, 100 Stat. 3925, renumbered title IX, Pub. L. 100-26, §3(5), Apr. 21, 1987, 101 Stat. 273; amended Pub. L. 102-190, div. A, title II, §256(a)(1), Dec. 5, 1991, 105 Stat. 1330; Pub. L. 104-106, div. A, title XV, §1502(a)(9), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 503; Pub. L. 106-65, div. A, title X, §1067(1), Oct. 5, 1999, 113 Stat. 774; Pub. L. 107-314, div. A, title X, §1041(a)(12), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2645.)

CODIFICATION

Pub. L. 99-591 is a corrected version of Pub. L. 99-500. Pub. L. 99-500, Pub. L. 99-591, and Pub. L. 99-661 added identical sections.

AMENDMENTS

2002—Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 107-314, §1041(a)(12), struck out designations for pars. (1) and (2) and text of par. (1). Prior to amendment par. (1) read as follows: “In the documents provided to Congress by the Secretary of Defense in support of the budget submitted by the President under section 1105 of title 31 for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall set forth the proposed amount of the man-years of effort to be funded by the Department of Defense for each federally funded research and development center for the fiscal year covered by that budget.”

1999—Subsec. (d)(2). Pub. L. 106-65 substituted “and the Committee on Armed Services” for “and the Committee on National Security”.

1996—Subsec. (d)(2). Pub. L. 104-106 substituted “the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on National Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the” for “the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and”.

1991—Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 102-190 added subsec. (d).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1991 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 102-190, div. A, title II, §256(a)(2), Dec. 5, 1991, 105 Stat. 1330, provided that:

“(A) Paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 2367 of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall take effect with respect to the budget submitted for fiscal year 1994.

“(B) Paragraph (2) of such subsection shall take effect with respect to fiscal year 1992.”

GAO STUDY; REPORT

Pub. L. 99-500, §101(c) [title X, §912(b), (c)], Oct. 18, 1986, 100 Stat. 1783-82, 1783-146, Pub. L. 99-591, §101(c) [title X, §912(b), (c)], Oct. 30, 1986, 100 Stat. 3341-82, 3341-146, and Pub. L. 99-661, div. A, title IX, formerly title IV, §912(b), (c), Nov. 14, 1986, 100 Stat. 3926, renumbered title IX, Pub. L. 100-26, §3(5), Apr. 21, 1987, 101 Stat. 273, directed Comptroller General to conduct a study of national defense role of federally funded research and development centers and submit a report to Congress not later than one year after Oct. 18, 1986.

[§ 2368. Repealed. Pub. L. 102-190, div. A, title VIII, § 821(c)(1), Dec. 5, 1991, 105 Stat. 1431]

Section, added Pub. L. 100-456, div. A, title VIII, §823(a)(1), Sept. 29, 1988, 102 Stat. 2018; amended Pub. L. 101-189, div. A, title VIII, §841(c)(1), Nov. 29, 1989, 103 Stat. 1514; Pub. L. 102-25, title VII, §701(g)(1), Apr. 6, 1991, 105 Stat. 115, authorized studies in fields of research and development essential to development of critical technologies.

[§ 2369. Repealed. Pub. L. 103-355, title III, § 3062(a), Oct. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 3336]

Section, added Pub. L. 100-456, div. A, title VIII, §842(a), Sept. 29, 1988, 102 Stat. 2026; amended Pub. L. 103-160, div. A, title IX, §904(d)(1), Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1728, related to program for supervision and co-