(2) For a major defense acquisition program for which a designation of a major subprogram has been made under subsection (a), unit costs under this chapter shall be submitted in accordance with the definitions in subsection (d).

(c) REQUIREMENT TO COVER ENTIRE MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.—If a subprogram of a major defense acquisition program is designated as a major subprogram under subsection (a), all other elements of the major defense acquisition program shall be appropriately organized into one or more subprograms under the major defense acquisition program, each of which subprograms, as so organized, shall be treated as a major subprogram under subsection (a).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2432(a) of this title, in the case of a major defense acquisition program for which the Secretary has designated one or more major subprograms under this section for the purposes of this chapter—

(1) the term ''program acquisition unit cost'' applies at the level of the subprogram and means the total cost for the development and procurement of, and specific military construction for, the major defense acquisition program that is reasonably allocable to each such major subprogram, divided by the relevant number of fully-configured end items to be produced under such major subprogram;

(2) the term ''procurement unit cost'' applies at the level of the subprogram and means the total of all funds programmed to be available for obligation for procurement for each such major subprogram, divided by the number of fully-configured end items to be procured under such major subprogram;

(3) the term ''major contract'', with respect to a designated major subprogram, means each of the six largest prime, associate, or Government furnished equipment contracts under the subprogram that is in excess of $40,000,000 and that is not a firm-fixed price contract; and

(4) the term ''life cycle cost'', with respect to a designated major subprogram, means all costs of development, procurement, military construction, and operations and support, without regard to funding source or management control.

(Added Pub. L. 110–417, [div. A], title VIII, §811(a)(1), Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4520; amended Pub. L. 111–383, div. A, title VIII, §814(a), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4266; Pub. L. 112–81, div. A, title IX, §912, Dec. 31, 2011, 125 Stat. 1536; Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title VIII, §850, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2295.)

AMENDMENTS

2016—Subsec. (a)(1)(B). Pub. L. 114–328, which directed substitution of ''major defense acquisition program requires the delivery of two or more increments or blocks'' for ''major defense acquisition program to purchase satellites requires the delivery of satellites in two or more increments or blocks'' in par. (1)(B), was executed by making the substitution in par. (1)(B) of subsec. (a), to reflect the probable intent of Congress.

2011—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 112–81 designated existing provisions as subpar. (A) and added subpar. (B).

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 111–383 designated existing provisions as par. (1), redesignated former pars. (1) and (2) as subpars. (A) and (B), respectively, of par. (1), inserted ''(other than as provided in paragraph (2))'' before semicolon in subpar. (A), and added par. (2).

§ 2431. Weapons development and procurement schedules

(a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress each calendar year, not later than 45 days after the President submits the budget to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, budget justification documents regarding development and procurement schedules for each weapon system for which fund authorization is required by section 114(a) of this title, and for which any funds for procurement are requested in that budget. The documents shall include data on operational testing and evaluation for each weapon system for which funds for procurement are requested (other than funds requested only for the procurement of units for operational testing and evaluation, or long lead-time items, or both). A weapon system shall also be included in the annual documents required under this subsection in each year thereafter until procurement of that system has been completed or terminated, or the Secretary of Defense certifies, in writing, that such inclusion would not serve any useful purpose and gives his reasons therefor.

(b) Any documents required to be submitted under subsection (a) shall include detailed and summarized information with respect to each weapon system covered and shall specifically include each of the following:

(1) The development schedule, including estimated annual costs until development is completed.

(2) The planned procurement schedule, including the best estimate of the Secretary of Defense of the annual costs and units to be procured until procurement is completed.

(3) To the extent required by the second sentence of subsection (a), the result of all operational testing and evaluation up to the time of the submission of the documents, or, if operational testing and evaluation has not been conducted, a statement of the reasons therefor and the results of such other testing and evaluation as has been conducted.

(4)(A) The most efficient production rate, the most efficient acquisition rate, and the minimum sustaining rate, consistent with the program priority established for such weapon system by the Secretary concerned.

(B) In this paragraph:

(i) The term ''most efficient production rate'' means the maximum rate for each budget year at which the weapon system can be produced with existing or planned plant capacity and tooling, with one shift a day running for eight hours a day and five days a week.

(ii) The term ''minimum sustaining rate'' means the production rate for each budget year that is necessary to keep production lines open while maintaining a base of responsive vendors and suppliers.

(c) In the case of any weapon system for which procurement funds have not been previously requested and for which funds are first requested by the President in any fiscal year after the

Budget for that fiscal year has been submitted to Congress, the same documentation requirements shall be applicable to that system in the same manner and to the same extent as if funds had been requested for that system in that budget.

(Added Pub. L. 93–155, title VIII, § 803(a), Nov. 16, 1973, 87 Stat. 614, § 139; amended Pub. L. 94–106, title VIII, § 805, Oct. 7, 1975, 89 Stat. 538; Pub. L. 96–513, title V, § 511(5), Dec. 12, 1980, 94 Stat. 2920; Pub. L. 97–86, title IX, § 909(c), Dec. 1, 1981, 95 Stat. 1120; Pub. L. 97–258, § 3(b)(1), Sept. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 1063; Pub. L. 98–525, title XIV, § 1405(3), Oct. 19, 1984, 98 Stat. 2621; renumbered § 2431 and amended Pub. L. 99–433, title I, §§ 101(a)(5), 110(d)(12), (g)(6), Oct. 1, 1986, 100 Stat. 995, 1003, 1004; Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title XIII, § 1314(a)(1), Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1175; Pub. L. 101–510, div. A, title XIII, § 1301(13), title XIV, § 1484(f)(3), Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1668, 1717; Pub. L. 103–355, title III, § 3001, Oct. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 3327; Pub. L. 104–106, div. D, title XLIII, § 4321(b)(18), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 673.)

PRIOR PROVISIONS

Provisions similar to those in this section were contained in Pub. L. 92–156, title V, § 506, Nov. 17, 1971, 85 Stat. 429, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 93–155, § 803(b)(2).

AMENDMENTS

1996—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 104–106, § 4321(b)(18)(A)(i), substituted ''Any documents'' for ''Any report'' in first sentence.

Subsec. (b)(3). Pub. L. 104–106, § 4321(b)(18)(A)(ii), substituted ''the documents'' for ''the report''.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 104–106, § 4321(b)(18)(B), substituted ''documentation'' for ''reporting''.

1994—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 103–355, § 3001(a), substituted ''not later than 45 days after'' for ''at the same time'' and ''budget justification documents'' for ''a written report'' in first sentence and ''documents'' for ''report'' in second and third sentences.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 103–355, § 3001(b)(1), substituted ''include each of the following:'' for ''include—'' in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (b)(1) to (3). Pub. L. 103–355, § 3001(b)(2)–(4), capitalized first letter of first word in pars. (1) to (3) and substituted period for semicolon at end of pars. (1) and (2) and period for ''; and'' at end of par. (3).

Subsec. (b)(4). Pub. L. 103–355, § 3001(b)(5) amended par. (4) generally. Prior to amendment, par. (4) read as follows: ''the most efficient production rate and the most efficient acquisition rate consistent with the program priority established for such weapon system by the Secretary concerned.''

1990—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 101–510, § 1484(f)(3), substituted ''covered and shall specifically include'' for ''covered, and specifically include, but not be limited to'' in introductory provisions.

Pub. L. 101–510, § 1301(13), redesignated subsec. (c) as (b), struck out ''or (b)'' after ''under subsection (a)'', and struck out former subsec. (b) which read as follows: ''The Secretary of Defense shall submit a supplemental report to Congress not less than 30, or more than 90, days before the award of any contract, or the exercise of any option in a contract, for the procurement of any such weapon system (other than procurement of units for operational testing and evaluation, or long lead-time items, or both), unless—

''(1) the contractor or contractors for that system have not yet been selected and the Secretary of Defense determines that the submission of that report would adversely affect the source selection process and notifies Congress in writing, prior to such award, of that determination, stating his reasons therefor; or

''(2) the Secretary of Defense determines that the submission of that report would otherwise adversely affect the vital security interests of the United States and notifies Congress in writing of that determination at least 30 days prior to the award, stating his reasons therefor.''

Subsecs. (c), (d). Pub. L. 101–510, § 1301(13)(C), redesignated subsecs. (c) and (d) as (b) and (c), respectively.

1987—Pub. L. 100–180 made technical amendment to directory language of Pub. L. 99–433, § 101(a)(5). See 1986 Amendment note below.

1986—Pub. L. 99–433, § 101(a)(5), as amended by Pub. L. 100–180, § 1314(a)(1), renumbered section 139 of this title as this section.

Pub. L. 99–433, § 110(d)(12), substituted ''Weapons development and procurement schedules'' for ''Secretary of Defense: weapons development and procurement schedules for armed forces; reports; supplemental reports'' in section catchline.

Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 99–433, § 110(g)(6), substituted ''section 114(a)'' for ''section 138(a)''.

1984—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 98–525, § 1405(3)(B), substituted ''30'' for ''thirty'' and ''90'' for ''ninety'' in introductory text.

Subsec. (b)(2). Pub. L. 98–525, § 1405(3)(A), substituted ''30'' for ''thirty''.

1982—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 97–258 substituted ''section 1105 of title 31'' for ''section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11)''.

1981—Subsec. (c)(4). Pub. L. 97–86 added par. (4).

1980—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 96–513 substituted ''section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11)'' for ''section 11 of title 31''.

1975—Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 94–106 substituted ''or more than ninety, days before'' for ''or more than sixty, days before''.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1996 AMENDMENT

For effective date and applicability of amendment by Pub. L. 104–106, see section 4401 of Pub. L. 104–106, set out as a note under section 2302 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1987 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 100–180 applicable as if included in enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99–433, see section 1314(e) of Pub. L. 100–180, set out as a note under section 743 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1980 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 96–513 effective Dec. 12, 1980, see section 701(b)(3) of Pub. L. 96–513, set out as a note under section 101 of this title.

TRANSITION OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS TO MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title XVI, § 1676(b), Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1772, as amended by Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title XVI, § 1679, Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 2161, directed the Secretary of Defense to transfer, not later than the date on which the budget for fiscal year 2021 is submitted to Congress, the acquisition authority and the total obligational authority for each missile defense program that has received Milestone C approval or equivalent approval as of such date from the Missile Defense Agency to a military department, and directed the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than one year after Dec. 12, 2017, a report on the plans for such transition of missile defense programs.

DEVELOPMENT OF PERSISTENT SPACE-BASED SENSOR ARCHITECTURE

Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title XVI, § 1683, Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1777, as amended by Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title XVI, § 1675(a)–(c), (d)(2), Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 2159, 2160, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Commander of the Air Force Space Command and the Commander of the

United States Strategic Command, to develop a highly reliable and cost-effective persistent space-based sensor architecture capable of supporting the ballistic missile defense system, subject to the availability of appropriations, beginning fiscal year 2019, and to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, not later than one year after Dec. 12, 2017, a plan to carry out such development; and directed the Director to submit to such committees, not later than Jan. 31, 2019, a report on the options available to use other transactional authorities pursuant to section 2371 of this title to accelerate development and deployment of such architecture.

BOOST PHASE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title XVI, §1685, Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1781, as amended by Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title XVI, §1676, Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 2160, directed the Secretary of Defense to ensure that an effective interim kinetic or directed energy boost phase ballistic missile defense capability would be available for initial operational deployment as soon as practicable, directed the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees, together with the budget submitted to Congress for fiscal year 2019, a plan to achieve such capability, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, beginning fiscal year 2019, to carry out a program to develop kinetic boost phase intercept capabilities, required an independent study on the feasibility of providing an initial or demonstrated boost phase capability using unmanned aerial vehicles and kinetic interceptors, and directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such study not later than July 31, 2019.

GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTOR CAPABILITY, CAPACITY, AND RELIABILITY

Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title XVI, §1686, Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1781, authorized the Secretary of Defense to increase the number of the ground-based interceptors of the United States and to advance missile defense technologies to improve the capability and reliability of those elements of the ballistic missile defense system, and directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after the date on which the Ballistic Missile Defense Review commenced in 2017 is published, a report on those efforts.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE-BASED BALLISTIC MISSILE INTERCEPT LAYER

Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title XVI, §1688, Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1783, as amended by Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title XVI, §1680, Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 2161, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to develop a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer to the ballistic missile defense system, subject to the availability of appropriations, and to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, not later than one year after Dec. 12, 2017, a 10-year plan to carry out such development.

DESIGNATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SENIOR OFFICIAL WITH PRINCIPAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title II, §219, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2053, as amended by Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title II, §215, Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1326; Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title II, §§212, 237, Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1675, 1695, designated the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering as the official with principal responsibility for the development and demonstration of directed energy weapons for the Department of Defense, redesignated the High Energy Laser Joint Technology Office of the Department of Defense as the Joint Directed Energy Transition Office, which office was to report to the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, and directed the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary, to establish a program on the prototyping and demonstration of directed energy weapon systems to build and maintain the military superiority of the United States.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE POLICY

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, §1681(a), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2623, provided that: ''It is the policy of the United States to maintain and improve an effective, robust layered missile defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States, allies, deployed forces, and capabilities against the developing and increasingly complex ballistic missile threat with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense.''

Pub. L. 106–38, §2, July 22, 1999, 113 Stat. 205, which provided that it was the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for National Missile Defense, was repealed by Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, §1681(b), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2623.

DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN ACQUISITION AUTHORITY

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, §1684(e), (f), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2627, provided that:

''(e) DESIGNATION REQUIRED.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—Not later than March 31, 2018, the Secretary of Defense shall designate a military department or Defense Agency with acquisition authority with respect to—

''(A) the capability to defend the homeland from cruise missiles; and

''(B) left-of-launch ballistic missile defeat capability.

''(2) DISCRETION.—The Secretary may designate a single military department or Defense Agency with the acquisition authority described in paragraph (1) or designate a separate military department or Defense Agency for each function specified in such paragraph.

''(3) VALIDATION.—In making a designation under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include a description of the manner in which the military requirements for such capabilities will be validated.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'Defense Agency' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(11) of title 10, United States Code.

''(2) The term 'intelligence community' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).''

TECHNICAL AUTHORITY FOR INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, §1686(a), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2628, provided that:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Missile Defense Agency is the technical authority of the Department of Defense for integrated air and missile defense activities and programs, including joint engineering and integration efforts for such activities and programs, including with respect to defining and controlling the interfaces of such activities and programs and the allocation of technical requirements for such activities and programs.

''(2) DETAILEES.—

''(A) In carrying out the technical authority under paragraph (1), the Director may seek to have staff detailed to the Missile Defense Agency from the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense and the Joint Integrated Air and Missile

Defense Organization in a number the Director determines necessary in accordance with subparagraph (B).

''(B) In detailing staff under subparagraph (A) to carry out the technical authority under paragraph (1), the total number of staff, including detailees, of the Missile Defense Agency who carry out such authority may not exceed the number that is twice the number of such staff carrying out such authority as of January 1, 2016.''

HYPERSONIC DEFENSE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, § 1687, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2629, designated the Director of the Missile Defense Agency as the executive agent for the Department of Defense for the development of a capability by the United States to counter hypersonic boost-glide vehicle capabilities and conventional prompt strike capabilities that may be employed against the United States or its allies and directed the Director to establish a program to develop such hypersonic defense capability by not later than Mar. 31, 2017.

REQUIRED TESTING BY MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY OF GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE ELEMENT OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, § 1689, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2631, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, subject to certain exceptions, to administer a flight test of the ground-based midcourse defense element of the ballistic missile defense system not less frequently than once each fiscal year.

PILOT PROGRAM ON LOSS OF UNCLASSIFIED, CONTROLLED TECHNICAL INFORMATION

Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, § 1692, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2636, provided that:

''(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 23, 2016], the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall carry out a pilot program to implement improvements to the data protection options in the programs of the Missile Defense Agency (including the contractors of the Agency), particularly with respect to unclassified, controlled technical information and controlled unclassified information.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Director shall give priority to implementing data protection options that are used by the private sector and have been proven successful.

''(c) DURATION.—The Director shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) for not more than a 5-year period.

''(d) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which the Director commences the pilot program under subsection (a), the Director shall notify the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives], the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of—

''(1) the data protection options that the Director is considering to implement under the pilot program and the potential costs of such options; and

''(2) such option that is the preferred option of the Director.

''(e) DATA PROTECTION OPTIONS.—In this section, the term 'data protection options' means actions to improve processes, practices, and systems that relate to the safeguarding, hygiene, and data protection of information.''

PLAN ON FULL INTEGRATION AND EXPLOITATION OF OVERHEAD PERSISTENT INFRARED CAPABILITY

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1618, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1108, directed the Commander of the United States Strategic Command and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, not later than 180 days after Nov. 25, 2015, a plan for the integration of overhead persistent infrared capabilities, and directed the Secretary of Defense to include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress for each fiscal year a determination of how such plan was being implemented.

INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY OF AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1675, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1131, directed the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, acting through the Missile Defense Executive Board, to ensure the interoperability and integration of certain specified air and missile defense capabilities of the United States, including by carrying out operational testing.

BOOST PHASE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1680, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1137, directed the Secretary of Defense to develop and field an airborne boost phase defense system by not later than fiscal year 2025, and to submit a report on its efforts to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after Nov. 25, 2015.

DEVELOPMENT AND DEPLOYMENT OF MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE FOR MISSILE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES HOMELAND

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1681, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1138, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to develop a highly reliable multiple-object kill vehicle for the ground-based midcourse defense system using sound acquisition practices, and to include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress for fiscal year 2017 a report on the funding profile necessary for the program.

REQUIREMENT TO REPLACE CAPABILITY ENHANCEMENT I EXOATMOSPHERIC KILL VEHICLES

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1682, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1139, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all remaining ground-based interceptors of the ground-based midcourse defense system that are armed with the capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicle were replaced with the redesigned exoatmospheric kill vehicle before Sept. 30, 2022.

ADDITIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR COVERAGE FOR PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES HOMELAND

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1684, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1140, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to deploy, not later than Dec. 31, 2020, a long-range discrimination radar or other sensor capability to defend the United States from long-range ballistic missile threats from Iran, and to include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress for fiscal years 2017 to 2020 the plan to carry out such deployment.

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT OF SPACE-BASED MISSILE DEFENSE LAYER

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, § 1685, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1142, as amended by Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title XVI, § 1683, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2624, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, to commence, not later than 30 days after Nov. 25, 2015, the concept definition of a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer to the ballistic missile defense system, and directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees, not

later than 1 year after Nov. 25, 2015, a plan for developing one or more programs for a space-based ballistic missile intercept layer, and to commence research and development of such programs not later than 60 days after the submittal of the plan.

DEVELOPMENT OF REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES

Pub. L. 114–92, div. A, title XVI, §1687, Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1143, provided that:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the memorandum of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of January 27, 2014, regarding joint integrated air and missile defense, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall oversee the development of warfighter requirements for persistent and survivable capabilities to detect, identify, determine the status, track, and support engagement of strategically important mobile or relocatable assets in all phases of conflict in order to achieve the objective of preventing the effective employment of such assets, including through offensive actions against such assets prior to their use.

''(b) PURPOSE OF REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements developed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used and updated, as appropriate, for the purpose of informing applicable acquisition programs and systems-of-systems architecture planning that are funded through the Military Intelligence Program, the National Intelligence Program, and non-intelligence programs.

''(c) SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES.—The Vice Chairman shall also oversee the development of the enabling framework for intelligence support for integrated air and missile defense, including concepts for the integrated operation of multiple systems, and, as appropriate, the development of requirements for capabilities to be acquired to achieve such integrated operations.

''(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that new acquisition programs for applicable major systems or capabilities, or for upgrades to existing systems, should not be undertaken until the applicable requirements described in subsections (a) and (c) have been developed and incorporated into programmatic decision-making.''

TESTING AND ASSESSMENT OF MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS PRIOR TO PRODUCTION AND DEPLOYMENT

Pub. L. 113–291, div. A, title XVI, §1662, Dec. 19, 2014, 128 Stat. 3657, as amended by Pub. L. 115–91, div. A, title XVI, §1677(b), Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1774, prohibited the Secretary of Defense from making a final production decision for, or from operationally deploying, certain components of the ballistic missile defense system without sufficient and operationally realistic testing.

[For termination, effective Dec. 31, 2021, of reporting provisions in subsecs. (c)(2) and (d)(2) of section 1662 of Pub. L. 113–291, formerly set out above, see section 1061 of Pub. L. 114–328, set out as a note under section 111 of this title.]

ACQUISITION PLAN FOR RE-DESIGNED EXO-ATMOSPHERIC KILL VEHICLE

Pub. L. 113–291, div. A, title XVI, §1663, Dec. 19, 2014, 128 Stat. 3658, directed the Secretary of Defense to develop an acquisition plan for the re-design of the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle of the ground-based midcourse defense system, and required the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on such plan.

ADDITIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE UNITED STATES HOMELAND

Pub. L. 113–66, div. A, title II, §235, Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 714, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to deploy a long-range discriminating radar against long-range ballistic missile threats from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, directed the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Secretary was able to deploy additional tracking and discrimination sensor capabilities to defend the United States from future long-range ballistic missile threats from Iran, and required submission to the congressional defense committees of a report on the sensor capabilities of the United States not later than 180 days after Dec. 26, 2013.

PLANS TO IMPROVE THE GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 113–66, div. A, title II, §237, Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 717, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to develop options to achieve an improved kill assessment capability for the ground-based midcourse defense system by not later than Dec. 31, 2019, to develop an interim capability for improved hit assessment for the ground-based midcourse defense system that could be integrated into near-term exo-atmospheric kill vehicle upgrades and refurbishment, and to submit a report on such development not later than Apr. 1, 2014, and directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit a plan to develop and deploy an upgraded enhanced exo-atmospheric kill vehicle not later than 120 days after Dec. 26, 2013.

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MISSILE DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS IN EUROPE

Pub. L. 111–383, div. A, title II, §223(a)–(d), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4168, 4169, prohibited the expenditure of Department of Defense funds for the construction or deployment of missile defense interceptors in Europe until the host nation ratified a missile defense basing agreement and a status of forces agreement authorizing such interceptors and the Secretary of Defense submitted to the congressional defense committees the report on the independent assessment of alternative missile defense systems in Europe required by section 235(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Pub. L. 111–84, 123 Stat. 2235).

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT, CONSTRUCTION, AND DEPLOYMENT OF MISSILE DEFENSES IN EUROPE

Pub. L. 111–84, div. A, title II, §234, Oct. 28, 2009, 123 Stat. 2234, set forth reporting requirements for the use of Department of Defense funds for the acquisition or deployment of operational missiles of a long-range missile defense system in Europe, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 111–383, div. A, title II, §223(e), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4169.

Pub. L. 110–417, [div. A], title II, §233, Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4393, as amended by Pub. L. 111–383, div. A, title X, §1075(e)(3), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4374, prohibited the expenditure of Department of Defense funds for a long-range missile defense system in Europe unless the host nation ratified a missile defense basing agreement, and required a further certification to Congress by the Secretary of Defense.

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON PROTECTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES AGAINST IRANIAN BALLISTIC MISSILES

Pub. L. 110–181, div. A, title II, §229, Jan. 28, 2008, 122 Stat. 45, set forth as the policy of the United States to develop, along with its allies, a defense against Iranian ballistic missiles and to encourge the NATO alliance to accelerate its efforts to protect NATO territory against the threat of Iranian ballistic missiles.

POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES ON PRIORITIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT, TESTING, AND FIELDING OF MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES

Pub. L. 109–364, div. A, title II, §223, Oct. 17, 2006, 120 Stat. 2130, set forth as the policy of the United States that the Department of Defense prioritize the development, testing, fielding, and improvement of effective near-term missile defense capabilities.

PLANS FOR TEST AND EVALUATION OF OPERATIONAL CAPABILITY OF THE BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 109–163, div. A, title II, §234, Jan. 6, 2006, 119 Stat. 3174, as amended by Pub. L. 109–364, div. A, title

II, § 225, Oct. 17, 2006, 120 Stat. 2130, directed the operational and test components of the Department of Defense to prepare a plan to test the operational capability of each block of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, and directed the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to submit a report to the congressional defense committees.

INTEGRATION OF PATRIOT ADVANCED CAPABILITY-3 AND MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM INTO BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 108–375, div. A, title II, § 232, Oct. 28, 2004, 118 Stat. 1835, designated the Patriot Advanced Capability-3/Medium Extended Air Defense System air and missile defense program as an element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System, prohibited the Secretary of the Army from making any significant change to the baseline technical specifications or the baseline schedule for the PAC–3/MEADS program without the concurrence of the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, and directed the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for determining the effect of a proposed change to the procurement quantity for the PAC–3/MEADS program and to submit to Congress a report describing such procedures not later than Feb. 1, 2005.

BASELINES AND OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 108–375, div. A, title II, § 234, Oct. 28, 2004, 118 Stat. 1837, directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, to prescribe, not later than Feb. 1, 2005, criteria for operationally realistic testing of fieldable prototypes developed under the ballistic missile defense spiral development program, and to ensure that, not later than Oct. 1, 2005, any test of the ballistic missile defense system was conducted consistent with such criteria.

REPORT REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Pub. L. 107–314, div. A, title II, § 221, Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2484, related to annual submission of current performance goals and development baselines; research, development, test, and evaluation budget justification materials; and review of Missile Defense Agency criteria in relation to military requirements, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 112–81, div. A, title II, § 231(b)(3), Dec. 31, 2011, 125 Stat. 1339.

PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON FLIGHT TESTING OF GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 107–314, div. A, title II, § 224, Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2485, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide to the congressional defense committees information on the results of each flight test of the Ground-based Midcourse national missile defense system.

MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY TEST PROGRAM

Pub. L. 107–107, div. A, title II, § 232(c)–(h), Dec. 28, 2001, 115 Stat. 1037–1039, as amended by Pub. L. 107–314, div. A, title II, § 225(b)(2)(A), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2486; Pub. L. 108–136, div. A, title II, § 221(b)(2), (c)(2), Nov. 24, 2003, 117 Stat. 1419; Pub. L. 108–375, div. A, title II, § 233, Oct. 28, 2004, 118 Stat. 1836; Pub. L. 109–163, div. A, title II, § 232, Jan. 6, 2006, 119 Stat. 3174; Pub. L. 109–364, div. A, title II, § 224, Oct. 17, 2006, 120 Stat. 2130; Pub. L. 110–181, div. A, title II, § 225, Jan. 28, 2008, 122 Stat. 41; Pub. L. 110–417, [div. A], title II, § 231(a), (b), Oct. 14, 2008, 122 Stat. 4390, 4391; Pub. L. 111–383, div. A, title X, § 1075(e)(2), Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4374; Pub. L. 112–81, div. A, title II, § 232(c), title X, § 1062(h), Dec. 31, 2011, 125 Stat. 1340, 1585, directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to ensure that critical technology for a missile defense program was successfully demonstrated before it entered into operational service, and directed the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to conduct annual assessments of, and to report on, the program and the ballistic missile defense system.

[For termination, effective Dec. 31, 2021, of annual reporting provisions in section 232(h) of Pub. L. 107–107, formerly set out above, see section 1061 of Pub. L. 114–328, set out as a note under section 111 of this title.]

MISSILE DEFENSE TESTING INITIATIVE

Pub. L. 107–107, div. A, title II, § 234, Dec. 28, 2001, 115 Stat. 1039, set out requirements for the testing infrastructure of the ballistic missile defense program, including specific requirements for ground-based midcourse interceptor systems for fiscal year 2002.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Pub. L. 105–85, div. A, title II, § 231, Nov. 18, 1997, 111 Stat. 1661, provided that the Secretary of Defense was to ensure that the National Missile Defense Program was structured and programmed for funding so as to support a test, in fiscal year 1999, of an integrated national missile defense system that was representative of the national missile defense system architecture that could achieve initial operational capability in fiscal year 2003, and that not later than Feb. 15, 1998, the Secretary was to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the development and deployment of a national missile defense system that could achieve initial operational capability in fiscal year 2003.

ENHANCED COOPERATION BETWEEN NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

Pub. L. 106–398, § 1 [div. C, title XXXI, § 3132], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A–455, as amended by Pub. L. 107–314, div. A, title II, § 225(b)(3), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2486, directed the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to modify the memorandum of understanding entered into under section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Pub. L. 105–85, formerly set out as a note below) to provide for jointly funded projects.

Pub. L. 105–85, div. C, title XXXI, § 3131, Nov. 18, 1997, 111 Stat. 2034, directed the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to enter into a memorandum of understanding to improve and facilitate the use of the expertise of the national laboratories for the ballistic missile defense programs of the Department of Defense.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Pub. L. 104–106, div. A, title II, subtitle C, Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 228–233, as amended by Pub. L. 105–85, div. A, title II, § 236, Nov. 18, 1997, 111 Stat. 1665; Pub. L. 106–65, div. A, title X, § 1067(6), Oct. 5, 1999, 113 Stat. 774; Pub. L. 107–314, div. A, title X, § 1041(c), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2646, known as the Ballistic Missile Defense Act of 1995, restructured the core theater missile defense program, directed the Secretary of Defense to prepare a plan to develop theater missile defense systems, prohibited the use of Department of Defense funds to implement an agreement between the United States and any independent state of the former Soviet Union that would establish a demarcation between theater missile defense systems and anti-ballistic missile systems or restrict United States theater missile defense systems, and repealed the Missile Defense Act of 1991 (Pub. L. 102–190, div. A, title II, part C).

COMPLIANCE OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS AND COMPONENTS WITH ABM TREATY

Pub. L. 103–337, div. A, title II, § 231, Oct. 5, 1994, 108 Stat. 2699, prohibited the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the development or testing of anti-ballisitic missile systems or components except as consistent with the ABM Treaty, limited the use of funds appropriated for the Brilliant Eyes program until the Secretary of Defense submitted a report to Congress on the compliance of that program with the ABM Treaty, and directed the Secretary of Defense to review the Navy Upper Tier program to determine its compliance with the ABM Treaty.

Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title II, § 234, Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1595, contained findings of Congress, required compliance review, and limited funding pending submission of report, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 104–106, div. A, title II, § 253(6), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 235.

THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE MASTER PLAN

Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title II, § 235, Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1598, directed the Secretary of Defense to maximize the use of existing systems and technologies and promote joint use by the military departments of ballistic missile defense equipment in carrying out the Theater Missile Defense Initiative, to submit to Congress a TMD Master Plan, and to conduct a review of opportunities to streamline the weapon systems acquisition process applicable to the development, testing, and deployment of theater ballistic missile defenses.

COOPERATION OF UNITED STATES ALLIES ON DEVELOPMENT OF TACTICAL AND THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES

Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title II, § 242(a)–(e), Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1603–1605, stated congressional findings, required Secretary of Defense to develop plan to coordinate development and implementation of Theater Missile Defense programs of United States with theater missile defense programs of allies of United States, specified contents of such plan, required Secretary to submit to Congress report on such plan in both classified and unclassified versions, required Secretary to include in each annual Theater Missile Defense Initiative report to Congress report on actions taken to implement such plan, specified contents of such report, related to restriction on funds, stated sense of Congress that whenever United States deployed theater ballistic missile defenses to protect country that had not provided support for development of such defenses United States was to consider seeking reimbursement from such country to cover at least incremental cost of such deployment, and related to congressional encouragement of allies of United States to participate in cooperative Theater Missile Defense programs of United States and encouragement of participation by United States in cooperative theater missile defense efforts of allied nations, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 104–106, div. A, title II, § 253(7), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 235.

TRANSFER OF FOLLOW-ON TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title II, § 243, Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1605, as amended by Pub. L. 104–201, div. A, title X, § 1073(e)(1)(E), Sept. 23, 1996, 110 Stat. 2658; Pub. L. 107–314, div. A, title II, § 225(b)(4)(B), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2486, provided that management and budget responsibility for research and development of any program to develop far-term follow-on technology relating to ballistic missile defense was to be provided through the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency or the appropriate military department, and directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report identifying each program the Secretary had transferred from the Missile Defense Agency and the the agency or military department to which each such transfer was made.

THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE INITIATIVE

Pub. L. 102–484, div. A, title II, § 231, Oct. 23, 1992, 106 Stat. 2354, established the Theater Missile Defense Initiative to carry out all theater and tactical missile defense activities of the Department of Defense, effective 90 days after Oct. 23, 1992.

MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Pub. L. 102–190, div. A, title II, part C, Dec. 5, 1991, 105 Stat. 1321, as amended by Pub. L. 102–484, div. A, title II, § 234(a)–(d)(1), (e), (f), title X, § 1053(1), (2), Oct. 23, 1992, 106 Stat. 2356, 2357, 2501; Pub. L. 103–35, title II, §§ 202(a)(2), 203(b)(1), May 31, 1993, 107 Stat. 101, 102; Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title II, §§ 232, 243(e), Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1593, 1606; Pub. L. 103–337, div. A, title II, § 233, Oct. 5, 1994, 108 Stat. 2700, specified that such provisions could be cited as the ''Missile Defense Act of 1991'', and related to missile defense goal of United States, implementation of goal, review of follow-on deployment options, definition of term ''ABM Treaty'', and interpretation of such provisions, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 104–106, div. A, title II, § 238, Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 233.

Similar provisions were contained in the following prior authorization act:

Pub. L. 101–510, div. A, title II, § 221, Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1511.

STRETCHOUT OF MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

Pub. L. 100–456, div. A, title I, § 117, Sept. 29, 1988, 102 Stat. 1933, as amended by Pub. L. 104–106, div. D, title XLIII, § 4321(i)(3), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 676, required Secretary of Defense to submit a stretchout impact statement for certain major defense acquisition programs at same time the budget for any fiscal year is submitted to Congress and to submit to Committees on Armed Services of Senate and House of Representatives, no later than Mar. 15, 1989, a report on feasibility and effect of establishing maximum production rates by December 1990 for certain major defense acquisition programs, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 105–85, div. A, title X, § 1041(c), Nov. 18, 1997, 111 Stat. 1885.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH FOREIGN ENTITIES

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 222, Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1055, prohibited use of appropriated funds for certain Strategic Defense Initiative program contracts with foreign entities, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 111–383, div. A, title II, § 222, Jan. 7, 2011, 124 Stat. 4168.

LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MILITARY TECHNOLOGY TO INDEPENDENT STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 223, Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1056, as amended by Pub. L. 103–199, title II, § 203(a)(1), Dec. 17, 1993, 107 Stat. 2321, prohibited the transfer of technology developed with funds appropriated for the Ballistic Missile Defense Program to Russia or any other independent state of the former Soviet Union unless the President certified to Congress that such transfer was in the national interest and was to be made for the purpose of maintaining peace.

SDI ARCHITECTURE TO REQUIRE HUMAN DECISION MAKING

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 224, Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1056, prohibited the Federal Government from funding or otherwise supporting the development of command and control systems for strategic defense in the boost or post-boost phase against ballistic missile threats that would permit such strategic defenses to initiate the directing of damaging or lethal fire except by affirmative human decision at an appropriate level of authority.

PROHIBITION ON DEPLOYMENT OF ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 226, Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1057, prohibited Secretary of Defense from deploying anti-ballistic missile system unless such deployment was specifically authorized by law after Dec. 4, 1987, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 104–106, div. A, title II, § 253(3), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 234.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER TO SUPPORT SDI PROGRAM

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 227, Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1057, authorized the Secretary of Defense, using funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for the Strategic Defense Initiative program, to enter into a contract not to be awarded before Oct. 1, 1989, to provide for the establishment and operation of a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) to

provide independent and objective technical support to the Strategic Defense Initiative program, and provided that no Federal funds could be provided to the new FFRDC after the end of the five-year period beginning on the date of the award of the first contract awarded.

LIMITATION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER FOR STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE PROGRAM

Pub. L. 99–661, div. A, title II, § 213, Nov. 14, 1986, 100 Stat. 3841, prohibited the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending any funds for the purpose of operating a Federally funded research and development center that was established for the support of the Strategic Defense Initiative Program after Nov. 14, 1986, unless the Secretary submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report with respect to such proposed center and funds were specifically authorized to be appropriated for such purpose in an Act other than an appropriations Act or a continuing resolution.

SHOULD-COST ANALYSES

Pub. L. 99–145, title IX, § 915, Nov. 8, 1985, 99 Stat. 688, as amended by Pub. L. 100–26, § 11(a)(2), Apr. 21, 1987, 101 Stat. 288, required Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress an annual report setting forth Secretary's plan for performance during next fiscal year of cost analyses for major defense acquisition programs for purpose of determining how much production of covered systems under such programs should cost, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 101–510, div. A, title XIII, § 1322(d)(2), Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1672.

REQUIREMENT FOR SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATION FOR DEPLOYMENT OF STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 99–145, title II, § 222, Nov. 8, 1985, 99 Stat. 613, provided that strategic defense system developed as consequence of research, development, test, and evaluation conducted on Strategic Defense Initiative program could not be deployed in whole or in part unless President made a certain determination and certification to Congress and funding for deployment of such system was specifically authorized by legislation enacted after date of certification, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 104–106, div. A, title II, § 253(1), Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 234.

ANNUAL REPORT ON BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Pub. L. 101–189, div. A, title II, § 224, Nov. 29, 1989, 103 Stat. 1398, as amended by Pub. L. 103–160, div. A, title II, § 240, Nov. 30, 1993, 107 Stat. 1603; Pub. L. 104–201, div. A, title II, § 244, Sept. 23, 1996, 110 Stat. 2463, provided that not later than March 15 of each year, the Secretary of Defense was to transmit to Congress a report on the programs and projects that constitute the Ballistic Missile Defense program and on any other program or project relating to defense against ballistic missiles, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 106–65, div. A, title X, § 1032(b)(1), Oct. 5, 1999, 113 Stat. 751.

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 231(a), Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1059, provided that not later than Mar. 15, 1988 and Mar. 15, 1989, the Secretary of Defense was to transmit to Congress a report on the programs that constitute the Strategic Defense Initiative and on any other program relating to defense against ballistic missiles.

Pub. L. 98–525, title XI, § 1102, Oct. 19, 1984, 98 Stat. 2580, required Secretary of Defense, at time of his annual budget presentation to Congress beginning with fiscal year 1986 and ending with fiscal year 1990, to transmit to Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of House of Representatives and Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of Senate, a detailed report on programs that constitute SDI, prior to repeal by Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 231(b), Dec. 4, 1987, 101 Stat. 1060.

PLANS FOR MANAGEMENT OF TECHNICAL DATA AND COMPUTER CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENTS

Pub. L. 98–525, title XII, § 1252, Oct. 19, 1984, 98 Stat. 2610, directed Secretary of Defense, not later than one year after Oct. 19, 1984, to develop a plan for an improved system for the management of technical data relating to any major system of the Department of Defense and, not later than 5 years after Oct. 19, 1984, to complete implementation of the management plan, directed Comptroller General, not later than 18 months after Oct. 19, 1984, to transmit to Congress a report evaluating the plan developed, and directed Secretary of Defense, not later than 180 days after Oct. 19, 1984, to transmit to Congress a plan to improve substantially the computer capability of each of the military departments and of the Defense Logistics Agency to store and access rapidly data that is needed for the efficient procurement of supplies.

CONSULTATION WITH ALLIES ON STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE PROGRAM

Pub. L. 98–473, title I, § 101(h) [title VIII, § 8104], Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 1904, 1942, conveyed the sense of Congress that the President should consult with other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, and other appropriate allies concerning the research being conducted in the Strategic Defense Initiative program and that the Secretary of Defense should report the status of such consultations at the time of the submission of annual budget presentation materials for each fiscal year beginning after Sept. 30, 1984.

ANTISATELLITE WEAPONS TEST

Pub. L. 100–180, div. A, title II, § 208, Dec. 4, 1986, 101 Stat. 1048, prohibited the Secretary of Defense, until Oct. 1, 1988, from carrying out a test of the Space Defense System (antisatellite weapon) involving the F–15 launched miniature homing vehicle against an object in space until the President certified to Congress that the Soviet Union had conducted, after Dec. 4, 1987, a test against an object in space of a dedicated antisatellite weapon.

Pub. L. 99–661, div. A, title II, § 231, Nov. 14, 1986, 100 Stat. 3847, prohibited the Secretary of Defense, until Oct. 1, 1987, from carrying out a test of the Space Defense System (anti-satellite weapon) against an object in space until the President certified to Congress that the Soviet Union had conducted, after Nov. 14, 1986, a test against an object in space of a dedicated anti-satellite weapon.

Similar provisions were contained in the following prior acts:

Pub. L. 99–500, § 101(c) [title XI, § 1101], Oct. 18, 1986, 100 Stat. 1783–82, 1783–177, and Pub. L. 99–591, § 101(c) [title XI, § 1101], Oct. 30, 1986, 100 Stat. 3341–82, 3341–177.

Pub. L. 99–190, § 101(b) [title VIII, § 8097], Dec. 19, 1985, 99 Stat. 1185, 1219.

Pub. L. 99–145, title II, § 208(a), (b), Nov. 8, 1985, 99 Stat. 610, prohibited the use of funds to test the miniature homing vehicle (MHV) anti-satellite warhead launched from an F–15 aircraft unless the President made a certification to Congress as provided in section 8100 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1985 (Pub. L. 98–473, title I, § 101(h) [title VIII, § 8100], formerly set out as a note below), and provided that no more than three such tests could be conducted before Oct. 1, 1986.

Pub. L. 98–473, title I, § 101(h) [title VIII, § 8100], Oct. 12, 1984, 98 Stat. 1904, 1941, prohibited the use of funds to test the miniature homing vehicle (MHV) anti-satellite warhead launched from an F–15 aircraft unless the President made a certification to Congress that certain conditions had been satisfied, and provided that no more than three such tests could be conducted during fiscal year 1985.

Similar provisions were contained in the following prior authorization act:

Pub. L. 98–94, title XI, § 1235, Sept. 24, 1983, 97 Stat. 695; as amended by Pub. L. 98–525, title II, § 205, Oct. 19, 1984, 98 Stat. 2509.

EAST COAST TRIDENT BASE AND MX MISSILE SYSTEM SITES; USE OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE; ASSISTANCE TO NEARBY COMMUNITIES TO HELP MEET COSTS OF INCREASED MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Pub. L. 96–418, title VIII, § 802, Oct. 10, 1980, 94 Stat. 1775, as amended by Pub. L. 97–99, title IX, § 904(b), Dec. 23, 1981, 95 Stat. 1382; Pub. L. 98–115, title VIII, § 805, Oct. 11, 1983, 97 Stat. 785; Pub. L. 101–510, div. A, title XIII, § 1322(f), Nov. 5, 1990, 104 Stat. 1672, authorized the Secretary of Defense to assist communities located near MX Missile System sites and the East Coast Trident Base, and the States in which such communities were located, in meeting the increased costs of municipal services and facilities resulting from the construction and operation of the MX Missile System or the East Coast Trident Base.

MX MISSILE AND BASING MODE

Pub. L. 96–342, title II, § 202, Sept. 8, 1980, 94 Stat. 1079, directed the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the development of the MX missile and a Multiple Protective Structure (MPS) basing mode in order to achieve an Initial Operational Capability not later than Dec. 31, 1986.

DEVELOPMENT OF MX MISSILE SYSTEM

Pub. L. 96–29, title II, § 202, June 27, 1979, 93 Stat. 79, directed the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the development of the Multiple Protective Structure (MPS) system concurrently with the development of the MX missile, unless and until the Secretary of Defense certified to the Congress that an alternative basing mode was militarily or technologically superior to, and was more cost effective than, the MPS system or the President informed the Congress that in his view the MPS system was not consistent with United States national security interests.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS OF ACQUISITIONS FOR MAJOR DEFENSE SYSTEMS

Pub. L. 94–106, title VIII, § 811, Oct. 7, 1975, 89 Stat. 539, as amended by Pub. L. 96–107, title VIII, § 809, Nov. 9, 1979, 93 Stat. 815; Pub. L. 97–86, title IX, § 917(e), Dec. 1, 1981, 95 Stat. 1131, which required reports to Congress respecting acquisitions of major defense systems, including total program acquisition unit costs, was repealed by Pub. L. 97–252, title XI, § 1107(b), Sept. 8, 1982, 96 Stat. 746, effective Jan. 1, 1983, as provided in section 1107(c) of Pub. L. 97–252, set out as an Effective Date note under section 2432 of this title. See sections 2432 and 2433 of this title.

TRIDENT SUPPORT SITE, BANGOR, WASHINGTON; FINANCIAL AID TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES; REPORTS

Pub. L. 93–552, title VI, § 608, Dec. 27, 1974, 88 Stat. 1763, authorized the Secretary of Defense to assist communities located near the TRIDENT Support Site in Bangor, Washington, in meeting the increased costs of municipal services and facilities resulting from the construction and operation of the TRIDENT Weapon System, and directed the Secretary to transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives semiannual reports on such assistance provided during the preceding six-month period.

§ 2431a. Acquisition strategy

(a) ACQUISITION STRATEGY REQUIRED.—There shall be an acquisition strategy for each major defense acquisition program, each major automated information system, and each major system approved by a milestone decision authority.

(b) RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL.—For each acquisition strategy required by subsection (a), the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, or the milestone decision authority, when the milestone decision authority is the service acquisition executive of the military department that is managing the program, is responsible for issuing and maintaining the requirements for—

(1) the content of the strategy; and

(2) the review and approval process for the strategy.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—(1) In issuing requirements for the content of an acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program, major automated information system, or major system, the Under Secretary, or the milestone decision authority, when the milestone decision authority is the service acquisition executive of the military department that is managing the program, shall ensure that—

(A) the strategy clearly describes the proposed top-level business and technical management approach for the program or system, in sufficient detail to allow the milestone decision authority to assess the viability of the proposed approach, the method of implementing laws and policies, and program objectives;

(B) the strategy contains a clear explanation of how the strategy is designed to be implemented with available resources, such as time, funding, and management capacity;

(C) the strategy is tailored to address program requirements and constraints; and

(D) the strategy considers the items listed in paragraph (2).

(2) Each strategy shall, where appropriate, consider the following:

(A) An approach that delivers required capability in increments, each depending on available mature technology, and that recognizes up front the need for future capability improvements.

(B) Acquisition approach, including industrial base considerations in accordance with section 2440 of this title.

(C) Risk management, including such methods as competitive prototyping at the system, subsystem, or component level.

(D) Business strategy, including measures to ensure competition at the system and subsystem level throughout the life-cycle of the program or system in accordance with section 2337 of this title.

(E) Contracting strategy, including—

(i) contract type and how the type selected relates to level of program risk in each acquisition phase;

(ii) how the plans for the program or system to reduce risk enable the use of fixed-price elements in subsequent contracts and the timing of the use of those fixed price elements;

(iii) market research; and

(iv) consideration of small business participation.

(F) Intellectual property strategy in accordance with section 2320 of this title.

(G) International involvement, including foreign military sales and cooperative oppor-