

“(B) to ensure that such monitoring capabilities are integrated into the Department of Defense system of cyber defense-in-depth capabilities.

“(5) An update to Committee for National Security Systems Instruction No. 4009, entitled ‘National Information Assurance Glossary’, to include a standard definition for software security assurance.

“(6) Either—

“(A) mechanisms to ensure that vulnerable Mission Assurance Category III information systems, if penetrated, cannot be used as a foundation for penetration of protected covered systems, and means for assessing the effectiveness of such mechanisms; or

“(B) plans to address critical vulnerabilities in Mission Assurance Category III information systems to prevent their use for intrusions of Mission Assurance Category I systems and Mission Assurance Category II systems.

“(7) A funding mechanism for remediation of critical software assurance vulnerabilities in legacy systems.

“(d) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 2011, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives] a report on the strategy required by subsection (a). The report shall include the following:

“(1) A description of the current status of the strategy required by subsection (a) and of the implementation of the strategy, including a description of the role of the strategy in the risk management by the Department regarding the supply chain and in operational planning for cyber security.

“(2) A description of the risks, if any, that the Department will accept in the strategy due to limitations on funds or other applicable constraints.”

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE COMPUTER SECURITY AND INFORMATION PROTECTION

Pub. L. 106-398, § 1 [[div. A], title IX, §921], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-233, provided that:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish an Institute for Defense Computer Security and Information Protection.

“(b) MISSION.—The Secretary shall require the institute—

“(1) to conduct research and technology development that is relevant to foreseeable computer and network security requirements and information assurance requirements of the Department of Defense with a principal focus on areas not being carried out by other organizations in the private or public sector; and

“(2) to facilitate the exchange of information regarding cyberthreats, technology, tools, and other relevant issues.

“(c) CONTRACTOR OPERATION.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract with a not-for-profit entity, or a consortium of not-for-profit entities, to organize and operate the institute. The Secretary shall use competitive procedures for the selection of the contractor to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary.

“(d) FUNDING.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 301(5) [114 Stat. 1654A-52], \$5,000,000 shall be available for the Institute for Defense Computer Security and Information Protection.

“(e) REPORT.—Not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives] the Secretary’s plan for implementing this section.”

§ 2224a. Information security: continued applicability of expiring Governmentwide requirements to the Department of Defense

(a) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of subchapter II¹ of chapter 35 of title 44 shall continue to

apply through September 30, 2004, with respect to the Department of Defense, notwithstanding the expiration of authority under section 3536¹ of such title.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—In administering the provisions of subchapter II¹ of chapter 35 of title 44 with respect to the Department of Defense after the expiration of authority under section 3536¹ of such title, the Secretary of Defense shall perform the duties set forth in that subchapter for the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(Added Pub. L. 107-314, div. A, title X, § 1052(b)(1), Dec. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 2648.)

Editorial Notes

REFERENCES IN TEXT

Provisions relating to the expiration of authority of subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, referred to in text, did not appear in section 3536 of title 44 subsequent to the general revision of subchapter II by Pub. L. 107-296, title X, § 1001(b)(1), Nov. 25, 2002, 116 Stat. 2259. Subchapter II, as revised by Pub. L. 107-296, was repealed and a new subchapter II enacted by Pub. L. 113-283, § 2(a), Dec. 18, 2014, 128 Stat. 3073.

§ 2225. Repealed. Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title VIII, § 833(b)(2)(A), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2284]

Section, added Pub. L. 106-398, § 1 [[div. A], title VIII, § 812(a)(1)], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-212; amended Pub. L. 108-178, § 4(b)(2), Dec. 15, 2003, 117 Stat. 2640; Pub. L. 109-364, div. A, title X, § 1071(a)(2), Oct. 17, 2006, 120 Stat. 2398; Pub. L. 111-350, § 5(b)(6), Jan. 4, 2011, 124 Stat. 3842, related to tracking and management of information technology purchases.

Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION; APPLICABILITY

Pub. L. 106-398, § 1 [[div. A], title VIII, § 812(b)], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-214, which provided that the Secretary of Defense was to collect data as required under section 2225 of this title for all contractual actions covered by such section entered into on or after Oct. 30, 2000, was repealed by Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title VIII, § 833(b)(2)(C)(i), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2284.

GAO REPORT

Pub. L. 106-398, § 1 [[div. A], title VIII, § 812(c)], Oct. 30, 2000, 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A-214, which directed the Comptroller General to submit to committees of Congress a report on the collection of data under this section not later than 15 months after Oct. 30, 2000, was repealed by Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title VIII, § 833(b)(2)(C)(i), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2284.

§ 2226. Renumbered § 4602]

§ 2227. Renumbered § 4601]

§ 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 and Sustainment.

(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 respon-

¹ See References in Text note below.

sible in the Department of Defense to the Secretary of Defense (after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment) for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense.

(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 1731 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.

(6) The Director shall ensure that contractors of the Department of Defense carrying out activities for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense employ for such activities a substantial number of individ-

uals who have completed, or who are currently enrolled in, a qualified training program.

(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;¹

(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; and

(4) require that any training or professional development activities for military personnel or civilian employees of the Department of Defense for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense are conducted under a qualified training program that trains and certifies individuals in meeting corrosion control standards that are recognized industry-wide.

(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.

¹ So in original.

(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 and ending with the budget for fiscal year 2022, 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 estimated composite return on investment achieved by implementing the strategy, and documented in the assessments by the Department of Defense of 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) If the full amount of funding requirements is not requested in the budget, the reasons for not including the full amount and a description of the impact on readiness, logistics, and safety of not fully funding required corrosion prevention and mitigation activities.

(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 program, and other corrosion-related activities.

(2)(A) Each report under this section shall include, in an annex to the report, a summary of the most recent report required by subparagraph (B).

(B) Not later than December 31 of each year, through December 31, 2020, the corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department shall submit to the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight 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. The report required under this subparagraph shall—

(i) provide a summary of key accomplishments, goals, and objectives of the corrosion control and prevention program of the military department; and

(ii) include the performance measures used to ensure that the corrosion control and prevention program achieved the goals and objectives described in clause (i).

(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, vehi-

cles, 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.

(6) The term “qualified training program” means a training program in corrosion control, mitigation, and prevention that is—

(A) offered or accredited by an organization that sets industry corrosion standards; or

(B) an industrial coatings applicator training program registered under the Act of August 16, 1937 (popularly known as the “National Apprenticeship Act”; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.).

(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; Pub. L. 114–328, div. A, title IX, §954(a), (b), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2376, 2377; Pub. L. 115–232, div. A, title VIII, §811(a), Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1845; Pub. L. 116–92, div. A, title VIII, §861(j)(13), title XVII, §1731(a)(32), Dec. 20, 2019, 133 Stat. 1520, 1814; Pub. L. 117–81, div. A, title VIII, §813, Dec. 27, 2021, 135 Stat. 1823.)

Editorial Notes

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The Act of August 16, 1937, referred to in subsec. (f)(6)(B), is act Aug. 16, 1937, ch. 663, 50 Stat. 664, popularly known as the National Apprenticeship Act, which is classified generally to chapter 4C (§50 et seq.) of Title 29, Labor. For complete classification of this Act to the Code, see Short Title note set out under section 50 of Title 29 and Tables.

AMENDMENTS

2021—Subsec. (b)(6). Pub. L. 117–81, §813(1), added par. (6).

Subsec. (c)(4). Pub. L. 117–81, §813(2), added par. (4).

Subsec. (f)(6). Pub. L. 117–81, §813(3), added par. (6).

2019—Subsec. (a)(2). Pub. L. 116–92, §1731(a)(32), struck out second period at end.

Subsec. (a)(4). Pub. L. 116–92, §861(j)(13), substituted “under section 1731 of this title” for “under section 1733(b)(1)(C) of this title”.

2018—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 115–232, §811(a)(1), substituted “and Sustainment” for “, Technology, and Logistics”.

Subsec. (a)(2). Pub. L. 115–232 substituted “and Sustainment” for “, Technology, and Logistics” and struck out “The Director shall report directly to the Under Secretary” after “infrastructure of the Department of Defense.”

2016—Subsec. (e)(1). Pub. L. 114–328, §954(a)(1), inserted “and ending with the budget for fiscal year 2022” after “2009” in introductory provisions.

Subsec. (e)(1)(B). Pub. L. 114-328, § 954(a)(2), amended subpar. (B) generally. Prior to amendment, subpar. (B) read as follows: “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.”

Subsec. (e)(1)(D). Pub. L. 114-328, § 954(a)(3), amended subpar. (D) generally. Prior to amendment, subpar. (D) read as follows: “An explanation if the funding requirements are not fully funded in the budget.”

Subsec. (e)(1)(F). Pub. L. 114-328, § 954(a)(4), struck out “pilot” before “program”.

Subsec. (e)(2). Pub. L. 114-328, § 954(b), designated existing provisions as subpar. (A), substituted “a summary of the most recent report required by subparagraph (B)” for “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).”, and added subpar. (B).

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).

Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

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.

SUBMISSION OF NOTICE AND PLAN TO CONGRESS BEFORE REORGANIZING, RESTRUCTURING, OR ELIMINATING ANY POSITION OR OFFICE

Pub. L. 115-232, div. A, title VIII, § 811(i), Aug. 13, 2018, 132 Stat. 1846, provided that: “Not less than 30 days before reorganizing, restructuring, or eliminating any position or office specified in this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives notice of such reorganization, restructuring, or elimination together with a plan to ensure that mission requirements are met and appropriate oversight is conducted in carrying out such reorganization, restructuring, or elimination. Such plan shall address how user needs will be met and how associated roles and responsibilities will be accomplished for each position or office that the Secretary determines requiring reorganization, restructuring, or elimination.”

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 Government 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. 114-328, div. A, title III, § 322, Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2075, provided that:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 23, 2016], the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight for the Department of Defense, shall revise guidance relating to corrosion control and prevention executives to—

“(1) clarify the role of each such executive with respect to assisting the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight in holding the appropriate project management office in each military department accountable for submitting the annual report required under [former] section 903(b)(5) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 10 U.S.C. 2228 note [set out below]); and

“(2) ensure that corrosion control and prevention executives emphasize the reduction of corrosion and the effects of corrosion on the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense, as required in the long-term strategy of the Department of Defense under section 2228(d) of title 10, United States Code.

“(b) CORROSION CONTROL AND PREVENTION EXECUTIVE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘corrosion control and prevention executive’ means the employee of a military department designated as the corrosion control and prevention executive of the department under section 903(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417; 10 U.S.C. 2228 note).”

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; Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title IX, § 954(c), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2377; Pub. L. 115-91, div. A, title IX, § 924, Dec. 12, 2017, 131 Stat. 1526, 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 a 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. Each individual so designated shall be a senior civilian employee of the military department concerned in pay grade GS-15 or higher.

“(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—Any individual designated as a corrosion control and prevention executive of a military department pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

“(1) have a working knowledge of corrosion prevention and control;

“(2) have strong program management and communication skills; and

“(3) understand the acquisition, research, development, test, and evaluation, and sustainment policies and procedures of the military department, including for the sustainment of infrastructure.

“(c) 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) Repealed. Pub. L. 114-328, div. A, title IX, § 954(c), Dec. 23, 2016, 130 Stat. 2377.]”

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, support for crisis response elements, 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 submit to the congressional defense committees a certification in writing that the prepositioned stocks of each of the military departments meet all operations plans, in both fill and readiness, that are in effect as of the date of the submission of the certification.

(2) If, for any year, the Secretary cannot certify that any of the prepositioned stocks meet such operations plans, the Secretary shall include with the certification for that year a list of the operations plans affected, a description of any measures that have been taken to mitigate any risk associated with prepositioned stock shortfalls, and an anticipated timeframe for the replenishment of the stocks.

(3) A certification under this subsection shall be in an unclassified form but may have a classified annex.

(Added Pub. L. 109-364, div. A, title III, §351(a), Oct. 17, 2006, 120 Stat. 2160; amended Pub. L. 112-81, div. A, title III, §341(a), Dec. 31, 2011, 125 Stat. 1369; Pub. L. 113-66, div. A, title III, §321(a), Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 730; Pub. L. 113-291, div. A, title III, §322, Dec. 19, 2014, 128 Stat. 3343; Pub. L. 114-92, div. A, title X, §1081(a)(8), Nov. 25, 2015, 129 Stat. 1001.)

Editorial Notes

AMENDMENTS

2015—Subsec. (d)(1). Pub. L. 114-92 substituted “a certification in writing” for “certification in writing”.

2014—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 113-291 inserted “support for crisis response elements,” after “service requirements.”

2013—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 113-66 amended subsec. (a) generally. Prior to amendment, text read as follows: “The Secretary of Defense shall maintain a strategic policy on the programs of the Department of Defense for the prepositioning of materiel and equipment. Such policy shall take into account national security threats, strategic mobility, service requirements, and the requirements of the combatant commands.”

2011—Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 112-81 added subsec. (d).

Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries

TERMINATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

For termination, effective Dec. 31, 2021, of provisions in subsec. (d) of this section requiring submittal of annual report to Congress, see section 1061 of Pub. L. 114-328, set out as a note under section 111 of this title.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND REPORT

Pub. L. 113-66, div. A, title III, §321(b), (c), Dec. 26, 2013, 127 Stat. 731, 732, as amended by Pub. L. 113-291, div. A, title III, §324, Dec. 19, 2014, 128 Stat. 3343, provided that:

“(b) **IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act [Dec. 26, 2013], the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees [Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives] a plan for implementation of the prepositioning strategic policy required under section 2229(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a).

“(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The implementation plan required under paragraph (1) shall include the following elements: