



Defense Budget: The Storied Unfunded Priorities Lists

Elaine McCusker and John G. Ferrari

April 2023

Key Points

- Congress requires select uniformed and civilian leaders in the Pentagon to submit unfunded priority lists (UPLs) each year shortly after the president's budget is released. In performing its constitutional responsibilities, Congress uses the UPLs, as the best judgment and advice of senior leaders, to understand risk inherent in the defense budget.
- This year's UPLs total \$16.9 billion and are notable in part for what they do not include: requests for assistance in addressing inflation that was not part of the budget request.
- As in previous years, investment accounts continue to dominate the UPLs, providing continuing evidence that defense needs both capacity and capability to perform its missions.

As required by law, the chiefs of the military departments, combatant commands, and selected staff in the Office of the Secretary of Defense are required to submit unfunded priority lists (UPLs) directly to Congress for consideration as Congress develops the fiscal year (FY) 2024 appropriations and authorization legislation.

It is particularly useful this year to examine the content, size, and appropriateness of these lists, as they raise an interesting issue about the unique nature of national defense in the overall federal government mission and budget. In this report, we will cover key points for the debate about the requirement for UPLs and provide themes and highlights of interest in the FY2024 submissions.¹

Requirement for the UPLs

A group of lawmakers sent a letter to the secretary of defense earlier this year asking him to limit UPLs, something he is not actually permitted to do.² This letter, the

subsequent discussion during posture hearings, and a letter from the Department of Defense (DOD) comptroller to the Hill on the matter illuminate congressional disagreement about the lists Congress has required the DOD's uniformed leadership to submit.³

Setting aside for now the quality of the lists and the eventual execution of programs on the lists for which Congress appropriates funds, it is worth examining two key questions: Should Congress require senior uniformed personnel to directly convey their best military judgment on risk in the defense budget through submission of UPLs? And should it require such lists only from defense leaders?

To answer these questions, there are two fundamental points to consider. First, do congressional responsibilities to authorize and appropriate funds benefit from, and in fact require, advice directly from senior military leaders? Second, is the DOD like every other federal department?

Article I, Section 9 of the US Constitution stipulates that “no Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.”⁴ In shorthand, this gives Congress the “power of the purse.” Given the immense size and complexity of the federal government, Congress needs as much insight, advice, and access to quality program information as possible to make wise decisions on the appropriation of taxpayer funds for national priorities.

Additionally, the Constitution gives Congress the power to raise armies and maintain the Navy while making the president commander in chief. To assist Congress in its constitutional role, during confirmation for their position, every senior military leader is asked if they will present Congress with their best professional military judgment, even if their judgment does not agree with that of the president. It is assumed that if a senior military leader said “no” to this question, they would not be confirmed. During the development of annual budgets, executive branch officials benefit from the military’s advice. It appears that Congress, by directing submission of the UPLs in statute, believes it needs this advice directly as well, particularly when it decides the president’s budget request is too low.

Additionally, defense is the federal government’s only mandatory and exclusive job. It should not be *a* priority; it should be *the* priority. DOD is not like every other federal department. As such, conveying the risk inherent in a proposed budget should include those closest to it, and not just those political appointees charged with defending the president’s budget.

In support of its fundamental constitutional responsibility and in recognition of the foundational and unique function of national defense, Congress requested through a sense of Congress resolution, and then mandated through Section 1003 of the FY2013 National Defense Authorization Act, that senior military commanders directly provide their unfunded requirements.⁵ It was not intended or expected that these requirements would represent a full strategic perspective, as they were to be developed at a combatant command or military department (chief of service) level and specifically submitted without the Pentagon headquarters-level viewpoint on them.

In fact, the legislation specifically indicates that the UPL report contain unfunded priorities “under the jurisdiction” or command of the officer directed

to submit it and that requirements conveyed are “necessary to fulfill a requirement associated with an operational or contingency plan of a combatant command or other validated requirement.”⁶ The lists are specifically not meant to be vetted through the department-wide lens, and they are often not even seen by the DOD leadership until after they are submitted to Congress.

It is obvious why the Pentagon leadership is not fond of UPLs. After working for months on analysis and evaluation of the department’s programs and budget in context of the overall strategy, negotiating for the best possible defense topline, and then submitting that budget to Congress, the immediate submission of a long list of unfunded priorities seems to counter all that work and, in some cases, even undermine it.

The Pentagon’s budget, as with any budget, is not without strategic, operational, and tactical risk. This is risk that military commanders charged with training, equipping, and employing the force each understand from their own perspective.

Though there is an inherent awkwardness to these perspectives being shared directly with Congress, they also provide important context on the budget and necessary advice to Congress in performing its fundamental role. Whether these lists should have been extended to combatant commanders, the undersecretary for research and engineering, and others is an interesting question, but it’s ultimately a question only Congress itself can answer—and it has. At any time, Congress may repeal the requirement or reduce the list by changing the legislation. Though soliciting views on the value of any statute or piece of legislation is part of the process, for members of Congress to pressure the DOD or the military to disregard the law is not appropriate.

As to the question of the quality of the UPL and what happens in execution to the unfunded priorities Congress decides to fund, Congress should look at this. In fact, expressing concern about the use of funds provided for unfunded priorities, Congress has already directed the DOD to not only include updated requirements and programmatic and execution plans for unfunded requirements previously supported with the budget submission but also incorporate execution data for appropriations provided in the previous three fiscal years for unfunded requirements.

Table 1. Service and Command Breakouts

Service and Command	2023 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2023 Percentage of Total	2024 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2024 Percentage of Total	Change Between 2024 and 2023
Marine Corps	\$3,477.5	16.2%	\$3,671.9	21.7%	\$194.4
INDOPACOM	\$1,509.0	7.0%	\$3,481.0	20.6%	\$1,972.0
Navy	\$4,020.0	18.7%	\$2,533.8	15.0%	(\$1,486.2)
Air Force	\$4,613.4	21.5%	\$2,452.5	14.5%	(\$2,160.9)
Army	\$5,120.7	23.9%	\$1,930.4	11.4%	(\$3,190.3)
SOCOM	\$656.3	3.1%	\$847.3	5.0%	\$191.0
Space Force	\$638.1	3.0%	\$477.3	2.8%	(\$160.8)
AFRICOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$397.8	2.4%	\$397.8
NORTHCOM	\$135.0	0.6%	\$376.7	2.2%	\$241.7
CENTCOM	\$35.0	0.2%	\$278.8	1.7%	\$243.8
SOUTHCOM	\$267.9	1.2%	\$278.3	1.6%	\$10.4
EUCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$159.5	0.9%	\$159.5
CYBERCOM	\$236.0	1.1%	\$0.0	0.0%	(\$236.0)
MDA	\$748.0	3.5%	\$0.0	0.0%	(\$748.0)
Grand Total	\$21,456.9		\$16,885.4		(\$4,571.5)

Note: SOCOM is US Special Operations Command, AFRICOM is US Africa Command, NORTHCOM is US Northern Command, CENTCOM is US Central Command, SOUTHCOM is US Southern Command, EUCOM is US European Command, CYBERCOM is US Cyber Command, and MDA is Military Defense Agency.

Source: Authors' calculations based off fiscal year 2023 and 2024 unfunded priority lists.

2024 Unfunded Priorities

While the DOD was finalizing its negotiations with the Office of Management and Budget on the defense topline and locking down the details of its FY2024 request late last year, we noted that strategic priorities combined with realistic inflationary projections pointed to a topline requirement of at least \$882 billion.⁷ It is not surprising that UPLs submitted to date illustrate a shortfall of \$16.9 billion in the \$842 billion budget President Joe Biden requested for defense. The FY2024 UPL is currently \$4.5 billion less than the FY2023 list, but it is important to note that Congress added \$45 billion to last year's president's budget request and that the FY2024 lists do not yet include submissions from the Missile Defense Agency and US Cyber Command. Table 1 depicts the breakout by component, comparing the FY2024 and FY2023 UPLs.

What is surprising is that the UPLs do not include what will be necessary budget adjustments to account for realistic inflation projections, which will require at least another \$21 billion to keep the budget equal in

buying power to the start of FY2021 in September 2020. Table 2 depicts the potential growth in inflation over the next 19 months (March 2023–September 2024). While some may argue over what the best inflation rate is to actually manage DOD, the Producer Price Index recently added inflation for defense goods, and it is actually higher than the Consumer Price Index.

There are three general observations when analyzing the 2024 UPLs: (1) Investment accounts continue to dominate the lists; (2) the Army list is perplexing, particularly given it was the military department with the least support in the president's budget; and (3) there are no unfunded requirements listed related to inflation.

Detailed Analysis

This year, as is shown in Table 3, the investment accounts dominate the lists, with procurement making up more than 40 percent of total shortfalls reported. This is reflective of years of neglecting procurement, the continued Pentagon strategy of divesting to invest, and reliance on Congress to make up shortfalls in procurement

Table 2. Inflation and Lost Buying Power

US Consumer Price Index Four-Year Potential Inflation	Percentage
Consumer Price Index Inflation September 2020–February 2023	15.58%
Potential Inflation March 2023–September 2023	2.50%
Potential Inflation October 2023–September 2024	4.50%
Potential Four-Year Inflation September 2020–September 2024	22.58%
Defense Four-Year Topline	US Dollars (Billions)
FY2021 Enacted (Started October 2020)	\$703.7
President's Budget 2024 (Ends September 2024)	\$842.0
Percentage Growth in Topline from FY2021 Start	19.65%
Delta Potential Inflation vs. Topline Growth	–2.93%
Dollars in Lost Buying Power	(\$20.60)

Source: Authors' analysis of US Department of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), "DoD Budget Request," <https://comptroller.defense.gov/Budget-Materials>; and US Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI Inflation Calculator, https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

Table 3. Appropriation Category Breakout

Appropriation Category	2023 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2023 Percentage of Total	2024 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2024 Percentage of Total	Dollar Change Between 2024 and 2023
Investments	\$17,050.3	79.5%	\$13,974.1	82.8%	(\$3,076.2)
Procurement	\$11,359.5	52.9%	\$7,120.1	42.2%	(\$4,239.4)
Infrastructure	\$3,805.6	17.7%	\$3,415.3	20.2%	(\$390.3)
RDTE	\$1,885.2	8.8%	\$3,438.8	20.4%	\$1,553.6
Operations and Maintenance	\$4,406.5	20.5%	\$2,911.3	17.2%	(\$1,495.2)
Total	\$21,456.8		\$16,885.4		(\$4,571.4)

Source: Authors' calculations based off fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

accounts. It also continues the puzzling trend noted last year that no amount of research, development, test, and evaluation (RDTE) seems to be enough.

Procurement. At the \$7.1 billion seen in Table 4, more than 40 percent of the UPL is made up of shortfalls in procurement with the Marine Corps \$2.8 billion requirement, comprising nearly 40 percent of that total. It should be noted that when combined with RDTE and construction, both also investment accounts, over 83 percent of the ask list is for long-term investments, signaling a greater need for both capacity and capability.

The budget request did not include procurement of amphibious ships for the Marines, which—despite the political leadership's good attempt at giving talking points about a strategic pause and reevaluating the design—was an immediate red flag in briefings and a

concern in Congress.⁸ In fact, during a press discussion on the budget, Navy Under Secretary Erik Raven said that the Navy would continue working with Congress to determine amphibious warship numbers and capabilities, which sounds like code for relying on Congress to fix the Navy budget.⁹ So it is not a shock to see an amphibious transport dock (LPD-17 Flight II) on the Marine Corps UPL, the highest single dollar-value unfunded requirement in any of the lists.

Other notable items on the procurement unfunded lists include purchase of long-lead capabilities to accelerate delivery of two E-7 early warning and control aircraft, two additional KC-130J aircraft, enhanced Abrams tanks, Joint Light Tactical Vehicles and trailers, long-range radars, and acceleration of the surface electronic warfare improvement capability for three ships (two carriers and a destroyer). Though the UPLs contain aviation requirements this year, the request for

Table 4. Procurement Breakout

Service and Command	2023 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2023 Percentage of Total	2024 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2024 Percentage of Total	Dollar Change Between 2024 and 2023
Marine Corps	\$2,780.1	24.5%	\$2,804.7	39.4%	\$24.6
Army	\$2,584.9	22.8%	\$1,064.0	14.9%	(\$1,520.9)
Air Force	\$2,110.5	18.6%	\$1,058.6	14.9%	(\$1,051.9)
Navy	\$2,176.6	19.2%	\$967.6	13.6%	(\$1,209.0)
INDOPACOM	\$496.4	4.4%	\$333.0	4.7%	(\$163.4)
SOCOM	\$426.3	3.8%	\$301.0	4.2%	(\$125.3)
NORTHCOM	\$34.9	0.3%	\$262.8	3.7%	\$227.9
CENTCOM	\$35.0	0.3%	\$123.8	1.7%	\$88.8
EUCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$114.9	1.6%	\$114.9
AFRICOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$46.9	0.7%	\$46.9
Space Force	\$526.5	4.6%	\$36.3	0.5%	(\$490.2)
SOUTHCOM	\$188.4	1.7%	\$6.6	0.1%	(\$181.8)
Total	\$11,359.6		\$7,120.1		(\$4,239.5)

Note: SOCOM is US Special Operations Command, AFRICOM is US Africa Command, NORTHCOM is US Northern Command, CENTCOM is US Central Command, SOUTHCOM is US Southern Command, and EUCOM is US European Command.

Source: Authors' calculations based off fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

Table 5. RDTE Breakout

Service and Command	2023 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2023 Percentage of Total	2024 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2024 Percentage of Total	Dollar Change Between 2024 and 2023
INDOPACOM	\$322.4	17.1%	\$2,117.9	61.6%	\$1,795.5
Space Force	\$0.0	0.0%	\$441.0	12.8%	\$441.0
SOCOM	\$66.3	3.5%	\$235.7	6.9%	\$169.4
Navy	\$283.4	15.0%	\$196.3	5.7%	(\$87.1)
Army	\$69.0	3.7%	\$117.6	3.4%	\$48.6
Marine Corps	\$83.2	4.4%	\$109.6	3.2%	\$26.4
NORTHCOM	\$50.9	2.7%	\$101.8	3.0%	\$50.9
Air Force	\$262.0	13.9%	\$90.7	2.6%	(\$171.3)
SOUTHCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$28.1	0.8%	\$28.1
MDA	\$748.0	39.7%	\$0.0	0.0%	(\$748.0)
Total	\$1,885.2		\$3,438.8		\$1,553.6

Note: SOCOM is US Special Operations Command, NORTHCOM is US Northern Command, SOUTHCOM is US Southern Command, and MDA is Military Defense Agency.

Source: Authors' calculations based off fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

these items is not as significant as it was last year, so it is not highlighted here.

RDTE. It is noteworthy that the list includes \$3.4 billion in RDTE shortfalls when the 2024 president's budget

again touts the largest request for these activities in history. This request is also remarkable in that it is almost \$1.5 billion more than in 2023, as seen in Table 5. Shortfalls listed by the US Indo-Pacific Command (INDOPACOM) dominate this list, with \$2.1 billion in asks for

Table 6. Military Construction Breakout

Service and Command	2023 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2023 Percentage of Total	2024 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2024 Percentage of Total	Dollar Change Between 2024 and 2023
Air Force	\$1,146.1	30.1%	\$1,223.4	35.8%	\$77.3
Marine Corps	\$614.2	16.1%	\$757.6	22.2%	\$143.4
Army	\$1,777.9	46.7%	\$635.9	18.6%	(\$1,142.0)
Navy	\$144.9	3.8%	\$511.3	15.0%	\$366.4
SOCOM	\$24.6	0.6%	\$149.1	4.4%	\$124.5
INDOPACOM	\$47.6	1.3%	\$131.0	3.8%	\$83.4
NORTHCOM	\$49.3	1.3%	\$7.0	0.2%	(\$42.3)
SOUTHCOM	\$1.0	0.0%	\$0.0	0.0%	(\$1.0)
Total	\$3,805.6		\$3,415.3		(\$390.3)

Note: SOCOM is US Special Operations Command, NORTHCOM is US Northern Command, and SOUTHCOM is US Southern Command.
Source: Authors' calculations based off fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

Table 7. Service Requests

Service	FY2022 Actuals	FY2023 Enacted	President's Budget 2024	Delta President's Budget 2024 to FY2022 Actuals
Army	\$180.0	\$184.9	\$185.3	\$5.3
Navy and Marine Corps	\$221.2	\$243.0	\$255.8	\$34.6
Air Force and Space Force	\$221.4	\$246.8	\$259.2	\$37.8
Defense Wide	\$119.6	\$141.3	\$141.7	\$22.1
Total	\$742.2	\$816.0	\$842.0	\$99.8

Source: Authors' analysis of US Department of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), "DoD Budget Request," <https://comptroller.defense.gov/Budget-Materials>.

maritime and precision strike capabilities, space control, missile defense, joint fires, and the Navy standard missile variant.

Military Construction. Military construction remains nearly constant on the lists as compared to last year. The mystery here is with the Army, which appears to be the only service to cut its unfunded construction request. Given the Army's recent publicity about mold in barracks and a substantial construction deficit, one has to wonder why the Army has more than \$1 billion less on its list this year to fix these big facility problems (Table 6).¹⁰

What's Going on with the Army? From an organizational perspective, the largest ask by component this year is from the Marine Corps (primarily driven by

the amphibious procurement shortfall); followed by INDOPACOM, which typically has a long list of asks; and then the Navy, Air Force, and Army. Interestingly, though the Army received barely a nominal increase in the 2024 president's budget (less than \$500 million over the FY2023 base budget enacted), it also has the smallest UPL among the military departments, listing only \$1.9 billion in priority requirement gaps, as Table 7 shows. Most of that amount would go to the Abrams and Apache systems, the completion of construction projects, and INDOPACOM "campaigning" activities.

What's Missing? Inflation. The UPLs do not address inflation shortfalls. This will be the biggest near-term problem for the operations and maintenance (O&M) accounts that were already burdened with lost buying

Table 8. Readiness, O&M, and Defense Security Cooperation Agency Breakout

Service and Command	2023 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2023 Percentage of Total	2024 UPL Dollars (Millions)	2024 Percentage of Total	Dollar Change Between 2024 and 2023
INDOPACOM	\$642.6	14.6%	\$899.1	30.9%	\$256.5
Navy	\$1,415.1	32.1%	\$858.5	29.5%	(\$556.6)
AFRICOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$350.9	12.1%	\$350.9
SOUTHCOM	\$78.5	1.8%	\$243.6	8.4%	\$165.1
SOCOM	\$139.0	3.2%	\$161.5	5.5%	\$22.5
CENTCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$155.0	5.3%	\$155.0
Army	\$688.9	15.6%	\$112.9	3.9%	(\$576.0)
Air Force	\$1,094.8	24.8%	\$79.8	2.7%	(\$1,015.0)
EUCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$44.6	1.5%	\$44.6
NORTHCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$5.2	0.2%	\$5.2
CYBERCOM	\$236.0	5.4%	\$0.0	0.0%	(\$236.0)
Space Force	\$111.6	2.5%	\$0.0	0.0%	(\$111.6)
Total	\$4,406.5		\$2,911.3		(\$1,495.2)

Note: SOCOM is US Special Operations Command, AFRICOM is US Africa Command, NORTHCOM is US Northern Command, CENTCOM is US Central Command, SOUTHCOM is US Southern Command, EUCOM is US European Command, and CYBERCOM is US Cyber Command.
Source: Authors' calculations based off fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

power during the FY2023 continuing resolution period and inflation costs even above what Congress supported with the final FY2023 enacted defense budget of \$816 billion.¹¹ In fact, the O&M UPL displayed in Table 8 totals only \$2.6 billion and—except for US Africa Command intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance and presence requirements; two large Navy lines for dry dock repairs and facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization; and one huge INDOPACOM line for “campaigning”—include 57 mostly small combatant command requirements.

Table 8 also includes programs and activities we have categorized under the Defense Security Cooperation Agency as the combined combatant command request for such partner engagement efforts, which supports readiness and interoperability and is \$284 million on the FY2024 lists.

Conclusion

While respectful debate on issues like the role of UPLs in the budget process is useful, as is respective discourse

on nearly any subject, it seems clear that the direct military advice conveyed in the annual shortfalls lists is appropriate and useful for Congress in performing its fundamental duties. DOD is not like every other federal department, and its uniformed leaders should continue to convey their best judgment on budget risk, even if it is at times awkward for those who have determined—and are defending—the submitted request.

The 2024 UPLs tell a useful story about targeted areas of risk, though they neglect to convey the rapidly inbound budget gap that will result from inflation rates well above those assumed in the budget request. In reviewing these funding gaps, it is important that Congress also keep a keen eye on the clock.¹² The work the DOD has done to develop and present a budget combined with the advice contained in these unfunded lists will not mean much if time and money are again wasted this fall under damaging continuing resolutions.¹³

About the Authors

Elaine McCusker is a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, where she focuses on defense strategy, budget, and innovation; the US military; and national security. She was previously acting under secretary of defense comptroller and has a background in defense planning and budgeting, military campaign assessments, defense data analytics, contingency operations, and science and technology.

John G. Ferrari is a nonresident senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, where his work focuses on the defense budget, defense reform and acquisition, and the US military. Ferrari is a retired major general and former director of program analysis and evaluation for the Army.

Appendix

Table A1. Military Construction Breakout (US Dollars, Millions)

Army	
Army National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	\$16.4
Army Reserve Center Located on US Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia	\$40.0
Automated Multipurpose Machine-Gun Range, Camp Blanding, Florida	\$11.0
Cost-to-Complete (C2C) Active Army	\$122.2
C2C Army National Guard	\$134.9
C2C Army Reserve	\$23.0
Multipurpose Athletic Field, Fort Polk, Louisiana	\$13.4
National Guard Readiness Center, New York	\$90.0
Network Enterprise Center, Fort Hunter Liggett, California	\$40.0
Organic Industrial Base Modernization Planning and Design	\$4.2
Planning and Design Military Construction Projects Active Army	\$34.7
Planning and Design Military Construction Projects Army National Guard	\$13.1
Water System Upgrade Projects, Hawaii	\$93.0
Subtotal	\$635.9
Indo-Pacific Command	
Military Construction—Construction	\$62.0
Military Construction—Design	\$69.0
Subtotal	\$131.0
Navy	
MCON-D (Utilities Military Construction)	\$85.0
P215 Electromagnetic and Cyber Countermeasures Lab, Navy Research Laboratory (NRL) Production and Deployment (P&D)	\$40.0
P286 Advanced Helicopter Training System (AHTS) Hangar, Whiting Field, Florida	\$141.5
P33 Electrical Power Plant, Camp Lemonnier, Djibouti	\$106.6
P758 Artificial Intelligence Machinery Control Development Center, Naval Special Warfare Command, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	\$88.2
P823 Alternative Power Transmission Line, Naval Submarine Base (NSB), Bangor, Washington	\$19.0
P982 Armored Fighting Vehicle Support Facility, NSB, Bangor, Washington	\$31.0
Subtotal	\$511.3
Northern Command	
Arctic Campaigning Infrastructure in Greenland, Thule Air Force Base	\$7.0
Subtotal	\$7.0
Special Operations Command	
C2C Special Operations Forces (SOF) Advanced Training Command (ATC) Operations Support Facility (P-951)	\$11.4
SOF Human Performance Training Center, Baumholder	\$16.7
SOF Marine Raider Battalion Operations Facility (P1550), Camp Lejeune	\$70.0
SOF Naval Special Warfare Command Operations Support Facility Phase 2	\$51.0
Subtotal	\$149.1

(continued on next page)

(Table A1 continued from previous page)

Table A1. Military Construction Breakout (US Dollars, Millions)

Air Force	
307 Bomber Wing (BW) Medical Facility Addition	\$7.0
91 Cyber Operations Center	\$48.0
Addition and Alteration (ADAL) Alert Crew Facility Hangar 18	\$7.0
Basic Military Training (BMT)—Chapel for America's Airmen	\$122.0
BMT—Classrooms and Dining Facility 4	\$124.0
C2C: Consolidated Helicopter/Tactical Response Force (TRF) Ops/Aircraft Maintenance Unit (AMU) and Alert Facility	\$18.0
C2C: European Deterrence Initiative (EDI) Munitions Holding Area	\$20.0
C2C: EDI-Construct Deployable Airbase Systems—Facilities, Equipment, and Vehicles (DABS-FEV) Storage	\$28.0
C2C: Wyoming Gate Upgrade for Antiterrorism Compliance	\$24.4
Construct Fire Station Bay and Storage Area	\$10.3
Dining Hall and Services Training Facility	\$27.0
Entry Control Facility	\$8.0
F-35 Composite and Repair and Training Facility, Phase 1	\$171.0
F-35 Maintenance Facility, Phase 1	\$235.0
F-35 Facility B701	\$5.2
Guardian Angel Preservation of the Force and Family (POTFF) Facility	\$8.5
Improve Family Housing Post Acquisition Improvement Program (PAIP) 9, Phase 1 (24 Units)	\$27.0
Large Vehicle Inspection Station	\$50.0
Natural Disaster Recovery (Offut, Tyndall, Langley)	\$252.0
Special Tactics Complex, Phase 3	\$20.0
Special Tactics Complex, Phase 4	\$11.0
Subtotal	\$1,223.4
Marine Corps	
P100 Unspecified Minor Construction	\$30.0
P101 US Marine Corps Military Construction Planning and Design	\$48.7
P1499 Corrosion Repair Facility Replacement, Marine Corps Base (MCB) Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	\$92.5
P1546 Amphibious Combat Vehicle Shelters, MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	\$31.9
P1556 10th Marines Operations and Maintenance Complex, MCB Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	\$91.3
P258 2nd Low Altitude Air Defense (LAAD) Maintenance and Operations Facilities, Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Cherry Point, North Carolina	\$145.0
P521 Fire and Emergency Response Station (53 Area) Replacement, MCB Camp Pendleton	\$26.8
P875 Water Reclamation Facility Compliance Upgrade, MCB Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii	\$227.4
P982 Consolidated Communication Facility, Marine Corps Logistics Base (MCLB) Albany, Georgia	\$64.0
Subtotal	\$757.6
Total	\$3,415.3

Source: Authors' calculations based off consolidation of fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

Table A2. Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Breakout (US Dollars, Millions)

Africa Command		
Procurement	Enterprise Command and Control (C2) Network Resiliency on the African Continent	\$10.0
	Somalia Persistent Presence (2 of 2)	\$36.9
	Subtotal	\$46.9
Army		
Procurement	Abrams System Enhancement Program Version 3 (SEPV3) Procurement	\$533.0
	Apache (AH-64E) Replacement	\$121.0
	Blackhawk (HH-60M) Replacement	\$62.1
	High-Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) Anti-Lock Braking and Electronic Stability Control	\$47.5
	Integrated Air and Missile Defense Battle Command System	\$77.0
	Integrated Visual Augmentation Procurement	\$98.0
	Maneuver-Short Range Air Defense Increment 1	\$22.7
	Trojan Special Purpose Integrated Remote Intelligence Terminal	\$81.2
	Water Intake Pump Upgrades, Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia	\$21.5
	Subtotal	\$1,064.0
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	AH-64E Apache New Generator	\$35.0
	Air-Launched Effects Acceleration	\$39.0
	Integrated Visual Augmentation Development	\$22.4
	Maneuver Support Vessel, Heavy, Army Watercraft	\$21.2
	Subtotal	\$117.6
Central Command		
Procurement	Expeditionary Airfield Basing Assets for Prepositioned Equipment Set	\$82.2
	Globally Positioned Network for Prepositioned Equipment Set	\$16.0
	War Reserve Materiel (WRM) Equipment/Secondary Items (Fuel Support Equipment) for Prepositioned Equipment Set	\$25.6
	Subtotal	\$123.8
European Command		
Procurement	European Deterrence Initiative (EDI) Improved Infrastructure 1 of 2 for Communications	\$48.4
	European Command Air Base Defense 1 of 2 for Sensors, Launchers, and Command and Control Capabilities	\$66.5
	Subtotal	\$114.9
Indo-Pacific Command		
Procurement	Hammerhead Mine (US Navy) (2 of 2)	\$36.2
	Persistent Targeting for Undersea	\$117.0
	Powered Quickstrike (US Navy) (2 of 2)	\$46.4
	Precision Strike Missile Increment 2 (US Army) and Increment 4 (US Army) (2 of 2)	\$30.2
	Resilient Top Secret–Sensitive Compartmented Information (TS-SCI) Warfighting Architecture (2 of 3)	\$23.4
	Standard Missile 1B Variant (US Navy) (2 of 2)	\$79.8
	Subtotal	\$333.0

(continued on next page)

(Table A2 continued from previous page)

Table A2. Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Breakout (US Dollars, Millions)

Indo-Pacific Command		
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	All Domain Missile Warning and Missile Tracking Architecture	\$108.0
	Clandestine Delivered Mine (US Navy)	\$2.0
	Cybersecurity and Network Defenses	\$90.0
	Guam Defense System Missile Defense	\$147.0
	Hammerhead Mine (US Navy) (1 of 2)	\$17.8
	Joint Experimentation and Innovation (1 of 2)	\$10.0
	Joint Fires Network	\$174.0
	Maritime Strike Tomahawk Land-Attack Missile (TLAM) (US Army)	\$395.0
	Maritime Strike TLAM (US Marine Corps)	\$98.0
	Offensive Cyber—Access and Effects	\$184.0
	Operationalize Near-Term Space Control	\$275.0
	Powered Quickstrike (US Navy) (1 of 2)	\$38.6
	Precision Strike Missile Increment 2 (US Army) and Increment 4 (US Army) (1 of 2)	\$120.8
	Resilient TS-SCI Warfighting Architecture (1 of 3)	\$37.5
	Space-Based Persistent Custody Sensors	\$143.0
	Standard Missile 1B Variant (US Navy) (1 of 2)	\$277.2
Subtotal		\$2,117.9
Navy		
Procurement	APN-6 Spares	\$175.0
	CVN 75 and CVN 80 Surface Electronic-Warfare Improvement Program (SEWIP) Block (BLK) III	\$264.0
	DDG-51 SEWIP BLK III (DDG-136-137)	\$208.1
	Navy Unique Fleet Essential Airlift Logistics KC-130J (+1 Active Component (A/C) and Reserves)	\$118.8
	OPN-8 Maritime Spares	\$100.0
	VIOLET (2 of 3)	\$8.5
	Zumwalt Enterprise Upgrade Solution (ZEUS) for DDG-1000 Class (2 of 2)	\$93.2
Subtotal		\$967.6
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	E-2D Theater Combat Identification (ID) and Hawkeye Cockpit Technical Refresh (HECTR)	\$49.3
	Maritime Targeting Cell Afloat (MTC-A) Development	\$45.3
	VIOLET (3 of 3)	\$8.5
	ZEUS for DDG-1000 Class (1 of 2)	\$93.2
Subtotal		\$196.3
Northern Command		
Procurement	Core Technology Investment for Data Sharing and Collaboration	\$13.9
	Modernize Homeland Defense Communications System Infrastructure	\$4.2
	Modernize National Capital Region (NCR) Domain Awareness (Enhanced Regional Situational Awareness) Camera System	\$33.2
	Three-Dimensional Expeditionary Long-Range Radars Procure 9	\$211.5
	Subtotal	\$262.8
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	Archer Passive Sensor Transition, Shelter, Communications, and Software	\$27.0
	Arctic Capable Prepositioned Shelters Design for –65 Degrees	\$10.0
	Domain Awareness Technology Development—Sensor Demonstration	\$9.8
	Over-the-Horizon Radar Capability Acceleration Test Bed and Development	\$55.0
Subtotal		\$101.8

(continued on next page)

(Table A2 continued from previous page)

Table A2. Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Breakout (US Dollars, Millions)

Special Operations Command		
Procurement	AC-130J Formal Training Unit Temporary Squadron Operational Facility	\$14.0
	Counter Uncrewed Aerial Systems Group 3 Defeat Acceleration (2 of 3)	\$49.9
	Maritime Precision-Strike Munition Accelerated Fielding	\$10.9
	MH-47G Block II Production Contract Funding Shortfall	\$108.0
	Next-Generation Battlefield Awareness Head Mounted Observation Systems (1 of 2)	\$15.3
	Seal Delivery Vehicle Sonar Payload for Subsea Seabed Acceleration	\$13.5
	Small Unmanned Systems Acceleration (1 of 2)	\$33.1
	Special Operations Forces (SOF) Enterprise Data Layer and SOF Enterprise Platform (2 of 2)	\$25.0
	Unmanned Systems (UxS) Autonomy Acceleration (2 of 3)	\$22.5
	United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) Next-Generation Tactical Communication High-Frequency (HF) Radio Modernization	\$5.0
	Zero-Trust Architecture Compliance Acceleration (2 of 2)	\$3.8
	Subtotal	\$301.0
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	Adaptive Airborne Enterprise	\$93.1
	Counter Uncrewed Aerial Systems Group 3 Defeat Acceleration (1 of 3)	\$11.3
	Female Body-Armor Development and Modernization (2 of 2)	\$10.0
	Ground Organic Precision Strike System Aerial Loitering Munitions Acceleration	\$5.0
	Next-Generation Blue Force Tracker	\$5.9
	Project Apollo	\$18.0
	Small Unmanned Systems Acceleration (2 of 2)	\$1.2
	SOF Enterprise Data Layer and SOF Enterprise Platform (1 of 2)	\$45.0
	Unmanned Systems Autonomy Acceleration (1 of 3)	\$46.4
	Subtotal	\$235.7
Southern Command		
Procurement	Airborne Long-Wave Infrared Hyperspectral Sensor (2 of 2)	\$5.2
	Single Aircraft Precision High-Frequency Direction Finding and Geolocation (2 of 2)	\$1.4
	Subtotal	\$6.6
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	Long Duration, Broad-Area, Multi-Sensor Capability Program Development	\$28.1
	Subtotal	\$28.1
Space Force		
Procurement	MSSPAC	\$36.3
	Subtotal	\$36.3
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	Classified # 1	\$83.0
	Classified # 2	\$53.0
	Classified # 3	\$67.0
	Classified # 4	\$105.0
	Classified # 5	\$90.0
	Defensive Cyber Operations for Space (DCO-S) Expedited Deployment of 16 Enclaves (8 Manticore and 8 Kraken)	\$43.0
	Subtotal	\$441.0

(continued on next page)

(Table A2 continued from previous page)

Table A2. Procurement and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation Breakout (US Dollars, Millions)

Air Force		
Procurement	Accelerate E-7 Delivery (1 of 2)	\$596.2
	Agile Communications Equipment (1 of 2)	\$219.4
	F-15EX Conformal Fuel Tank	\$63.6
	Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Digital Infrastructure (2 of 3)	\$5.0
	Post-Block F-16 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radar	\$174.5
	Subtotal	\$1,058.6
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	Accelerate E-7 Delivery (x2) (2 of 2)	\$37.2
	ISR Digital Infrastructure (3 of 3)	\$53.5
	Subtotal	\$90.7
Marine Corps		
Procurement	(+1) KC-130J Weapons System Trainer and Initial Spares	\$36.4
	(+1) LPD-17 Flight II (LPD-33)	\$1,712.5
	(+2) KC-130J Aircraft and Initial Spares	\$252.9
	(+3) UC-12W(ER) Beechcraft King Air 350ER with Cargo Door and Initial Spares	\$67.5
	(+4) AN/TPS-80 Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar (G/ATOR)	\$160.0
	(+4) F-35B Engine/Lift System US Marine Corps Spares	\$122.4
	CH-53K Initial and Outfitting Spares	\$93.0
	Demolition Equipment Set, Squad Engineer/Explosive Hazard Defeat Systems	\$8.0
	Distributed Common Ground/Surface System—Marine Corps All-Source Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) Workstations	\$5.1
	Family of Field Medical Equipment Damage-Control Resuscitation and Damage-Control Surgery Equipment Sets	\$11.0
	H-1 Digital Interoperability Link-16	\$16.4
	Joint All-Domain Command and Control/Testing, Evaluation, and Engineering Environment	\$5.1
	Joint Light Tactical Vehicles and Trailers	\$206.3
	Joint Marine Innovation Unit Fusion and Marine Corps Forces Cyberspace Command (MARFORCYBER) Continuity of Operations Site	\$11.0
	Marine Corps Cyberspace Environment—Archimedes Program	\$24.0
	Multi-Terrain Loader—Replacement	\$10.0
	Project 7/11—Modular Operations Cells	\$21.1
	Ultra-Light Tactical Vehicle—High-Power Purchase	\$6.0
	Ultra-Light-Weight Camouflage Netting System	\$21.0
	US Marine Corps Marine Air-Ground Task Force (MAGTF) Defensive Cyberspace Operation-Internal Defensive Measures Suites	\$15.0
	Subtotal	\$2,804.7
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	Digital Interoperability—Marine Agile Network Gateway Link Roll-Up	\$78.5
	H-1 Digital Interoperability Mobile User Objective System	\$14.8
	Satellite Communications Terminal, Network-on-the-Move	\$16.3
	Subtotal	\$109.6
Total	Procurement	\$7,120.1
Total	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	\$3,438.8

Source: Authors' calculations based off consolidation of fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

**Table A3. Operations and Maintenance and Defense Security Cooperation Agency Breakout
(US Dollars, Millions)**

Africa Command		
Operations and Maintenance	Commercial Satellite Communications	\$12.0
	Department of Defense High-Risk Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance	\$223.8
	Somalia Persistent Presence (1 of 2)	\$115.1
	Subtotal	\$350.9
Army		
Operations and Maintenance	Demilitarization Preparation for Hazardous Material	\$10.4
	Expanding Indo-Pacific Command Campaigning Activities	\$102.5
	Subtotal	\$112.9
Central Command		
Operations and Maintenance	Army Intelligence Information Systems and Networks	\$5.0
	Army IT Services Management Command and Control (C2) Systems and Satellite Communications (SATCOM)	\$23.3
	Cloud Transition and Computing	\$30.0
	Data Analysis and Artificial Intelligence Initiative	\$8.0
	Full Motion Video and Agile Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR)	\$12.0
	Maven Smart System Enterprise Licenses	\$34.0
	Software Defined Networks (Communications)	\$3.4
	Tactical Electronic Surveillance System/Air Vigilance	\$14.7
	US Air Force Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (TENCAP)/CRESTONE Database	\$15.0
	War Reserve Materiel (WRM) Equipment/Secondary Items for Prepositioned Equipment Set	\$4.1
	Zero-Trust Architecture (Communications)	\$5.5
	Subtotal	\$155.0
European Command		
Operations and Maintenance	European Deterrence Initiative (EDI) Improved Infrastructure 2 of 2 for Communications Leased Circuits	\$32.8
	European Command Air Base Defense 2 of 2 for Operation and Maintenance of Air Defense Capabilities	\$11.8
	Subtotal	\$44.6
Indo-Pacific Command		
Defense Security Cooperation Agency	International Security Cooperation Programs	\$117.0
	Subtotal	\$117.0
Operations and Maintenance	Asia-Pacific Regional Initiative	\$6.0
	Headquarters Manpower Enhancements	\$5.0
	Indo-Pacific Command Campaigning	\$511.0
	Information Operations—Military Information Support Operations (MISO)	\$11.3
	Joint Experimentation and Innovation (2 of 2)	\$9.0
	Joint Task Force Indo-Pacific	\$9.0
	Joint Task Force Micronesia	\$25.5
	Joint Training Team	\$49.0
	Joint Training, Exercise, and Evaluation Program	\$69.9
	Mission Partner Environment	\$39.0
	Resilient Top Secret–Sensitive Compartmented Information (TS-SCI) Warfighting Architecture (3 of 3)	\$2.0

(continued on next page)

(Table A3 continued from previous page)

**Table A3. Operations and Maintenance and Defense Security Cooperation Agency Breakout
(US Dollars, Millions)**

Indo-Pacific Command		
Operations and Maintenance	Service Tactical Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Upgrades and Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination (PED) Enhancements	\$45.4
	Subtotal	\$782.1
Navy		
Operations and Maintenance	Dry Dock Repairs at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard (PSNS) Investment, Restoration, and Modernization	\$300.0
	Targeted Facilities Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization	\$550.0
	VIOLET (1 of 3)	\$8.5
	Subtotal	\$858.5
Northern Command		
Operations and Maintenance	Counter Strategic Competitors in Western Hemisphere by Expanded Intelligence, Aerial/Land Detection, Monitoring Capabilities	\$5.2
	Subtotal	\$5.2
Special Operations Command		
Operations and Maintenance	Common Intelligence Picture/Common Operational Picture Services	\$43.4
	Counter Uncrewed Aerial Systems Group 3 Defeat Acceleration (3 of 3)	\$31.1
	Female Body-Armor Development and Modernization (1 of 2)	\$10.0
	Hybrid Cloud Enterprise Services/Infrastructure as Code	\$44.5
	Next-Generation Battlefield Awareness Head-Mounted Observation Systems (2 of 2)	\$0.1
	Special Operations Forces (SOF) Unique Enterprise Datasets	\$20.0
	Unmanned Systems Autonomy Acceleration (3 of 3)	\$0.4
	Zero-Trust Architecture Compliance Acceleration (1 of 2)	\$12.0
	Subtotal	\$161.5
Southern Command		
Defense Security Cooperation Agency	Jamaica SOF (Defense Security Cooperation Agency, or DSCA, Security Assistance)	\$39.0
	Paraguay Air Domain Awareness (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$42.5
	Paraguay Pilot Initiative (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$5.9
	Paraguay Riverine Security Resilience Program (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$2.4
	Paraguay SOF (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$3.0
	Regional Andean Ridge Environmental Multi-Domain Awareness (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$43.3
	Regional Caribbean Domain Awareness (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$16.5
	Regional Environmental Security (Guyana, Suriname) (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$3.0
	Theater Maintenance Partnership Initiative (DSCA Security Assistance)	\$11.4
	Subtotal	\$167.0
Operations and Maintenance	Airborne Long-Wave Infrared Hyperspectral Sensor (1 of 2)	\$9.7
	Center for Southeast Tropical Advance Remote Sensing	\$6.7
	Countering Disinformation	\$7.3
	CRUZEX Aerial Combat Large-Force Exercise	\$2.4
	Cyber Domain Awareness and Network Interoperability	\$11.1
	FIDAE Aerial Combat and Space Force Presentation	\$3.4
	Global Prepositioning Network Concept	\$9.9
	Keel-Billed Toucan 2024	\$3.7

(continued on next page)

(Table A3 continued from previous page)

**Table A3. Operations and Maintenance and Defense Security Cooperation Agency Breakout
(US Dollars, Millions)**

Southern Command		
Operations and Maintenance	Naval Small-Craft Instruction and Technical Training School	\$15.4
	RELAMPAGO Colombia-Led Multinational Joint and Combined Exercise	\$2.1
	Single Aircraft Precision High-Frequency Direction Finding and Geolocation (1 of 2)	\$0.4
	Southern Star Interoperability with Partner Nations	\$3.0
	TAPIO Bilateral US-Brazil Exercise	\$1.5
	Subtotal	\$76.6
Air Force		
Operations and Maintenance	Agile Communications Equipment (2 of 2)	\$8.4
	ISR Digital Infrastructure (1 of 3)	\$71.4
	Subtotal	\$79.8
Total	Defense Security Cooperation Agency	\$284.0
Total	Operations and Maintenance	\$2,627.2

Source: Authors' calculations based off consolidation of fiscal year 2024 unfunded priority lists.

Notes

1. US Department of the Air Force, *Air Force Unfunded Priority List: Fiscal Year 2024 v18*, March 23, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03242023_af.pdf; US Department of the Army, *Army FY24 Unfunded Priorities List*, March 27, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03272023_army.pdf; US Special Operations Command, *USSOCOM FY 2024 Unfunded Priorities List*, March 27, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03272023_socom.pdf; US Northern Command, *USNORTHCOM and NORAD FY24 Unfunded Priority List*, March 17, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03222023_northcom.pdf; US Department of the Navy, *Fiscal Year 2024 Marine Corps Unfunded Priority List*, March 16, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03222023_usmc.pdf; US Central Command, *United States Central Command Unfunded Priorities List for Fiscal Year 2024*, March 23, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03232023_centcom.pdf; US Southern Command, *U.S. Southern Command FY24 Unfunded Priorities List (\$K)*, March 22, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03222023_southcom.pdf; US European Command, *U.S. European Command FY24 Unfunded Priorities*, March 16, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03222023_eucom.pdf; US Africa Command, *USAFRICOM FY24 Unfunded Priority List (CUT)*, March 23, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03232023_africom.pdf; US Department of the Navy, *Navy FY 2024 Unfunded Priorities List Descriptions Enclosure*, March 24, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03242023_navy.pdf; and US Indo-Pacific Command, *USINDOPACOM FY2024 UPL*, March 23, 2023, https://insidedefense.com/sites/insidedefense.com/files/documents/2023/mar/03232023_indopacom.pdf.
2. Elizabeth Warren et al., letter to Lloyd J. Austin III, January 31, 2023, <https://www.warren.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2023.31.01%20Letter%20to%20Austin%20on%20Unfunded%20Priorities%20Lists.pdf>.
3. Tony Bertuca, “DOD Supports Repealing Law Requiring Unfunded Priorities Lists,” *Inside Defense*, March 28, 2023, <https://insidedefense.com/daily-news/dod-supports-repealing-law-requiring-unfunded-priorities-lists>.
4. US Const. art I, § 9.
5. Unfunded Priorities of the Armed Forces and Combatant Commands: Annual Report, 10 U.S.C. § 222(a) (2022).
6. 10 U.S.C § 222(a) (2022).
7. Elaine McCusker and Emily Coletta, “Matching Defense Budget to Strategy,” *AEIdeas*, February 9, 2023, <https://www.aei.org/foreign-and-defense-policy/matching-defense-budget-to-strategy>; and John G. Ferrari, “For Pentagon’s 2024 Budget, OMB ‘Passback’ Must Give the DoD a Big Boost,” *Breaking Defense*, December 14, 2022, <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/for-pentagons-2024-budget-omb-passback-must-give-the-dod-a-big-boost>.
8. Megan Eckstein, “US Navy Reviews Cost-Saving Design Changes Before Resuming Amphib Buys,” *Defense News*, February 28, 2023, <https://www.defensenews.com/naval/2023/02/28/us-navy-reviews-cost-saving-design-changes-before-resuming-amphib-buys>.
9. C-SPAN, “Navy Fiscal Year 2024 Budget Request Briefing,” March 13, 2023, <https://www.c-span.org/video/?526679-1/navy-fiscal-year-2024-budget-request-briefing>.
10. Jonathan Lehrfeld, “Army Finds Mold in over 2,000 Facilities After Service-Wide Inspection,” *Army Times*, March 28, 2023, <https://www.armytimes.com/news/your-army/2023/03/28/army-finds-mold-in-over-2000-facilities-after-service-wide-inspection>.
11. Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2023, Pub. L. No. 117-328.
12. “Defense Fiscal Year Countdown,” *American Enterprise Institute*, <https://www.aei.org/defense-fiscal-year-countdown>.
13. Elaine McCusker, “Another Continuing Resolution? The Enemy Is Us,” *Breaking Defense*, December 8, 2022, <https://www.aei.org/op-eds/another-continuing-resolution-the-enemy-is-us>.

© 2023 by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. All rights reserved.

The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, 501(c)(3) educational organization and does not take institutional positions on any issues. The views expressed here are those of the author(s).