

Stenographic Transcript
Before the

Subcommittee on
Readiness and Management Support

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON
THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDIT

Wednesday, November 20, 2019

Washington, D.C.

ALDERSON COURT REPORTING
1111 14TH STREET NW
SUITE 1050
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 289-2260
www.aldersonreporting.com

1 HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON
2 THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUDIT

3
4 Wednesday, November 20, 2019

5
6 U.S. Senate
7 Subcommittee on Readiness and
8 Management Support
9 Committee on Armed Services
10 Washington, D.C.
11

12 The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.
13 in Room SR-222, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Dan
14 Sullivan, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

15 Members Present: Senators Sullivan [presiding],
16 Fischer, Ernst, Perdue, Blackburn, Shaheen, Hirono, Kaine,
17 and Jones.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DAN SULLIVAN, U.S. SENATOR
2 FROM ALASKA

3 Senator Sullivan: Good morning. This hearing on the
4 Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support will come
5 to order.

6 Today, this subcommittee meets to receive the testimony
7 from Deputy Secretary of Defense David Norquist concerning
8 the Department of Defense's 2018 and 2019 audits. Last
9 year, when he was serving as the DOD Comptroller, Secretary
10 Norquist completed the first DOD audit ever. Soon
11 thereafter, Secretary Norquist was nominated and then
12 confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Defense, with overwhelming
13 Senate support from both sides of the aisle. He is a wealth
14 of knowledge on these issues, and I thank him for being here
15 today.

16 To a lot of people, aside from my good friend Senator
17 Perdue, who I'm hopeful will be here a little bit later, the
18 DOD audit might not come across as the most interesting
19 topic in the world. However, Ranking Member Kaine and I
20 take our oversight responsibility seriously and are happy to
21 have this important and timely hearing.

22 Another responsibility we take seriously has been one
23 of providing the funding needed to rebuild our military,
24 with a specific focus on restoring readiness.

25 Conducting an audit of this magnitude is a massive

1 undertaking, as I'm sure we'll hear. In fact, until
2 Secretary Norquist arrived, it had never happened. The
3 Pentagon had never completed an audit. Let me repeat that.
4 In its history, the Department of Defense had never
5 completed an audit. Kind of remarkable.

6 The FY19 DOD audit is one of the largest audits of any
7 organization in history. Over the course of this year, this
8 audit has required more than 1400 auditors and hundreds of
9 DOD site inspections. These auditors and inspections
10 evaluated thousands of sample and document items to account
11 for the roughly \$2.8 trillion in DOD assets. Conducting an
12 audit of this size is no easy task, but it's a critical
13 function that DOD must do, and the results reveal issues
14 that we all must learn from. There is still much, much more
15 work to be done, but I commend the Secretary for undertaking
16 this difficult, but important, task.

17 As of last Friday, the Department of Defense completed
18 its second agency-wide audit. And, while it did not receive
19 an overall clean opinion, much knowledge was gained from
20 actually doing the audit. I'm sure we'll hear more, but
21 over 24 individual audits done across the different
22 agencies, seven did come back clean.

23 So, why do we take the time to do an audit? In part,
24 it is to encourage the more responsible use of resources
25 within the Department, and, from a readiness perspective,

1 the ability to promote real change within the Department.
2 And, while identifying cyber vulnerabilities in DOD
3 information technology systems or locating unaccounted-for
4 equipment or improving the recordkeeping of personnel is not
5 a glamorous undertaking, it does produce process
6 improvements and technological upgrades that are long
7 overdue. These improvements are critical to the DOD's
8 responsibility that, quote, "It's important to gain full
9 value from every taxpayer dollar spent on defense, thereby
10 earning the trust of Congress," unquote. That is from the
11 2019 National Defense Strategy. In other words, if DOD
12 wants Congress to continue to fund the military in order to
13 counter great-power competition, like that from Russia and
14 China, as laid out in the 2019 NDS, we, in the Congress, and
15 the American people need to have the confidence that these
16 dollars are being spent wisely.

17 As Chairman Inhofe regularly states, the NDS has been
18 preparing our military for a return to strategic competition
19 and does represent a prime example of bipartisanship for the
20 support of that strategy and our troops in the Senate. The
21 NDS explicitly states the audit as a priority towards
22 driving a better budget discipline for the Department and
23 achieving our overall national defense goals. I hope this
24 budget discipline starts with the audit and spreads
25 throughout the Department to all the financial processes

1 within DOD, including our procurement, acquisition, and
2 contracting processes that this subcommittee has oversight
3 of. I look forward to hearing about the progress, some of
4 the successes, some of the failures.

5 And I know my Ranking Member, Senator Kaine, is also
6 interested, so I will turn the dais over to him for his
7 opening remarks.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF HON. TIM KAINE, U.S. SENATOR FROM
2 VIRGINIA

3 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 And, Secretary Norquist, it's good to have you here.
5 When I saw the amount of press streaming into the Capitol
6 this morning, I thought finally the Pentagon audit is going
7 to get the attention that it has deserved.

8 [Laughter.]

9 Senator Kaine: Apparently, there's other things going
10 on, on the Hill. But, I do want to welcome you and thank
11 you for your long record of public service, but also for
12 your making sure that the auditability of the DOD is a top
13 priority.

14 The fact that all Federal agencies were mandated to do
15 audits, really beginning in 1990, and that the DOD has been
16 the last to get in line is well known, so much so that the
17 NDAA, in, I believe, 2015, this committee sort of said,
18 "Okay, you had enough time, you've got to make this happen."
19 And I was gratified to be part of the committee when we
20 finally gave the ultimatum. And I'm gratified that, under
21 your leadership, the DOD is moving to get this done.

22 Last week, the Department announced that it had
23 officially failed the 2019 audit. That's not surprising. I
24 think, actually, you would have found a great deal of
25 skepticism on this committee had the 2019 report said, "Hey,

1 everything's fine." When you start something as complex as
2 this, if you're not finding areas to improve, failings that
3 need to be corrected, then you lead policymakers to question
4 the veracity or the sufficiency of the effort.

5 But, what the report last week showed is that there's
6 so much more to be done to get warfighters and taxpayers
7 what they deserve, a fully auditable Pentagon. We had a
8 witness testify before the full committee recently. I'm
9 blanking on the witness's name, but she used the phrase
10 "efficiency for lethality," the idea that the audit should
11 drive us to not spend on things we shouldn't, reduce
12 spending on things we shouldn't, as a way of then directing
13 those resources to more lethality, to a more effective
14 Department of Defense.

15 So, I hope we can talk about a number of issues today.
16 What benefits are the military forces already seeing from
17 the audit and its findings? Benefits in efficiency, but it
18 was always my hope, as a mayor and Governor, in looking at
19 audits, to also learn some things that might improve the
20 effectiveness of operations. I don't think it's just a
21 number-counting exercise and a -- an exercise that should
22 lead to saving a dollar here or a dollar there. It should
23 also lead to greater efficiencies and effectiveness, as
24 well. And so, I hope we can talk about benefits.

25 How is the process of the audit already helping the

1 Pentagon clean up any data or accounting practices that need
2 to be improved? What resources are being applied to the
3 audit? And are there additional resources that need to be
4 applied so that it can be as effective as possible, moving
5 forward? And, in your opinion, Secretary Norquist, how long
6 will it be, realistically, before the DOD will be in a
7 position where the audits will be clean audits across all
8 the numerous audits that are done?

9 So, I look forward to working with the committee, with
10 -- under your leadership, with the Department, to make good
11 on this promise made so long ago to the American taxpayer
12 that every aspect of the American Federal Government would
13 be subject to an audit, and that we would learn from the
14 audit in a process of continuous improvement so that we can
15 get better at what we do.

16 Thank you.

17 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Senator Kaine.

18 And, Mr. Secretary, thanks again for being here. We
19 look forward to your opening statement. And if you want a
20 longer written statement, that will be submitted for the
21 record.

22 The floor is yours.

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID L. NORQUIST, DEPUTY SECRETARY
2 OF DEFENSE

3 Mr. Norquist: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 Chairman Sullivan, Ranking Member Kaine, distinguished
5 members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to
6 testify before you today on the Department of Defense
7 financial statement audit.

8 There are three major questions about the audit I'd
9 like to briefly address. First, why do we even have an
10 audit? Second, what are the results of this year's audit?
11 And third, how does the audit and other reforms benefit
12 American taxpayers?

13 So, the short answer on why we have an audit is that
14 DOD is an extraordinarily large and complex organization.
15 We employ nearly 3 million servicemembers and civilians.
16 While a typical commercial airline manages between 300 and
17 1600 aircraft, the military services fly approximately
18 16,000 aircraft. And we manage 292 billion in inventory,
19 more than six times the size of Walmart, the world's largest
20 retail company. Financial statement audits are a proven
21 commercial solution that uses independent auditors to
22 effectively assess complex operations. A financial
23 statement audit is comprehensive, and it includes verifying
24 the count, location, and condition of our military
25 equipment, property, material, and supplies. It tests

1 vulnerabilities in our security system of our business
2 systems, and it validates the accuracy of records and
3 actions, such as promotions and separations. In short, it
4 provides the independent feedback that both DOD leadership
5 and Congress needs.

6 This year, more than 1400 auditors conducted over 600
7 site visits, with the following results: Consistent with
8 last year, they reported no evidence of fraud, no
9 significant issues with the amounts paid to civilian or
10 military members, and that DOD could account for the
11 existence and completeness of major military equipment. In
12 addition, one more organization received a clean opinion:
13 the Defense Commissary Agency. So, now 7 of the 24 will
14 have an unmodified or clean opinion this year. And of the
15 2,377 findings in FY2018, the Department was successful in
16 closing more than 550, or 23 percent, of the findings. The
17 audit demonstrates progress, but we have a lot more to do.

18 How does the audit benefit the American taxpayer?
19 Well, the original and primary purpose in an audit is
20 transparency. But, at DOD, we have seen how the audit saves
21 money by improving inventory management, identifying
22 vulnerabilities in cybersecurity, and providing better data
23 for decisionmaking. So, let me give two examples:

24 The Navy, at Fleet Logistics Center Jacksonville,
25 conducted a 10-week assessment, and they identified \$81

1 million worth of active material not tracked in the
2 inventory system. That was now available for immediate use,
3 decreasing maintenance time and filling 174 requisitions.
4 They also eliminated unneeded equipment, freeing up
5 approximately 200,000 square feet, the equivalent of 4.6
6 acres.

7 We are already seeing the benefits of better data in
8 the use of data analytics. For example, the Department uses
9 the ADVANA tool recently to automate the quarterly review
10 process of its obligations. This workflow tool eliminated
11 inefficiencies and provided the analysts the time and the
12 insights they needed to identify 316 million in high-risk
13 funds, moving them from a low-priority function to better
14 use of those before they canceled or expired.

15 The audit is a foundational element of a broader
16 landscape of business reform in the National Defense
17 Strategy. We are moving forward on multiple fronts,
18 improving our enterprise buying power, consolidating IT,
19 realigning and reforming healthcare, consistent with
20 congressional direction, reforming how we do background
21 investigations to make them more effective and less
22 expensive, and eliminating duplicate and inefficient
23 business systems, as well as identifying efficiencies in
24 what we like to call "the fourth estate."

25 I would be remiss if I didn't mention the harmful

1 impacts of the ongoing continuing resolution. And I
2 recognize I'm preaching to the choir. The Department and
3 the White House have both expressed the urgent need for
4 Congress to pass the FY2020 authorization and appropriation
5 bills. The CR stopgap measures are wasteful to the
6 taxpayer. They delay storm-damage repairs and the damage
7 the gains our military has made in readiness and
8 modernization. Ultimately, a CR is good for the enemy, not
9 for the men and women of the United States military. The
10 administration and I urge Congress to come to agreement as
11 quickly as possible, consistent with the budget deal reached
12 in the summer.

13 In closing, I'd like to thank President Trump for his
14 leadership, and the DOD workforce for embracing this complex
15 and important issue. And I'd also like -- Congress and this
16 committee, and in particular the committee staff, for your
17 commitment to this massive undertaking and the role you have
18 played in making an annual financial statement audit a
19 regular way of doing business.

20 The Department of Defense is one of the most complex
21 enterprises in the world. In partnership with this
22 Congress, we must continually improve our business practices
23 in order to reduce costs and maintain our competitive edge.
24 Each of us owes it to the American taxpayer to be as
25 responsible in spending their money as they were in earning

1 it.

2 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 [The prepared statement of Mr. Norquist follows:]

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

2 Let me begin just with a kind of very basic question.

3 And I'm not sure you have the answer, since you've only been
4 in your position, in the Comptroller position, for a couple
5 of years. But, from your perspective, why was the Pentagon
6 never audited? You would think, given what you just
7 mentioned -- how important it is to the country, how large
8 it is, how complex it is -- that's exactly the kind of
9 Federal agency that you do want to audit. Why was this the
10 first time that somebody undertook this daunting task? And,
11 again, I commend you for doing it.

12 Mr. Norquist: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13 So, let me start, just to clarify. The Pentagon has
14 multiple audits. We have GAO, we have the IG, we others.
15 They do program audits, particular subjects. The difference
16 with the financial statement is the sheer breadth and depth
17 of it. It is an end-to-end audit, on a dramatic scale. So
18 --

19 Senator Sullivan: What you just did twice.

20 Mr. Norquist: What we just did twice.

21 Senator Sullivan: That had never happened before.

22 Mr. Norquist: That had never happened before.

23 Senator Sullivan: Why?

24 Mr. Norquist: Well, there's a couple of reasons. One
25 is, it is an extremely hard task that would outlast anyone

1 who started it. And so --

2 Senator Sullivan: Okay, the Pentagon is used to hard
3 tasks, so --

4 Mr. Norquist: It is.

5 Senator Sullivan: It won World War II, for example.

6 Mr. Norquist: They did. They did.

7 The challenge with the audit is, there was an emphasis
8 on trying to get ready for it. And this is where I brought
9 a fundamentally different view from those who had come
10 before me. They said, "It's too expensive to pay the
11 auditors. Let's get ourselves ready enough that we could
12 pass the audit, and then bring the auditors in." My
13 experience at Homeland Security, where they were under
14 audit, was that that would be a major mistake.

15 Homeland Security, we didn't have a choice. When I
16 showed up, the auditors were already there. I found the
17 auditors and their feedback to be the central piece of
18 getting us to that clean opinion. So, my view is, the money
19 we paid the auditors made sure that all the other money we
20 were spending was going towards valuable things, we were
21 getting feedback on whether we were being successful.

22 So, even though Defense Department was spending money
23 on fixing problems, they had no audit baseline by which to
24 tell you: Were they better from one year to the next? We
25 have fixed that in this approach. We are carefully

1 measuring those items, precisely for that purpose. And I
2 think that's the biggest difference, is, I believe that the
3 auditors are the key step in getting us to the clean
4 opinion, not something you bring at the end, when you think
5 you're ready.

6 Senator Sullivan: Okay. Let me dig into that a little
7 bit more, because the audit did cost a lot of money. I
8 think the FY19 audit cost close to a billion dollars. So,
9 if we're doing this annually, which is your goal -- correct?

10 Mr. Norquist: Uh-huh.

11 Senator Sullivan: -- will this eventually pay for
12 itself, in terms of -- or it already paying for itself?

13 Mr. Norquist: So, let's take that into pieces. So,
14 before we started the audit, the Department was spending
15 \$770 million to fix problems. With the audit piece --
16 there's about 195-200 million dollars we pay the external
17 auditors. We know, from the experience of the Corps of
18 Engineers, that, when they went from no opinion to a clean
19 opinion, their cost of their audit dropped in half. So,
20 over time, that will -- number will come down as we start to
21 move from where they have to do detailed sampling to what we
22 call "test of controls." But, that's a level of funding
23 that's necessary for transparency. I mean, you think -- 200
24 million is one-thirtieth of 1 percent of our budget. To be
25 held accountable, that's fine. We then have to spend

1 certain money on DOD side to support that. Those numbers
2 will come down, as well.

3 The big number, about half-a-billion dollars, is in the
4 remediation. And the question there is, Can you show what
5 you have fixed? In the absence of the audit, it's very
6 hard. One of the things I learned in my prior jobs is,
7 self-reporting of fixing problems isn't a very reliable
8 indicator. I was dependent upon the auditors confirming
9 that people had, in fact, fixed it. And one of the best
10 things the auditors show us is, when an organization says
11 they fixed 10 problems, and the auditor agrees with all 10,
12 I have great confidence in that organization's ability to go
13 forward. Another organization claims they've fixed 10, and
14 the auditor agrees with them on three, I have a problem.
15 I've got some training I need to do, some people I need to
16 talk to. That's not going to get them to success. But, you
17 can't wait till the end of the process to find that. You
18 need the auditors doing that on a continual basis.

19 So, we have already seen benefits and savings and
20 return on investment, that I had not expected to see this
21 early, long before we got to the point where I expected the
22 cost to come down. But, we can -- I can go on more about
23 DFAS, but I'll let you wait if --

24 Senator Sullivan: Well, let me just ask another basic
25 question. So, for those of us who are not auditors, what,

1 exactly, does this entail? You're going to installations,
2 you have people fanning out over all our military bases,
3 they're going to supply depots, they're -- what, exactly,
4 are they doing? They're not counting every rifle and every,
5 you know, tank. Or are they?

6 Mr. Norquist: No, they can't, because the sheer labor
7 that would be involved is the problem. What the commercial
8 practice brings us is best practices, which is -- they will
9 go up to the highest level of the organization and look into
10 their databases and say, "Show me everything you think you
11 own and have in inventory." So, they start there. And then
12 they pull samples from that and follow it all the way down
13 to the installation. They went to Fort Wainwright, they
14 went to Anniston. And they come in with a list and say, "I
15 need to see -- not just a tank, I need to see this tank,
16 with this serial number that's supposed to be here." And
17 when they show up, is it in working condition? Because
18 that's one of the things they test for, is you're accurate
19 on working condition. "Do you have proof of ownership? Is
20 it where it's supposed to be?" They walk through each of
21 those. And then they look around the base, and they find a
22 series of items, and they go the other direction, which is,
23 "Here are 25 things we found on the base. Show us that you,
24 at the Department level, have them in your system." So, it
25 goes one direction, and then it comes the other. And what

1 they're looking for is examples of a breakdown, where the
2 summary is not equal to the parts. But, that's sampling
3 process across inventory. And then they do the same thing
4 with pay. "You paid somebody a certain amount. Do you have
5 the records to back up that that soldier was, in fact,
6 promoted? Did they, in fact, qualify for hazardous-duty
7 pay? Do you have the paperwork to support that? And can
8 you produce it in a timely manner?" That's the process they
9 go through. It's relatively extensive. But, it's the
10 standards that we're held to.

11 Senator Sullivan: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
12 Secretary. I'm glad you're here to testify. And hopefully,
13 we're all going to learn from this, and, most importantly,
14 that the Pentagon in as well -- as well.

15 Senator Kaine.

16 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17 Mr. Secretary, I'm going to start with a question that
18 is based, not on the audit, but on your role as Deputy
19 Secretary of Defense, number-two official within the
20 Pentagon. I was proud to support your nomination.

21 In the last day, there have been a number of articles
22 that have come out. And I'll just read two headlines as
23 examples. Business Insider, quote, "The Army Is Prepared to
24 Move Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Vindman and His Family to
25 a Safe Location, If Necessary." Reuters, "Army Assessing

1 Impeachment Witness Vindman's Security, U.S. official."
2 These articles were based on some initial reporting that was
3 done by the Wall Street Journal. Lieutenant Colonel Vindman
4 is a Virginian -- resident, like you are. Lieutenant
5 Colonel Vindman is a patriotic American, like you are. I'm
6 not going to ask you whether you think it's appropriate to
7 attack his loyalty, his patriotism, his judgment, or his
8 character, because I know how you would think about such an
9 attack. I'm not going to ask you whether you think it's
10 okay to use the White House social media account or other
11 White House assets to amplify such an attack, because I know
12 what you would think about that. But, I do want to ask you
13 this. In your role as Deputy Secretary of Defense, will you
14 make sure that members of the military are not punished or
15 face reprisals for cooperating with Congress?

16 Mr. Norquist: So, we take very seriously our
17 responsibility to accurately and responsibly respond to
18 Congress and, to the earlier part of your sentence, as well
19 to any issues that relate to personal security. So, I'm not
20 going to comment on any measures we take individuals on
21 personal security, but we do take it very seriously. And we
22 expect people to be responsive and truthful in their
23 dealings with Congress.

24 Senator Kaine: Thank you very much for that. And I
25 would urge you, at this particular time, to be very diligent

1 in protecting members of our military if they are
2 cooperating with Congress. I think that your words,
3 delivered here, should, hopefully, give some assurance and
4 some confidence to some who are very, very worried. And I
5 know they're worried, because their families are calling my
6 office. They're my constituents, and they're nervous about
7 what might happen to them. Your giving them that assurance
8 publicly means something to them.

9 Let me ask you this about the audit. A lot of the DOD
10 programs that have to be audited are classified. So, when
11 we do the NDAA, we're often, you know, grappling with issues
12 in this room, even in a closed session, and then there's a
13 separate classified annex that we have to spend, you know,
14 in a more classified setting, figuring out our own
15 responsibilities with those. Talk a little bit about how
16 the audit approaches classified programs, and how you can do
17 a real audit, and a meaningful one, while respecting the
18 classified nature of the information.

19 Mr. Norquist: Thank you.

20 So, the challenge we had at the beginning was how to
21 deal with classified information. And, in the budget, it's
22 either -- it's redacted or -- in documents, it's often
23 redacted, or it's otherwise just protected. We talked with
24 GAO, who wants to be able to summarize the -- a Federal
25 Governmentwide audit, and the concern was, "If you do that

1 here, if we have redactions, if we have classified annexes,
2 you won't be able to do a governmentwide audit." So, what
3 we looked was, How do we do this in a way that we can keep
4 it unclassified? And here I'd like to tip my hat to a group
5 called FASAB. They're the accounting standards group for
6 the Federal Government. Because we had to go to them and
7 say, "We need you all to get a security clearance, because
8 we have to be able to have conversations with you that are
9 classified. And you have to give us the accounting
10 standards on how to treat classified information." So, they
11 did. That was one of the process we went through. They got
12 security clearances. They, in fact, issue us classified
13 guidance that allow us -- you know, for example, when NASA
14 was going to a clean opinion, they went and said, "Hey,
15 we've got a question about satellites. Do we expense or
16 depreciate?" And so, we will have those types of things
17 that are classified. And we will go to them, and they, in
18 their clearances, will be able to say, "Here's how you
19 should handle it in a classified" answer that allows us to
20 present the data in an unclassified report. Our auditors
21 have security clearances, right up to the highest level.
22 There's nothing that, because it's classified, is excluded
23 from the audit. The -- even if it's the serious, most
24 sensitive items, the IG will test it. So, there is nothing
25 that's classified that is excluded from the scope of the

1 audit.

2 Senator Kaine: Excellent. Excellent.

3 Let me ask you this. In a public hearing like this, I
4 think we would like to get some success stories, so it's
5 less about the findings or the agencies that passed, but do
6 you have examples of things that you've learned in the audit
7 process that you've already been able to direct toward this
8 "efficiency for lethality" construct that the DOD witness
9 talked about recently at our hearing?

10 Mr. Norquist: We have. And so, let me just walk
11 through a couple of examples. And if people have others, I
12 can go on extensively on this issue. But, let me pick the
13 issue of inventory, and I'll use the Navy as an example.

14 I mentioned how the auditors went down, and then they'd
15 pull samples and test them backwards. What the Navy started
16 discovering is warehouses and storage facilities that had
17 items that had never been loaded into their inventory
18 system. So, you opened it up, and you find spare parts.
19 And the spare parts are not where somebody who's trying to
20 order them can get to them. So, the Navy -- and I will give
21 credit to Vice Admiral Dixon Smith, the N4, because he was
22 particularly aggressive in this and would travel to some of
23 these bases and just say, "Open that up. Open that up."
24 And they started to, and he's found enough concerns he's
25 said they're going to take 100 percent. But, even at the

1 bases they have already visited, they've -- which is about
2 five or six -- they found \$167 million worth of usable
3 supplies that, when they put them into the system, addressed
4 unneeded -- unmet demands, things that were on backorder,
5 other items that now can be put back into the system.
6 Again, it's -- you have the part, but if somebody can't know
7 it's there, if the person who ordered it rotates away and
8 the new one doesn't know that's where it's stored, and, more
9 importantly, from the Department, the Department doesn't
10 know it, so the neighboring base doesn't see it, you're out.
11 So, each one of those is an immediate and direct savings to
12 the taxpayer.

13 Senator Kaine: My time is expired, but others may want
14 to get -- hear other examples.

15 Mr. Norquist: Hopefully -- I've got a list. I'm happy
16 to keep going.

17 Senator Kaine: All right.

18 Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

19 Senator Sullivan: Senator Jones.

20 Senator Jones: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here, and thank you
22 for the letter of November 15th regarding the Anniston Army
23 Depot, who passed their audit test with 100 percent.

24 Tell me briefly, if you would, how important are those
25 audit tests like that? And I'm proud of Anniston, but I

1 assume those --

2 Mr. Norquist: Right.

3 Senator Jones: -- were going on elsewhere, too. So,
4 what's the importance?

5 Mr. Norquist: Yeah. These are the core of what the
6 auditor does. So, when they pull samples from above, and
7 they get -- they come down to a base, they're not testing
8 everything on the base, but they've got a list of what
9 they're looking for. And so, at 60 of the places they
10 showed up, there was 100 percent accuracy. Everything they
11 looked for, that base had. And so, I sent you a letter
12 because you had some of them in your State. That's
13 incredibly valuable. And one of the things that I have
14 heard when I talk to the auditors is the importance of the
15 local leadership. When they show up and the commander of
16 the base meets them and walks them around, they can quickly
17 see they're likely to have a good result because that
18 leadership has control and oversight of the process. Now,
19 we have other places where the samples are not there, so we
20 have to get there on everyone. But, this is going to get
21 solved at the local level, and then fixing the systems that
22 lie between what's accurate at the local level and what we
23 record at the departmentwide level. So, tremendous success.

24 One of the reasons I sent those letters out is so folks
25 can -- we don't just want to use sticks. People can go give

1 kudos to those who deserve it. And that will help drive
2 this process forward.

3 Senator Jones: And as the process goes forward, those
4 leaders at the various locations are going to get the word
5 that they did participate and cooperate, and that'll --

6 Mr. Norquist: Right.

7 Senator Jones: -- help everybody.

8 Mr. Norquist: It's also in everyone's evaluation form.

9 Senator Jones: Right.

10 Mr. Norquist: Senior officers and civil servants, the
11 SES's have the audit as their -- part of their performance
12 evaluation.

13 Senator Jones: I want to move to an area where Senator
14 Kaine kind of touched on. Are you familiar with the
15 Antideficiency Act?

16 Mr. Norquist: I am.

17 Senator Jones: All right. I -- I'm having -- I'm
18 struggling here with a couple of things. On the one hand, I
19 hear your testimony. And you and I have talked in my
20 office, and I just applaud your effort so much. And you've
21 emphasized the responsibility, and taking seriously your
22 responsibility, to report to Congress. On the other hand,
23 I'm also seeing this administration continually thwarting
24 Congress's oversight capabilities. They're not producing
25 witnesses, they're not producing documents, just because

1 they don't particularly like the subject matter of the
2 particular hearing. That's particularly going on in the
3 House. And then, recently, I read a report this morning
4 where OMB counsel has stated that, as a legislative branch
5 of government, the GAO, when they report deficiencies or
6 violations of the Antideficiency Act, that the
7 administration, the executive branch agencies, have no
8 obligation to report that back to Congress. And it just
9 seems to me that there is a concerted effort with the
10 administration to just, basically, take those things that
11 they don't want to report and just ignore the Article 1
12 branch of the Constitution. And I'm really concerned about
13 that. Have you seen OMB counsel's opinion? And, if so --
14 or I'd like to hear your thoughts about that and whether or
15 not that squares with what you said earlier about your
16 ability and your earnest, honest efforts to report to
17 Congress.

18 Mr. Norquist: So, I haven't seen that opinion, and I
19 don't know whether, as a matter of law, they are correct.
20 But, I know, as a matter of practice, whenever I had to sign
21 out one of those, it went to everybody. It went to the
22 White -- the President, it went to the leader of the House
23 and the Senate, it went, I believe, to GAO. So, in
24 practice, I know that, when we have one -- an Antideficiency
25 Act violation, the notification is broadspread.

1 Senator Jones: Well, I think -- and I appreciate that
2 -- I think that this is new. And so, I may follow up with
3 you, because I think that this is changing a practice that
4 has been in -- a practice for -- across administrations,
5 including this administration, but now we've come,
6 apparently, with a counsel who expressed a new version of
7 that. So, I may follow up to give you a chance to look at
8 that guidance to see how it might affect the Department of
9 Defense and your obligations to report to Congress.

10 If I have time -- and I'm not sure -- my timer's not
11 going, here -- you mentioned the Navy, where you found about
12 \$81 million of material, I think at the Jacksonville Naval
13 Air Station, where it just freed up inventory, you were able
14 to do some things. How important is that? What are the
15 lessons that you can learn and take away from that
16 particular episode, where there was, like, \$280 million that
17 was just really, kind of, unaccounted for -- \$81 million,
18 when they found it, immediately got to use. So, obviously,
19 a little concerning to Congress that 280 million bucks at
20 place can not be accounted for. Tell me a little bit about
21 what you're trying to implement and how the lessons learn
22 from that.

23 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, the issue here is the value
24 of the inventory. But, our concern is, over time, you know,
25 people, if they buy inventory, if they store it without

1 putting it into the system, they may know it's there, but
2 their successor may not, the Department doesn't know it's
3 there. It's inefficient. It's an inefficient way to use
4 taxpayer resources. The value of the audit is, that's a
5 problem, and the auditors will come up every year and poke
6 them for that problem, and expose it, because the audit
7 requires that, if we have it, it's in our system and it's
8 properly recorded. That's why it goes both, "Can you
9 account for what you have? And do you account for
10 everything you have?" This is valuable for readiness. This
11 is valuable for making sure we make the best use of
12 taxpayers' money.

13 We think that there's a connection between this and
14 some of the challenges of CRs, which is -- a lot of this
15 tends to be the type of supplies you might order at year-
16 end. And so, in the -- it -- the more we can limit that,
17 the more we can have the discipline over, "When you buy it,
18 you log it into the system." Right? "You make sure that
19 it's properly recorded." With the discipline -- and this is
20 where I get to the value of the audit -- they come every
21 year. It's not enough to clean out your office once.
22 They're coming next year. They're coming the year after.
23 You've got to make this a habit.

24 Senator Jones: So, are you satisfied that the systems
25 in place are adequate? It's just a question of plugging

1 them in, as opposed to, we need to upgrade the systems?

2 Mr. Norquist: No, we're going to need to upgrade the
3 systems. In some of the comments I got -- because I met
4 with each of the auditors, and one of them said, "As you
5 field your new ERP systems, which are more compliant and
6 more effective, you need to make better use of technology."
7 A lot of people are doing this manually, filling out paper
8 forms and others. If they had tablets, where they could
9 just do it more directly, they could barcode scan, all of
10 those reduces the labor, and that increases compliance. And
11 so, what we're looking for here is places where either
12 people stop doing it because they didn't have the labor and
13 it was too hard, where the automation solution speeds that
14 up. But, it highlights the very value of that. And that's
15 important.

16 Senator Jones: All right. Well, thank you, Mr.
17 Secretary. I will follow up with written questions
18 regarding the OMB guidance.

19 Mr. Norquist: Okay.

20 Senator Jones: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Senator Sullivan: Senator Hirono.

22 Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 Considering how long it took for the DOD to undergo an
24 audit, thank you very much for expressing your firm belief
25 that audits are very important.

1 And, as you noted, the -- your auditors conducted a
2 number of site visits, 600 site visits. And two of these
3 visits were performed at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam and
4 the Marine Corps Base Hawaii. And both of these came back
5 100 percent. And thank you for also noting how important it
6 is that the local leadership buys in and cooperates with the
7 audit. So, I do want to give a shout-out to the folks at
8 Joint Base Pearl Harbor and the Marine Corps Base.

9 Mr. Norquist: Excellent. Thank you for doing that.

10 Senator Hirono: Thank you.

11 One of the areas that were pointed out in the most
12 recent audit were newly identified high-risk areas involving
13 privatized housing programs and the F-35 program. And I
14 won't go into my questions relating to those, but I assume
15 that you are going to be undergoing the things that you need
16 to do to bring those programs up to snuff. Because there's
17 a lot of concern about military housing. It's an ongoing --

18 Mr. Norquist: Absolutely.

19 Senator Hirono: -- issue for us.

20 Senator Kaine touched on this other matter recently
21 regarding the threats to Alexander Vindman and also your
22 Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Laura Cooper, who --
23 I don't know if she's already testified, but she certainly
24 will be testifying, and not to mention the constant efforts
25 to out the whistleblower, and, basically, the whistleblower

1 feeling very threatened by everything that is going on. So,
2 I note that you are doing everything you can to make sure
3 that Colonel Vindman and Ms. Cooper remain safe. What steps
4 have you already taken to send a clear message to DOD staff
5 that their identity, their jobs, and safety will be
6 protected if they come forward to report abuse or
7 misconduct?

8 Mr. Norquist: So, this is something that we have as a
9 matter of practice on all sorts of things. We have IG
10 reports, we have GAO reports. This is just part of the
11 culture of how we -- when people come forward, we expect
12 them to be honest and truthful in their dealings, and we
13 expect them to be taken care of in doing so. We look for,
14 and the IG looks, if there's an issue of reprisal, to make
15 sure that those are held accountable for it. And we also
16 look for their security. And again, I -- as I mentioned,
17 I'm not going to go into the measures we take, but if we
18 think there's a security issue, we either deal with it, we
19 deal with local authorities. This is -- this -- these are
20 the types of things that occur in different forums, and we
21 provide the same standard and approach across them. I just
22 think it's an important signal that we send in the way we
23 deal with organizations.

24 Senator Hirono: I think, in this environment, it's
25 very important for the DOD, from the top, to say that the

1 whistleblowers who come out of the DOD, or anyone who
2 participates in appropriate proceedings, that they will be
3 safe. I think it's really important for that message to be
4 quite obvious and put out there, and I hope that that's what
5 you will do.

6 On October 22nd, the day before Ms. Cooper was
7 scheduled to testify before the House in a deposition, you
8 signed a letter to Ms. Cooper's lawyer prohibiting her from
9 participating in the impeachment inquiry. And at her
10 deposition, she was asked whether she was concerned about
11 the repercussions against her at DOD for testifying, under
12 subpoena, after receiving your letter. She stated, quote,
13 "This is a challenging environment, and for a civil servant
14 who is trying -- who is just trying to fulfill my
15 obligations, this is a challenge. This is challenging in
16 both respects." This is quoting Ms. Cooper.

17 In light of House Resolution 660, which lays out the
18 procedure for public impeachment hearings, will you refrain
19 from prohibiting any other DOD official from cooperating
20 with Congress, going forward?

21 Mr. Norquist: So, I did not prohibit her. What I did
22 was, I forwarded to her the information that we -- I
23 forwarded to her lawyer the information we had received from
24 the White House that expressed their views about the
25 impeachment process. One of the challenges, we wouldn't be

1 able to send a lawyer with her. I wanted her to have that
2 available information. But, we understand each of the
3 individuals are making their own decision on how to --

4 Senator Hirono: So, even if you were just forwarding a
5 letter that came, not out of your department, but it came
6 out from -- I forget what -- where it emanated, but for you
7 to send it, it does create a chilling effect. And I think
8 that -- are you intending to continue to forward these kinds
9 of letters from the White House or from any other --

10 Mr. Norquist: I don't know of any other individuals --

11 Senator Hirono: -- source?

12 Mr. Norquist: -- being called. My only point is, I
13 would have felt it inappropriate to not have their lawyer be
14 aware of this information. And so, that's why we shared it.

15 Senator Hirono: But, you can understand why it --

16 Mr. Norquist: Oh, I understand. I understand the --
17 that that's --

18 Senator Hirono: -- it comes from the number-two
19 person.

20 Mr. Norquist: -- which is, if you don't send it, it
21 you do send it, what do you do? So, what we tried to do is
22 set the right tone in the letter.

23 Senator Hirono: So, in the letter, did you say, "We're
24 just forwarding this, we're not going to" --

25 Mr. Norquist: I will check the language, and I will

1 send it to you.

2 [The information referred to follows:]

3 [SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Mr. Norquist: But, I think we tried to be --

2 Senator Hirono: Thank you.

3 Mr. Norquist: -- clear about the nature of it. We try
4 to be very professional in it, and factual in the way we
5 handle these.

6 Senator Hirono: Could I just ask one more question? I
7 have no idea what my time is.

8 But, during his nomination hearing, I asked Secretary
9 Esper whether he would commit to reinstating Parole in Place
10 for undocumented family members of Active Duty
11 servicemembers. And Secretary Esper said that he would,
12 quote, "look into it, for sure." We are still waiting for
13 some response on this issue. But, we did receive a response
14 from Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and
15 Readiness, Mr. James Stewart, who deferred comment on the
16 program to the Department of Homeland Security, but
17 committed to working closely with DHS on the future of the
18 policy.

19 Well, you can understand why Active Duty servicemembers
20 would be very concerned if the administration is going ahead
21 -- Department of Homeland Security is going ahead and
22 deporting undocumented members even as they are serving our
23 country. So, I'd like to know what steps the DOD has taken
24 to coordinate with DHS, as referred to in this letter from
25 James Stewart on this issue, and whether DOD has urged DHS

1 to reinstate this program not to deport undocumented family
2 members of Active Duty personnel.

3 Mr. Norquist: So, Senator, let me take that one for
4 the record. I don't know the answer to your question.

5 [The information referred to follows:]

6 [SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Hirono: Well, I hope you get the message that
2 we certainly don't want Active Duty servicemembers' families
3 to be deported. That is not a good thing, and that program
4 should be reinstated.

5 Thank you.

6 Senator Sullivan: Senator Ernst.

7 Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8 This is a really important hearing, I think, for all of
9 us. And, Secretary Norquist, thank you for appearing today
10 and testifying on this often overlooked topic. And Senator
11 Sullivan and I were having a discussion yesterday, and we're
12 just so thrilled actually to have some results to be put in
13 front of us.

14 So, you have done, really, what your predecessors
15 haven't been able to do, or did not do at the Pentagon,
16 which is making the audit a priority. And we've had past
17 Comptrollers and Chief Financial Officers at the Pentagon,
18 of both political parties, and they have whined, they've
19 complained, they've dragged their feet on this issue, and
20 found every last excuse under the sun not to get it done.
21 And so, we've had Pentagon hearings going on and on and on,
22 here on the Hill, for decades. So, again, thanks for doing
23 the hard job and getting this audit done, and not delaying
24 it further. Despite the disclaimer of opinion from the last
25 2 years, we are much further along in this progress toward a

1 clean opinion, and I just wanted to make that statement and
2 thank you very much for your leadership on this topic.

3 Now, the National Defense Strategy makes it clear that
4 the United States has a very distinct challenge to maintain
5 its supremacy in the global arena, and this has implications
6 on our homeland defense, overseas operations, and the
7 vibrancy of a free and open society. So, before we dive
8 into these strategic goals, it's good to take a step back
9 and maybe do a little bit of housekeeping. And so, what I'd
10 like you to explain, Mr. Secretary, is, In addition to
11 fiscal responsibility, how do you think the audit's findings
12 actually fit into the NDS and benefit our operational and
13 war mission capabilities?

14 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So --

15 Senator Ernst: Why do we need to do this?

16 Mr. Norquist: Absolutely. So, the NDS has three lines
17 of effort: enhancing lethality, working by, with, and
18 through allies, and the third one is reform in the way we
19 defend -- operate for more efficiency. The reason for that
20 is twofold. One is, we can see the same deficit numbers
21 everyone else can, and we understand the fiscal limits with
22 which the Department needs to operate. The second is, we
23 have a responsibility, regardless of what level of funding
24 we receive, to make sure that we're using it with the
25 maximum benefit to lethality. So, that includes both

1 driving inefficiencies out of our business processes, as
2 well as simply cutting low-priority items and moving it to
3 high-priority items. You know, some of the things, they're
4 not bad things, they're just not as essential as others.

5 And so, what the audit is helping us do is not only
6 identify those inefficiencies where individual systems have
7 been built that don't talk to each other -- so, if you get
8 to the point where you only enter the data once, and it
9 flows through the system, there is a lot of labor savings
10 and costs that come out of the way you operate, versus
11 manual entries and transfers where they create data errors.

12 The other part of the National Defense Strategy as you
13 go through this is, you're trying to improve readiness.
14 That gets to the issue of the spare parts: Can I get the
15 spare parts in the people's hands, can I get things through
16 depot maintenance faster?

17 And the last part is the data analytics. One of the
18 big leaps in what the private sector's been able to do is to
19 use terms -- you can use "big data," you can -- "cloud,"
20 whatever you want to call them -- but, they're able to
21 manipulate incredibly large sums of data. Well, DOD, we
22 have tens of billions of transactions. When we get audited,
23 it goes back to funds Congress appropriate to us 8 or 9
24 years ago, because those funds are still available for
25 payment or disbursement. The ability to organize those in a

1 dataset, to search them, to track them, to be able to find
2 errors, that allows us to adopt some of the best practice
3 from the private sector on inventory and other things you
4 can't do when you don't trust your data.

5 Senator Ernst: Yeah.

6 Mr. Norquist: And so, I think those types of reforms,
7 we -- we can't adopt private-sector best practices unless we
8 can get to the quality of the data they have so that we can
9 rely on it.

10 Senator Ernst: Yes. And thank you. The -- kind of
11 along that quality-versus-quantity issue, the DOD has closed
12 22 percent of the Notice of Findings and Recommendations
13 from the Fiscal Year '18 --

14 Mr. Norquist: Correct.

15 Senator Ernst: -- Audit. And -- but the number has
16 actually increased. And so, do we -- should we interpret
17 that as "the system is working," or should we be worried
18 that we're not making enough progress?

19 Mr. Norquist: So, the first answer is, the system is
20 working. There were, I think, 200 more auditors this year
21 than last year. One of the things that we took as a lesson
22 learned from my time at Homeland was, we set up these
23 contracts -- normally, an auditor, when they think you're
24 not going to pass, they stop working. They say, "You have a
25 disclaimer. We're done." We worked with our IG, who's been

1 a tremendous help in this whole process, and the contracts
2 basically say, "Keep auditing. Even if you think we're
3 going to fail, keep auditing. We want as many problems as
4 you can find." And so, the thing I tell everyone inside the
5 building is, when the auditors find, I think, 1300
6 additional findings, those were always there. Right? The
7 more clearly they identify them, the sooner we can make sure
8 we have corrective action plans to address them. So, I
9 expect, for the first couple of years, they will find more.
10 We will keep closing them. We will get better and more
11 efficient. At a certain point, they will have been able to
12 fully go through it, and those numbers will come down. But,
13 I see this as exactly what we're paying them for and what I
14 hope we would get out of them.

15 Senator Ernst: Well -- and my time is expiring, so I
16 just want to say, again, thanks for your leadership on this
17 issue. It is such a bureaucratic beast, and trying to sort
18 through that, boil it down, you've been able to take this
19 on, and we, as Congress, truly do appreciate your effort.
20 So, thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

21 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Senator Ernst.

23 Senator Shaheen.

24 Senator Shaheen: Well, thank you.

25 I would add my appreciation to what you've heard from

1 my colleagues about the work that you're doing.

2 You talked about the list of examples of successes
3 based -- that you've already uncovered as the result of the
4 audit. At some point, it would be helpful for us to get
5 more of that list so that we can share that with others and
6 let people know what's been successful, to date, about the
7 audit.

8 I want to go back to your early comment, though, about
9 the CR, and preaching to the choir about the CR, because I
10 do agree you're preaching to the choir, but I also think
11 there doesn't seem to be a universal appreciation in
12 Congress and in the administration for what the impact of a
13 continuing resolution for the remainder of this year would
14 be. And at what point -- are you concerned that that might
15 trigger the budget cap so it would kick us back into
16 sequestration? Can you just talk about what the impacts are
17 that you see if we are not able to get appropriations bills
18 through?

19 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, let me take them -- first,
20 the CR, and then I'll go to sequestration.

21 The CR is designed to be destructive. It is --

22 Senator Shaheen: Right.

23 Mr. Norquist: -- designed in order to get you not to
24 want to do it. So, the first thing it says is, no new-
25 starts. So, if we have ammunition that we would like to buy

1 more of that the Congress -- the House, the Senate, the
2 Republicans and Democrats have all agreed, "You need more,"
3 we get to 1 October, and we say, "Let's not start buying it
4 yet. Let's wait to place that order." We have research
5 technologies, artificial intelligence, our hypersonic
6 missiles. Republicans, Democrats, House and Senate all
7 agree, "Let's give the Chinese a 3-more-month headstart.
8 Let's make it harder for our people to keep up in that
9 technology race by letting this drag out." And then, the
10 last part is, you've got families in training that
11 constantly get disrupted because they don't -- we may
12 believe that there's a deal at the top-line, but they don't
13 know what that means to the installation. And so, in good
14 fiscal sense, they withhold the money, they delay training,
15 they minimize what they are going to do, and then sometime
16 in December or in a previous year's March, we then hand them
17 all of that money and say, "Now do it in 6 months." Well,
18 they can't get back their October training exercise, they
19 can't recover the time lost. And then we start having the
20 challenges with inventory and others. So, it is a misuse of
21 taxpayers' money to manage it in this way.

22 The sequestration is even worse, because the
23 sequestration is just a catastrophic cut that undermines
24 everything. And again, they don't know whether you're going
25 there, so they have to be very cautious about how they spend

1 money. But, you'd have problems making payroll under
2 sequestration. You'd have -- you know, we could wait, but
3 then we take an even cut in everything else. And then
4 you've completely lost readiness. And for anyone who has
5 ship maintenance in their district -- and they know the
6 importance of the ships coming in on time, the maintenance
7 happening on time -- you can't recover. The ship depot --
8 the ship facility can't take twice as many ships the next
9 year. If they don't come in on time, you've lost it. And
10 so, this is something we need to avoid. This is something
11 we need to minimize the length, if at all possible.

12 Senator Shaheen: Thank you. I certainly agree, 100
13 percent.

14 I want to ask about another issue that's outside of the
15 audit, but it goes to your current role. And that is, as
16 you're aware, I'm sure, there are a number of -- virtually
17 all military facilities have an issue with PFAS chemicals.
18 Secretary Esper, to his credit, appointed a task force, the
19 day he got sworn in, to address that on military
20 installations. My understanding is that the Navy is very
21 close to a breakthrough on finding a replacement for the
22 element in firefighting foam that would be equally
23 effective. Can you give us any update on that? And, if
24 not, can you take that for the record?

25 Mr. Norquist: So, let me take the particular question

1 of how close they are to the record.

2 [The information referred to follows:]

3 [SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Mr. Norquist: I know this is an area very important to
2 us. We have been researching alternatives. I think we
3 spent \$22 million on that. But, we'll continue, because we
4 need a foam that protects armed service members when they're
5 in high-risk areas, but we also need it to be one that's
6 environmentally safe. And so, we will definitely get you
7 the answer on how they stand.

8 As you pointed out, this is a high-priority area for
9 the Secretary. He's got the task force working on 40
10 different actions. But, this is something -- we're getting
11 to that solution -- is ultimately the right -- the best
12 place to end up.

13 Senator Shaheen: Good. Thank you.

14 And finally, in June, the Department released new
15 standards for defense contractors called the Cybersecurity
16 Maturity Model Certification, the CMMC, program. And I
17 appreciate the need for this program, to ensure that there
18 is cybersecurity in place for our contractors. But, can you
19 talk about the extent to which the -- Defense is working
20 with those contractors? Because one of the things that
21 we've heard from some of the businesses that we work with is
22 that they're very concerned about the timeframe within which
23 they have to comply with those standards, and also with the
24 assistance. For the big folks, it's not an issue as much as
25 for some of the smaller people who subcontract or who work

1 with Defense, who don't have the capacity and the assistance
2 that they need in order to comply. Can you talk about
3 what's happening on that?

4 Mr. Norquist: Sure. For those who are unfamiliar with
5 this, one of the issues we have is vulnerabilities in our
6 supply chain in the businesses we deal with. And so, other
7 countries tend to attack their networks to try and extract
8 important data. CMMC is a set of standards that they're
9 expected -- and, much like a financial statement audit, they
10 would hire a firm to come in and check their controls and be
11 able to verify the quality. Part of the intent of this is
12 to recognize that the larger firms are going to have an
13 easier time. We need to work with the small businesses. In
14 some cases, like when we have requirements that a firm has a
15 SCIF, they are able to hire a firm that -- whose SCIF they
16 have access to so that they can work with folks who can set
17 up a network that meets this compliance. So, if you have a
18 very small firm, you don't try and build your own network.
19 You just subscribe to one that's already certified. Now you
20 know you can count on it, and that firm then just provides
21 it to you as part of their IT services. But, this is
22 something that I know the CIO and the Under Secretary for
23 A&S are going to work very closely with the small business
24 community. We need them, most of all, to get up to that
25 standards, and we don't want this to be a barrier to entry.

1 Senator Shaheen: Right. We don't want to lose all of
2 the innovation that's coming out of the --

3 Mr. Norquist: No, that's where a lot of the innovation
4 is coming from. You're absolutely right, Senator.

5 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

6 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 Senator Sullivan: Senator Ernst.

8 Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9 And, Mr. Secretary, along similar lines, but a little
10 different question, focusing on the purchase of unsecure
11 commercial items. And, back in August, I had sent a letter
12 to you highlighting the threat that was posed by commercial
13 off-the-shelf computers and other types of electronic
14 equipment, specifically those that have been made in
15 communist China and those that present those cybersecurity
16 risks. And so, I appreciate the letter that you sent back
17 in reply, which discussed the ways in which the Department
18 is addressing those types of vulnerabilities, but perhaps
19 you could, maybe, just give us a quick update now on the
20 progress that the Department has actually made in that area.

21 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, one of the challenges you
22 have in buying, particularly, electronics is -- it's one
23 thing to say this is a large Chinese-made product and it
24 shouldn't be in the system. But, then you start buying
25 other ones, and you start discovering components that were

1 made -- the company that provides it to you is a U.S.-based
2 company, but all of a sudden there are components inside it.
3 So, this is where the Department has to do careful analysis
4 of what it's buying. So, we look at the threat
5 intelligence, we look at their supply chains, and we test
6 the products for its adherence to security standards. In
7 some cases, we do penetration testing, red-teaming. But, we
8 need to understand those supply chains to understand where
9 are the places where we can't afford to have them bringing
10 in those types of parts, because it creates a vulnerability.
11 And working with those firms directly on -- in some cases,
12 you can improve it if you take out the middleman, you buy
13 directly from the vendor. But, in other cases, you have to
14 understand if that vendor is assembling parts that includes
15 pieces. Now, some of those pieces aren't a risk, others
16 are. And that's where we have to work very carefully. And
17 that's the process that we're putting in, both in -- again,
18 in cooperation between our CIO and our Under Secretary for
19 Acquisition.

20 Senator Ernst: Do you know, is the Department still
21 purchasing equipment that possibly could have been
22 manufactured in areas of concern?

23 Mr. Norquist: Let me take that for the record so I
24 know how far along in this we are.

25 [The information referred to follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1 Senator Ernst: Okay. Wonderful.

2 Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

3 Senator Sullivan: Senator Kaine.

4 Senator Kaine: Thank you.

5 Mr. Secretary, what I said in my opening comments, that
6 I wanted to try to get your opinion about when it might be
7 reasonable to expect -- as we work through the process of
8 these annual audits and then, you know, engage in corrective
9 activities, when might it be reasonable for the committee to
10 expect that the Department would have a completely clean set
11 of audits?

12 Mr. Norquist: So, here's the trajectory you should
13 expect. We have 24 organizations. I would expect, every
14 year, to see movement forward, another one getting a clean
15 opinion, people moving to modified. Within 5 or so years,
16 I'd expect you to see the majority of them with a clean
17 opinion. The Department itself won't get a clean opinion
18 till the very last one falls. And so, in Homeland, it took
19 them 10 years to get a clean opinion. Five of those were
20 waiting on the Coast Guard. Everyone else got to a clean
21 opinion, and there was 5 years. And then, for several
22 years, it was just Coast Guard property. Everything else
23 was okay.

24 So, you'll start to see the number come down. I found
25 it very helpful, by the way, because, in the hearings, the

1 Coast Guard used to get that as an opening question, when
2 they were the one left out, as to, "Why are you holding it
3 up?" That helped focus everybody's attention. But, that
4 will -- you'll see that over time. You'll see different
5 parts get to a clean opinion. You'll see the number of
6 problems going down. You'll see some where they have only a
7 single issue holding them up. That's very helpful for
8 focusing it. I don't know how it takes to get to the last
9 one, because it's really who's the slowest and takes the
10 longest, and that will be the final pin to drop.

11 Senator Kaine: Thank you.

12 And, Mr. Chair, I would just like to ask to be
13 introduced in the record -- in response to Senator Hirono's
14 questions, Secretary Norquist talked about the letter that
15 he sent to -- under -- over his signature, to Daniel Levin,
16 who is the attorney for Laura Cooper, and there was a
17 reference to that letter. The letter is about a page-and-a-
18 half long, and the operative paragraph is the penultimate
19 one, which reads, in relevant part, quote, "This letter
20 informs you and Ms. Cooper of the administrationwide
21 direction that executive personnel," quote, "'cannot
22 participate in the impeachment inquiry under these
23 circumstances,'" close quote, period. I would like to
24 introduce this for the record. And I'm going to have some
25 additional followup via QFR about this letter.

1 Senator Sullivan: Without objection.

2 [The information referred to follows:]

3 [SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sullivan: Mr. Secretary, let me ask a couple
2 of other questions.

3 You mentioned that certain base commanders were very
4 open and willing to work, were -- did you run into some
5 obstinance or resistance from other commanders? And are --
6 was there a correlation between that and the -- maybe not
7 scoring so well? Or was the word out from the leadership in
8 the Pentagon to make sure there was good cooperation here?

9 Mr. Norquist: So, I think it's gotten better from year
10 to year. I -- the auditors were the ones who gave me the
11 feedback, and they said the more they're engaged, the more
12 likely that you are to see the results. It's a question of
13 them focusing on the items in the process and what they need
14 to be accountable for.

15 But, here was the big surprise for the audit. I'd --
16 one of the concerns we had, going in, from those of you
17 advocating for audit and those of us pushing it, is the risk
18 that it would be seen as a paperwork drill, "You come, you
19 audit me, and all you're doing to check is a bunch of paper
20 and whether it -- my bills match my invoices. This is just
21 an admin drill." The issue over inventory, things that had
22 direct benefit to readiness, this quickly turned around the
23 views of the military that we dealt with to understand is --
24 wasn't about paperwork, this was about readiness, this was
25 about being able to do their mission. So, I never ended up

1 getting the pushback that I was afraid I was going to see
2 and that everyone -- until you started it, everyone just
3 assumed was going to be the natural outcome of the audit.
4 So, I think we've seen a change. I think we've seen that
5 level of emphasis. Some places are stronger than others,
6 but I think we're going to continue to see it grow.

7 Senator Sullivan: Let me ask, related to that topic --
8 you know, some of the media, which I'm glad they covered it,
9 but, not surprisingly, the headlines were a little alarming.
10 There was a Reuters piece, a couple of days ago, "Pentagon
11 Gets Failing Grade in its Second Audit." And then, a
12 Bloomberg piece, just -- well, yesterday, I think --
13 headline, "Air Force's Inventory Listed Wrong Sites for 79
14 Nuclear Missiles." So -- "misidentification of 79 active
15 Minuteman II nuclear-armed missiles, almost a fifth of the
16 fleet." So, that's pretty alarming.

17 Can you talk to some of these headlines, and
18 particularly the one with regard to 79, quote, "missing
19 nuclear missiles"?

20 Mr. Norquist: Right. So, these types of --

21 Senator Sullivan: Were they really missing? I'm a
22 little bit concerned, if that was the case.

23 Mr. Norquist: So, the proper title would have been,
24 "79 Uninstalled Missile Motors," because they aren't actual
25 ICBMs and missiles. They are the motors that are used in

1 them. And when they are pulled out and put into maintenance
2 in the supply system, there was an issue in the accuracy of
3 the supply system, because it's manual, tracking whether
4 they were still on the base, and whether they were at the
5 depot. But, I don't think "uninstalled missile motors in
6 maintenance" has the same drama as the title that you read.

7 This comes up in the audit. You know, occasionally,
8 you'll have some story that references the Department and
9 trillions of dollars, even though that number is orders of
10 magnitude larger than our budget. There are these types of
11 misunderstandings of what the auditors -- again, remember,
12 these are -- these audit reports are written by accountants.
13 And so, they are written with a level of detail that makes
14 sense to somebody of that background. But, to others, these
15 stories come out, and you try and translate it, and you get
16 it wrong. So, part of my job is, when these come up,
17 explaining, "No, our missiles are in the ground. We know
18 where they are. They don't tend to move that often, for the
19 ICBMs. So, 79 would not have been relocated. But, this is
20 missile motors." And the answer is, it's still a problem,
21 we still have to get inaccuracy of our missile motors, but
22 it's not the -- it's a regular supply issue and inaccuracy
23 from a manually updated database.

24 Senator Sullivan: Okay. So, on that headline, still
25 useful, and it -- obviously, keeping track of the missile

1 motors is important, but it wasn't as if there was --

2 Mr. Norquist: Correct.

3 Senator Sullivan: -- a loss of the --

4 Mr. Norquist: Correct. And they did a --

5 Senator Sullivan: We knew where these ICBMs were.

6 Mr. Norquist: Right. And the auditors did a site
7 visit at F.E. Warren, and they gave it 100 percent thumbs-
8 up. I met with them and asked them what issues. They
9 didn't even bring this one up. They just talked about
10 supply issues, in general.

11 Senator Sullivan: And "failing grade"? That's
12 accurate. Was it --

13 Mr. Norquist: On the overall audit?

14 Senator Sullivan: Yes.

15 Mr. Norquist: Yeah, we didn't pass. I mean -- well,
16 let me -- in fairness, seven organizations did, and the
17 leaders of those should get credit, because many of them
18 started those audits before anybody else in the Department.
19 The -- some of the funds, having clean opinions for 5 or 10
20 years. That was sheer will by the leadership of that
21 organization, because there was not a pull signal from the
22 Department level for many of those. So, credit to those who
23 got it. But, we've still got another, you know --

24 Senator Sullivan: Let me ask a more parochial
25 question, from my perspective. You said you were at Fort

1 Wainwright in Alaska. What were the findings there?

2 Positive? Negative? Any good examples or things that need
3 to be improved upon?

4 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, it's a great example of the
5 test they did. So, they went to Fort Wainwright, and they
6 had a list of 108 items that they wanted to find. And these
7 were everything from rotary-wing aircraft to coms gear. And
8 then they look around and they picked 25 items they found,
9 and then they went back to the database and said, "Can you
10 show me these 25?" They had 95.5-percent pass rate. There
11 were six things. Examples included: the serial number
12 didn't match. Okay, well, then we can't be certain this is
13 the same item. You have an item, but the serial doesn't
14 match. Or the item was there, but it wasn't recorded in the
15 system. Okay, you've got a missing piece entry. Six is
16 somewhat small, but, again, this is a sample, so the
17 question becomes, What -- if you extrapolate that? But, it
18 was 95.5-percent pass rate. But, that's a good example of
19 the visits they did around the country. And I think it's
20 the type of thing where that feedback is helpful, because
21 the local commander can figure out why, "Why do I have these
22 six areas?" And then they can determine, "Is it in other
23 areas, as well? Do I have -- if they came back and pulled a
24 different sample, would I be 100 percent or would I still
25 have the same errors?" And then they have, you know, 6 to 9

1 months to work on it before the auditors potentially sample
2 them again.

3 Senator Sullivan: Great. Thank you.

4 Senator Perdue.

5 Senator Perdue: Well, first of all, I want to thank
6 you for your perseverance in here. You and the Ranking
7 Member Kaine have been warriors on this for years.

8 And I want to thank you, Secretary, for giving us our
9 first audit in the history of the United States. And I know
10 it's a laborious process. I know it's expensive, to start
11 with, to do your first one. I just have a couple of quick
12 questions.

13 When you look at the number -- or the cost of this
14 first exercise, pretty substantial, as you might imagine.
15 This is our third-largest expense -- item on our expense
16 sheet, second only to Social Security and Medicare. But,
17 it's only a few -- it's only a little bit larger than some
18 of our larger corporations. And so, they do this routinely,
19 and it doesn't cost them a billion dollars to do this. So,
20 my question is, Over time, do you see a possibility, number
21 one, that we can get to the answers, here, quicker, now that
22 we've got a start at it, we can get to clean -- a clean
23 report? And then, what's the quantitative -- I know we've
24 talked about some of the subjective benefits of this,
25 obvious -- that are obvious, but how do we quantify that? I

1 mean, it seems to me -- you've mentioned, in a private
2 conversation, that you've pretty much already paid for this,
3 in many regards, quantitatively. Can you just tell the
4 committee and get that on the record for us?

5 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, you talked about the cost.
6 So, let's break it into the three parts.

7 There's the amount we pay to the public accounting
8 firms --

9 Senator Perdue: Right.

10 Mr. Norquist: -- about 195 million. Compared to our
11 size, not dramatically different than some of the other
12 large firms.

13 Senator Perdue: It's about right.

14 Mr. Norquist: From the Corps of Engineers, their
15 experience has been, though, that, as the audits move from
16 these heavy sampling to reliance on controls, those costs
17 will come down. So, we expect to see the amount we pay the
18 auditors go down.

19 We have a similar amount, about 250 million, that we
20 spend either in labor of Federal employees or in the
21 contract support that we use to support the audit. Some of
22 that will come down. Some of that's just the cost of doing
23 business correctly.

24 When you look at what DFAS spends to process, they have
25 very good data over how much they spend fixing errors.

1 Their cost will go down by at least 400 million when they
2 start getting clean data, which will fully cover the cost of
3 the audit and the cost of our side of support.

4 Senator Perdue: The clean data is a byproduct of an
5 audit process.

6 Mr. Norquist: It absolutely is. And the -- and you
7 think about the labor we spend when a transaction comes
8 through that's unclean. Somebody has to research, they've
9 got to figure out why the codes are wrong --

10 Senator Perdue: Right.

11 Mr. Norquist: -- which is an automatic -- when the
12 whole thing flies through without a touch. Right? And
13 you're all set.

14 The second half of that is the money we spend on fixing
15 problems. And again, we're doing this to comply with our
16 standards and with the law, so we were spending that money
17 in the past, and we are spending now. The difference is, we
18 didn't have the audit to tell us if it was right.

19 So, I'll just pick a system example. You're fielding a
20 new accounting system. In the past, you'd field it, and
21 then you'd start discovering it didn't post right, it didn't
22 do what you want to. The person fielding it now knows the
23 auditors are going to show every year and test that system,
24 so you're not going to be done with your implementation
25 before the auditor's given you a list of problems. And the

1 program manager's thinking, "Am I paying you to make this
2 system work?" So, that level of discipline benefits the
3 taxpayer through these fieldings to get it to the right
4 level.

5 What I was surprised by was, when you look at the money
6 that the Navy has saved, the 167 million, when you look at
7 the 316 million that the Department was able to use data
8 analytics to recover as we did our budget scrubs, that's the
9 cost of what we're spending on the audit, and then some.
10 So, in terms of paying the auditors, we're already
11 recovering that.

12 Senator Perdue: Right.

13 Mr. Norquist: Now we're just living off the benefit of
14 all of their findings, making sure the rest of the money we
15 spend is better, that our processes get better, and that we
16 bring discipline to the system. So, I had originally
17 expected that this would be a savings some years out. And I
18 know the patience with, "Just wait, it will pass." But, we
19 are seeing that benefit now, and we are seeing the benefit
20 to the taxpayer immediately.

21 Senator Perdue: Can I ask one more, real quick?

22 I know you've talked about continuing resolutions since
23 you've taken this job. And we now know, because the SECNAV,
24 Secretary Richardson, has actually talked to us
25 quantitatively about that, and now the service heads --

1 Secretaries have also done that across the board. We now
2 know that it costs upwards of couple-hundred-billion dollars
3 over 10 years, in terms of these -- the CR practice that
4 we've been under for the last 45 years. Only four times in
5 the last 45 years have we actually funded the government on
6 time. And that means no need for a continuing resolution at
7 the beginning of the year. In the last decade, all but one
8 year, we've -- the first quarter has been under a continuing
9 resolution.

10 Now, this current debate that we'll have tomorrow, if
11 we have a vote on the next continuing resolution, will be
12 the 188th continuing resolution. Can you describe to us how
13 the audit interacts with our growing awareness of how this
14 insidious thing called a continuing resolution just
15 devastates the military? It doesn't sound so onerous to me,
16 as a business guy, coming -- you're going to spend no more
17 than last year? That doesn't sound so bad. But, because it
18 ties the hands of the military at the line-item level, seems
19 to me we're building in tremendous intrinsic costs there
20 just because of our lack of doing the job here in Congress.
21 And I know you agree with that. How would the audit help us
22 identify, expose those wasteful efforts? Like, \$4 billion
23 right now we're spending today, we're spending against \$4
24 billion of programs that the DOD has already said are
25 obsolete, we don't want to spend those anymore, but we're

1 obliged to under the continuing resolution law.

2 Mr. Norquist: So, you think of a contract where you're
3 buying some supply. Normally, you might place the order at
4 the beginning of the year for the entire year. And instead,
5 you're going to take that, and somebody's going to make an
6 order that covers the first 6 weeks. And then, after your
7 contracting action, they have to do all the normal
8 paperwork, they've got to load it in the system, and then,
9 when the CR is extended, they do another contract for
10 another 4 or 6 weeks. We keep breaking this contract into
11 multiple parts, increasing the amount of manual labor that
12 you have to do, increasing the chance for data error, making
13 it much harder on the vendor to deliver the quantity at the
14 right cost. And so, what the audit will show you is just
15 the volume of transactions you have artificially generated,
16 the amount of additional work. We see the consequences with
17 some of these inventory issues at year-end, where we held
18 back money for 3-6 months, and then we push it forward and
19 expect people to move out and be able to execute it with the
20 3 to 6 months left.

21 Senator Perdue: We're holding excess inventory in
22 anticipation of 3 months or more that we can't use.

23 Mr. Norquist: Or at the very end of the year, it's the
24 one thing I can order. Right? So, I order the inventory,
25 but it's a rush, because I didn't get it in a normal

1 sequence like I did, so I put it on the shelf. I'll get
2 around to loading it into the inventory system later. Life
3 gets busy --

4 You know, part of -- the other part is, the people
5 doing the audit are the ones most affected by the CR. It's
6 the acquisition community, it's the financial -- all these
7 folks who are now spending their time over here, we want
8 over on the other side, getting the data and getting the
9 process right.

10 So, it's very disruptive, and the audit highlights
11 that. And then, the whole effect on the mission side, on
12 the families, on the deployments, those are a pretty serious
13 problem.

14 Senator Perdue: Thank you.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Senator Sullivan: Senator Blackburn.

17 Senator Blackburn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 And, Mr. Secretary, thank you for being with us today.

19 I'll have tell you, going back to my freshman year in
20 the House in 2003, we started working on the management
21 initiative, the DOD audit processes, trying to simplify this
22 and get everybody into a system where data would be
23 interoperable, you would be able to put a lot of this online
24 at that point. Now we want it all in the Cloud. But, what
25 has frustrated me, and, I think, what continues to frustrate

1 some of our men and women in uniform, is that you take two
2 steps forward, you take a couple of steps back, and you end
3 up not making as much progress as you would like to see
4 made.

5 So, with our interests in Tennessee -- Fort Campbell,
6 Millington Air Naval Station, Arnold Air, our National Guard
7 presence, the full-time National Guard Intel Unit -- as I
8 talk with these men and women, one of the things that
9 continues to come up is having a standardized process,
10 having best practices, and being able to look, not just at
11 what is immediately in front of you, but looking out --
12 further out. And as -- Senator Perdue just talked about the
13 necessity for having budget authority and not running on a
14 CR. That's a big part of that. And we realize that. But,
15 also, I think the -- what comes back to being an issue with
16 DOD is the fact that they just can't seem to get ahead of
17 this process and get those best practices in place.

18 So, what I'd like to hear from you is, if you've got a
19 system in place to really incentivize identification of cost
20 savings by DOD employees, if that would help. And also,
21 what about a best-practices database? Is that something
22 that, as you go through this and you pull this data, and you
23 go in and research this, are you building a best-practices
24 database that is going to be available systemwide? And
25 then, the third thing I would say is, leveraging leaders

1 from the private sector who can really come in, based on
2 their experience, and help you streamline processes and
3 optimize operations for the Department. Because right now
4 -- and this is one of the problems, I think, that our units
5 have when they're deployed, is the number of hoops they have
6 to jump through to get authority or something that they need
7 in a timely manner.

8 So, as you look, holistically, at this and what you
9 intend to glean from it, if you'll just answer those, it
10 would be helpful.

11 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, it's in -- one of the
12 important things is how the audit puts a spotlight on some
13 of those problems. And one of the things that we have set
14 up at the Department is, we have three forums that include
15 the headquarters, but also Army, Navy, and Air Force. One
16 of them focuses on the IT aspects of the audit; another, on
17 the logistics, which is a lot of the issue you're talking
18 about; and the third is on financial management. And part
19 of the answer is, we're all going to find the same problem.
20 So, when we have the right fix, when we have a solution that
21 is usable across it -- and so, for example, the Army is
22 experimenting with -- it's a series of codes called a BOT, a
23 micro-thing -- but, what it does is, it's software that,
24 when you depart, runs through the accounts and looks for
25 every place you had a login account, and turns it off

1 instead of waiting for six different organizations to get
2 the paperwork to go in and turn off your access. That
3 works. Everybody can adopt it. The similar thing we're
4 looking at is, How do I make sure somebody doesn't login as
5 one user in one account, still login as another, and yet --
6 we're trying to design a control that prevents somebody from
7 doing both of those functions. So, all of those are best
8 practices. We have a forum that shares those.

9 You talk about being in the private sector. Secretary
10 Spencer, at the Navy, bought in private-sector overview of
11 how you do aircraft maintenance and has been looking through
12 and adopting some of the best practices on the Navy aircraft
13 in order to fix the depot issues, the supply issues they
14 have been facing. And so, when they have those, they then
15 share them with the other services. But, each of these
16 answers, there's a lot of analogy to what we do, even though
17 we're different, in the private sector. And the more we can
18 -- we used to call it, you know, best practices in
19 government. I think it used to be called plagiarism when I
20 was in college. But, you take their ideas, and you use
21 them, and you use it to drive efficiency in the process.

22 Senator Blackburn: Thank you.

23 I yield back.

24 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Senator Blackburn.

25 Senator Perdue.

1 Senator Perdue: Well, thank you for accommodating. I
2 just have one more.

3 I -- we could do this all day, Mr. Secretary, but
4 you've got a job to do, and we do, too.

5 But, this is so impactful. We're talking about big
6 dollars here, \$160 billion that we spent. Where do we go
7 from here? And what do you think we're going to identify?
8 And if you don't -- if you're not ready to quantify this
9 today, I totally understand that. But, the purpose -- one
10 of the purposes of an audit is to look at operational
11 effectiveness and best practices Senator Blackburn just
12 mentioned. But, I'm looking at the top-line. This is our,
13 sort of, first deep-dive look at the broad base of the DOD.
14 And, when you look at the impacts of CRs and other things,
15 given the NDS, what do you think the potential is going to
16 be for some rationalization of this lost cause?

17 For example -- and I will just highlight this quickly
18 -- we spend about 14 percent of the total money on overhead.
19 Now, that's up from about 2 percent in about the Vietnam
20 era. So, it's 2 percent to 14. I'd like to know how --
21 what that increase is. That should be part of the audit
22 process, as well. Then we allocate the balance -- a third,
23 a third, a third -- which is not consistent with the NDS.
24 And I would hope that the audit, in getting more efficacy
25 about where the money is spent and how that's decided, will

1 give us some flexibility in how to address that.

2 So, my question, sir, is, Where do we go from here?
3 What's the next step this year? And what do you hope to
4 improve after the first audit? And then, secondarily, what
5 do you think the rationalization potential could be in DOD?
6 And I'm -- and if you're not ready to quantify a number
7 there, I would totally understand. But, at least
8 directionally give us some idea of what you're thinking.

9 Mr. Norquist: Sure. So, I think the next big step --
10 I mean, in the small steps, we're going to keep identifying
11 the errors, we're going to close them -- the next big step
12 is to take advantage of the data we have. Part of it is, we
13 used to do transactions in blocks, thousands of transactions
14 as a single entry. Can't do that and pass an audit. So,
15 we're doing individual transactions. The advantage of that
16 is, you can now search on them. So, whereas, before,
17 somebody looking at a budget would see they had \$100
18 million, they've spent 50; they can now click on that and
19 get every single transaction that makes that up. Well, now
20 if you want to get after overhead, if you want to get after
21 some of those other expenses, you can go through the --
22 through those transactions and sort out, Is this overhead,
23 as in logistics support and maintenance and essential
24 things, or is this overhead, as in I hired a consultant?
25 Right? And am I getting something? So, that level of

1 transaction-level data.

2 Part of what I want to push for is, we should be able
3 to have a meeting in the Pentagon that looks like what you'd
4 have in a business company, where all the business units are
5 there and you've got a report from your CFO, that there's no
6 discussion about the report. It is an accurate summary of
7 the financial activities of each of the organization. We're
8 now going to have a discussion about what it means. Right?
9 If you don't trust the data, you can't get there. But, if
10 you start having this transaction level, we can bring it up.

11 We use, in Defense, something called PPBE -- you know,
12 "planning, program, budget, execution." It doesn't have a
13 backloop -- right? -- where you go and you say, And here's
14 what we did and how it's -- how it comes back. So, we may
15 end up changing that to PPBA, where we go from budgeting to
16 the accountability, which is, Did you do with the money,
17 what did you get for it? Before I do programming for the
18 next 5 years, how do I take that information back into the
19 system? And this is moving accounting from being a note at
20 the end that we send a report to somebody to -- and again,
21 the audit report is just to somebody, but it's the data that
22 produces it that can come back to the leadership in a usable
23 format. And this is what private-sector companies are able
24 to do, because they trust their data. And that's what we
25 want to be able to get to from how you manage an entity.

1 Senator Perdue: Well, of all the people who come to
2 the Hill and testify, I have to tell you, you have
3 consistently been a straight shooter, and I so much
4 appreciate that. Thanks for all you're doing over there.

5 Thank you, Mr. Chair, for --

6 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Senator Perdue.

7 And I want to thank the Secretary, as well.

8 I want to thank my colleagues. You're looking -- three
9 of the leaders in the Senate on these audit and budget
10 issues for the Pentagon -- Senator Ernst, Senator Blackburn,
11 Senator Perdue. So, thank you, to them.

12 And, you know, Mr. Secretary, you did raise the issue
13 of the CR, and heard bipartisan concern here today, which I
14 think is important, how you described it. There is a way to
15 deal with it, which is to allow us to get on the Defense
16 appropriations bill and have my colleagues on the other side
17 stop filibustering from getting on that, and we can just
18 vote on it. That would certainly help. That's what we're
19 trying to do. So, to the bipartisan concern, there's a
20 simple answer: Let's get on the bill and vote on the
21 Defense approps bill that came out of the Appropriations
22 Committee with a strong bipartisan support. But, we'll
23 continue to press that. I certainly will.

24 Well, I want to thank you, again.

25 And members are requested to submit any additional

1 questions for the record by Friday at noon.

2 Mr. Secretary, I appreciate and respectfully ask that
3 you promptly respond to any of these additional questions
4 from any of the members of this committee.

5 With that, we are adjourned.

6 [Whereupon, at 10:49 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

WORD INDEX

< \$ >

\$100 71:17
\$160 70:6
\$167 24:2
\$2.8 3:11
\$22 47:3
\$280 28:16
\$4 64:22, 23
\$770 16:15
\$81 10:25 28:12, 17

< 1 >

1 16:24 27:11 44:3
10 17:11, 13 52:19
 58:19 64:3
10:49 74:6
100 23:25 24:23
 25:10 31:5 45:12
 58:7 59:24
108 59:6
10-week 10:25
1300 42:5
14 70:18, 20
1400 3:8 10:6
15th 24:22
16,000 9:18
1600 9:17
167 63:6
174 11:3
18 41:13
188th 64:12
195 61:10
195-200 16:16
1990 6:15

< 2 >

2 38:25 70:19, 20
2,377 10:15
20 1:4
200 16:23 41:20
200,000 11:5
2003 66:20
2015 6:17
2018 2:8
2019 1:4 2:8 4:11,
 14 6:23, 25
22 41:12
22nd 33:6
23 10:16
24 3:21 10:13
 52:13
25 18:23 59:8, 10
250 61:19
280 28:19
292 9:18

< 3 >

3 9:15 65:20, 22

300 9:16
316 11:12 63:7
3-6 65:18
3-more-month 44:7

< 4 >

4 65:10
4.6 11:5
40 47:9
400 62:1
45 64:4, 5

< 5 >

5 52:15, 21 58:19
 72:18
50 71:18
550 10:16

< 6 >

6 44:17 59:25
 65:6, 10, 20
60 25:9
600 10:6 31:2
660 33:17

< 7 >

7 10:13
79 56:13, 14, 18, 24
 57:19

< 8 >

8 40:23

< 9 >
9 40:23 59:25
9:30 1:12
95.5-percent 59:10,
 18

< A >

A&S 48:23
a.m 1:12 74:6
ability 4:1 17:12
 27:16 40:25
able 21:24 22:2, 8,
 18 23:7 28:13
 34:1 38:15 40:18,
 20 41:1 42:11, 18
 43:17 48:11, 15
 55:25 63:7 65:19
 66:23 67:10 72:2,
 23, 25
absence 17:5
Absolutely 31:18
 39:16 49:4 62:6
abuse 32:6
access 48:16 69:2
accommodating
 70:1

account 3:10 10:10
 20:10 29:9 68:25
 69:5
accountability 72:16
accountable 16:25
 32:15 55:14
accountants 57:12
accounted 28:20
accounting 8:1
 22:5, 9 61:7 62:20
 72:19

accounts 68:24
accuracy 10:2
 25:10 57:2
accurate 18:18
 25:22 58:12 72:6
accurately 20:17
achieving 4:23
acquisition 5:1
 50:19 66:6

acres 11:6
Act 26:15 27:6, 25
Acting 36:14
action 42:8 65:7
actions 10:3 47:10
active 11:1 36:10,
 19 37:2 38:2 56:14
activities 52:9 72:7
actual 56:24

add 42:25
addition 10:12
 39:10

additional 8:3 42:6
 53:25 65:16 73:25
 74:3

address 9:9 42:8
 45:19 71:1
addressed 24:3

addressing 49:18
adequate 29:25
adherence 50:6
adjourned 74:5, 6
admin 55:21

administration
 12:10 26:23 27:7,
 10 28:5 36:20
 43:12

administrations
 28:4
administrationwide
 53:20

Admiral 23:21
adopt 41:2, 7 69:3
adopting 69:12
ADVANA 11:9

advantage 71:12, 15
advocating 55:17
affect 28:8
afford 50:9
afraid 56:1

agencies 3:22 6:14
 23:5 27:7
Agency 10:13 14:9

agency-wide 3:18
aggressive 23:22
ago 8:11 40:24
 56:10

agree 43:10 44:7
 45:12 64:21
agreed 44:2
agreement 12:10

agrees 17:11, 14
ahead 36:20, 21
 67:16
Air 28:13 56:13
 67:6 68:15

aircraft 9:17, 18
 59:7 69:11, 12
airline 9:16
aisle 2:13

alarming 56:9, 16
ALASKA 2:2 59:1
Alexander 19:24
 31:21

allies 39:18
allocate 70:22
allow 22:13 73:15
allows 22:19 41:2

alternatives 47:2
American 4:15
 8:11, 12 9:12
 10:18 12:24 20:5

ammunition 43:25
amount 6:5 19:4
 61:7, 17, 19 65:11,
 16

amounts 10:9
amplify 20:11
analogy 69:16
analysis 50:3

analysts 11:11
analytics 11:8
 40:17 63:8
annex 21:13

annexes 22:1
Anniston 18:14
 24:22, 25

announced 6:22
annual 12:18 52:8
annually 16:9

answer 9:13 14:3
 22:19 37:4 41:19
 47:7 57:20 68:9,
 19 73:20

answers 60:21
 69:16
anticipation 65:22
Antideficiency
 26:15 27:6, 24
anybody 58:18
anymore 64:25

Apparently 6:9
 28:6
appearing 38:9

applaud 26:20
applied 8:2, 4
appointed 45:18
appreciate 28:1
 42:19 47:17 49:16
 73:4 74:2

appreciation 42:25
 43:11

approach 15:25
 32:21
approaches 21:16

appropriate 20:6
 33:2 40:23
appropriation 12:4
appropriations
 43:17 73:16, 21

approps 73:21
approximately 9:17
 11:5

area 26:13 47:1, 8
 49:20
areas 7:2 31:11, 12
 47:5 50:22 59:22,
 23

arena 39:5
Armed 1:9 47:4
Army 19:23, 25
 24:22 68:15, 21

Arnold 67:6
arrived 3:2
Article 27:11

articles 19:21 20:2
artificial 44:5
artificially 65:15

aside 2:16
asked 33:10 36:8
 58:8

aspect 8:12
aspects 68:16
assembling 50:14
assess 9:22

Assessing 19:25
assessment 10:25
assets 3:11 20:11

assistance 47:24
 48:1
Assistant 31:22

assume 25:1 31:14
assumed 56:3
assurance 21:3, 7
attack 20:7, 9, 11
 48:7

attention 6:7 53:3

attorney 53:16
AUDIT 1:2 2:10,
 18, 25 3:3, 5, 6, 8,
 12, 18, 20, 23 4:21,
 24 6:6, 23 7:10, 17,

25 8:3, 13, 14 9:7,
8, 10, 11, 13, 23
10:17, 18, 19, 20
11:15 12:18 14:9,
17 15:7, 12, 14, 23
16:7, 8, 14, 15, 19
17:5 19:18 21:9,
16, 17, 25 22:2, 23
23:1, 6 24:23, 25
26:11 29:4, 6, 20
30:24 31:7, 12
38:16, 23 40:5
41:15 43:4, 7
45:15 48:9 55:15,
17, 19 56:3, 11
57:7, 12 58:13
60:9 61:21 62:3, 5,
18 63:9 64:13, 21
65:14 66:5, 10, 21
68:12, 16 70:10, 21,
24 71:4, 14 72:21
73:9
auditability 6:12
auditable 7:7
audited 14:6 21:10
40:22
auditing 42:2, 3
auditor 17:11, 14
25:6 41:23
auditors 3:8, 9
9:21 10:6 15:11,
12, 16, 17, 19 16:3,
17 17:8, 10, 18, 25
22:20 23:14 25:14
29:5 30:4 31:1
41:20 42:5 55:10
57:11 58:6 60:1
61:18 62:23 63:10
auditor's 62:25
audits 2:8 3:6, 21
6:15 7:19 8:7, 8
9:20 14:14, 15
30:25 52:8, 11
58:18 61:15
audit's 39:11
August 49:11
authorities 32:19
authority 67:13
68:6
authorization 12:4
automate 11:9
automatic 62:11
automation 30:13
available 11:2 34:2
40:24 67:24
avoid 45:10
aware 34:14 45:16
awareness 64:13

< B >

back 3:22 19:5
24:5 27:8 31:4
39:8 40:23 43:8,
15 44:18 49:11, 16
59:9, 23 65:18
66:19 67:2, 15
69:23 72:14, 18, 22
background 11:20
57:14
backloop 72:13
backorder 24:4
backwards 23:15
bad 40:4 64:17
balance 70:22
barcode 30:9
barrier 48:25
base 18:21, 23
24:10 25:7, 8, 11,
16 31:3, 4, 8 55:3
57:4 70:13
based 19:18 20:2
43:3 68:1
baseline 15:23
bases 18:2 23:23
24:1
basic 14:2 17:24
basically 27:10
31:25 42:2
basis 17:18
beast 42:17
beginning 6:15
21:20 64:7 65:4
belief 30:24
believe 6:17 16:2
27:23 44:12
benefit 9:11 10:18
39:12, 25 55:22
63:13, 19
benefits 7:16, 17, 24
11:7 17:19 60:24
63:2
best 17:9 18:8
29:11 41:2, 7
47:11 67:10, 17
69:7, 12, 18 70:11
best-practices 67:21,
23
better 4:22 8:15
10:22 11:7, 13
15:24 30:6 42:10
55:9 63:15
big 17:3 40:18, 19
47:24 55:15 67:14
70:5 71:9, 11
biggest 16:2
bill 73:16, 20, 21
billion 9:18 16:8
60:19 64:22, 24
70:6
billions 40:22

bills 12:5 43:17
55:20
bipartisan 73:13, 19,
22
bipartisanship 4:19
bit 2:17 16:7
21:15 28:20 39:9
56:22 60:17
Blackburn 1:16
66:16, 17 69:22, 24
70:11 73:10
blanking 7:9
blocks 71:13
Bloomberg 56:12
board 64:1
boil 42:18
BOT 68:22
bought 69:10
branch 27:4, 7, 12
breadth 14:16
break 61:6
breakdown 19:1
breaking 65:10
breakthrough 45:21
briefly 9:9 24:24
bring 15:12 16:4
31:16 58:9 63:16
72:10
bringing 50:9
brings 18:8
broad 70:13
broader 11:15
broadspread 27:25
brought 15:8
bucks 28:19
budget 4:22, 24
12:11 16:24 21:21
43:15 57:10 63:8
67:13 71:17 72:12
73:9
budgeting 72:15
build 48:18
Building 1:13 42:5
64:19 67:23
built 40:7
bunch 55:19
bureaucratic 42:17
business 10:1
11:16, 23 12:19, 22
19:23 40:1 48:23
61:23 64:16 72:4
businesses 47:21
48:6, 13
busy 66:3
buy 28:25 29:17
43:25 50:12
buying 11:18 44:3
49:22, 24 50:4 65:3
buys 31:6
byproduct 62:4

< C >

call 11:24 16:22
40:20 69:18
called 22:5 34:12
47:15 64:14 68:22
69:19 72:11
calling 21:5
Campbell 67:5
canceled 11:14
cap 43:15
capabilities 26:24
39:13
capacity 48:1
Capitol 6:5
care 32:13
careful 50:3
carefully 15:25
50:16
case 56:22
cases 48:14 50:7,
11, 13
catastrophic 44:23
cause 70:16
cautious 44:25
Center 10:24
central 15:17
certain 17:1 19:4
42:11 55:3 59:12
certainly 31:23
38:2 45:12 73:18,
23
Certification 47:16
certified 48:19
CFO 72:5
chain 48:6
chains 50:5, 8
Chair 19:16 38:7
42:21 49:8 52:2
53:12 66:15 73:5
chairman 1:14
4:17 6:3 9:3, 4
13:2 14:12 24:20
30:20, 22 49:6
66:17
challenge 15:7
21:20 33:15 39:4
challenges 29:14
33:25 44:20 49:21
challenging 33:13,
15
chance 28:7 65:12
change 4:1 56:4
changing 28:3
72:15
character 20:8
check 34:25 48:10
55:19
chemicals 45:17
Chief 38:17
chilling 34:7
China 4:14 49:15
Chinese 44:7
Chinese-made 49:23
choice 15:15
choir 12:2 43:9, 10
CIO 48:22 50:18
circumstances 53:23
civil 26:10 33:13
civilian 10:9
civilians 9:15
claims 17:13
clarify 14:13
classified 21:10, 13,
14, 16, 18, 21 22:1,
9, 10, 12, 17, 19, 22,
25
clean 3:19, 22 8:1,
7 10:12, 14 15:18
16:3, 18 22:14
29:21 39:1 52:10,
14, 16, 17, 19, 20
53:5 58:19 60:22
62:2, 4
clear 32:4 36:3
39:3
clearance 22:7
clearances 22:12,
18, 21
clearly 42:7
click 71:18
close 16:8 45:21
46:1 53:23 71:11
closed 21:12 41:11
closely 36:17 48:23
closing 10:16
12:13 42:10
cloud 40:19 66:24
CMMC 47:16 48:8
Coast 52:20, 22
53:1
codes 62:9 68:22
colleagues 43:1
73:8, 16
college 69:20
Colonel 19:24 20:3,
5 32:3
come 2:4, 18 3:22
12:10 15:9 16:20
17:2, 22 18:14
19:22 25:7 28:5
29:5, 20 32:6, 11
33:1 40:10 42:12
45:9 48:10 52:24
55:18 57:15, 16
61:17, 22 67:9
68:1 72:22 73:1
comes 18:25 34:18
57:7 62:7 67:15
72:14

<p>coming 29:22 45:6 49:2, 4 64:16</p> <p>commander 25:15 59:21</p> <p>commanders 55:3, 5</p> <p>commend 3:15 14:11</p> <p>comment 20:20 36:15 43:8</p> <p>comments 30:3 52:5</p> <p>commercial 9:16, 21 18:7 49:11, 12</p> <p>Commissary 10:13</p> <p>commit 36:9</p> <p>commitment 12:17</p> <p>committed 36:17</p> <p>Committee 1:9 6:17, 19, 25 7:8 8:9 9:5 12:16 52:9 61:4 73:22 74:4</p> <p>communist 49:15</p> <p>community 48:24 66:6</p> <p>companies 72:23</p> <p>company 9:20 50:1, 2 72:4</p> <p>Compared 61:10</p> <p>competition 4:13, 18</p> <p>competitive 12:23</p> <p>complained 38:19</p> <p>completed 2:10 3:3, 5, 17</p> <p>completely 45:4 52:10</p> <p>completeness 10:11</p> <p>complex 7:1 9:14, 22 12:14, 20 14:8</p> <p>compliance 30:10 48:17</p> <p>compliant 30:5</p> <p>comply 47:23 48:2 62:15</p> <p>components 49:25 50:2</p> <p>comprehensive 9:23</p> <p>Comptroller 2:9 14:4</p> <p>Comptrollers 38:17</p> <p>computers 49:13</p> <p>coms 59:7</p> <p>concern 21:25 28:24 31:17 50:22 73:13, 19</p> <p>concerned 27:12 33:10 36:20 43:14 47:22 56:22</p> <p>concerning 2:7 28:19</p>	<p>concerns 23:24 55:16</p> <p>concerted 27:9</p> <p>condition 9:24 18:17, 19</p> <p>conducted 10:6, 25 31:1</p> <p>Conducting 2:25 3:11</p> <p>confidence 4:15 17:12 21:4</p> <p>confirmed 2:12</p> <p>confirming 17:8</p> <p>Congress 4:10, 12, 14 10:5 12:4, 10, 15, 22 20:15, 18, 23 21:2 26:22 27:8, 17 28:9, 19 33:20 40:23 42:19 43:12 44:1 64:20</p> <p>congressional 11:20</p> <p>Congress's 26:24</p> <p>connection 29:13</p> <p>consequences 65:16</p> <p>Considering 30:23</p> <p>Consistent 10:7 11:19 12:11 70:23</p> <p>consistently 73:3</p> <p>consolidating 11:18</p> <p>constant 31:24</p> <p>constantly 44:11</p> <p>constituents 21:6</p> <p>Constitution 27:12</p> <p>construct 23:8</p> <p>consultant 71:24</p> <p>continual 17:18</p> <p>continually 12:22 26:23</p> <p>continue 4:12 34:8 47:3 56:6 73:23</p> <p>continues 66:25 67:9</p> <p>continuing 12:1 43:13 63:22 64:6, 8, 11, 12, 14 65:1</p> <p>continuous 8:14</p> <p>contract 61:21 65:2, 9, 10</p> <p>contracting 5:2 65:7</p> <p>contractors 47:15, 18, 20</p> <p>contracts 41:23 42:1</p> <p>control 25:18 69:6</p> <p>controls 16:22 48:10 61:16</p> <p>conversation 61:2</p> <p>conversations 22:8</p> <p>Cooper 31:22 32:3</p>	<p>33:6, 16 53:16, 20</p> <p>cooperate 26:5</p> <p>cooperates 31:6</p> <p>cooperating 20:15 21:2 33:19</p> <p>cooperation 50:18 55:8</p> <p>Cooper's 33:8</p> <p>coordinate 36:24</p> <p>core 25:5</p> <p>corporations 60:18</p> <p>Corps 16:17 31:4, 8 61:14</p> <p>correct 16:9 27:19 41:14 58:2, 4</p> <p>corrected 7:3</p> <p>corrective 42:8 52:8</p> <p>correctly 61:23</p> <p>correlation 55:6</p> <p>cost 16:7, 8, 19 17:22 60:13, 19 61:5, 22 62:1, 2, 3 63:9 65:14 67:19</p> <p>costs 12:23 40:10 61:16 64:2, 19</p> <p>counsel 27:4 28:6</p> <p>counsel's 27:13</p> <p>count 9:24 48:20</p> <p>counter 4:13</p> <p>counting 18:4</p> <p>countries 48:7</p> <p>country 14:7 36:23 59:19</p> <p>couple 14:4, 24 23:11 26:18 42:9 55:1 56:10 60:11 67:2</p> <p>couple-hundred- billion 64:2</p> <p>course 3:7</p> <p>cover 62:2</p> <p>covered 56:8</p> <p>covers 65:6</p> <p>CR 12:5, 8 43:9, 20, 21 64:3 65:9 66:5 67:14 73:13</p> <p>create 34:7 40:11</p> <p>creates 50:10</p> <p>credit 23:21 45:18 58:17, 22</p> <p>critical 3:12 4:7</p> <p>CRs 29:14 70:14</p> <p>culture 32:11</p> <p>current 45:15 64:10</p> <p>cut 44:23 45:3</p> <p>cutting 40:2</p> <p>cyber 4:2</p> <p>cybersecurity 10:22</p>	<p>47:15, 18 49:15</p> <p>< D ></p> <p>D.C 1:10</p> <p>dais 5:6</p> <p>damage 12:6</p> <p>Dan 1:13 2:1</p> <p>Daniel 53:15</p> <p>data 8:1 10:22 11:7, 8 22:20 40:8, 11, 17, 19, 21 41:4, 8 48:8 61:25 62:2, 4 63:7 65:12 66:8, 22 67:22 71:12 72:1, 9, 21, 24</p> <p>database 57:23 59:9 67:21, 24</p> <p>databases 18:10</p> <p>dataset 41:1</p> <p>date 43:6</p> <p>daunting 14:10</p> <p>David 2:7 9:1</p> <p>day 19:21 33:6 45:19 70:3</p> <p>days 56:10</p> <p>deal 6:24 12:11 21:21 32:18, 19, 23 44:12 48:6 73:15</p> <p>dealings 20:23 32:12</p> <p>dealt 55:23</p> <p>debate 64:10</p> <p>decade 64:7</p> <p>decades 38:22</p> <p>December 44:16</p> <p>decided 70:25</p> <p>decision 34:3</p> <p>decisionmaking 10:23</p> <p>decreasing 11:3</p> <p>deep-dive 70:13</p> <p>defend 39:19</p> <p>DEFENSE 1:2 2:7, 12 3:4, 17 4:9, 11, 23 7:14 9:2, 6 10:13 11:16 12:20 15:22 19:19 20:13 28:9 31:22 36:14 39:3, 6 40:12 47:15, 19 48:1 72:11 73:15, 21</p> <p>Defense's 2:8</p> <p>deferred 36:15</p> <p>deficiencies 27:5</p> <p>deficit 39:20</p> <p>definitely 47:6</p> <p>delay 12:6 44:14</p> <p>delaying 38:23</p> <p>deliver 65:13</p> <p>delivered 21:3</p>	<p>demands 24:4</p> <p>Democrats 44:2, 6</p> <p>demonstrates 10:17</p> <p>depart 68:24</p> <p>DEPARTMENT 1:2 2:8 3:4, 17, 25 4:1, 22, 25 6:22 7:14 8:10 9:6 10:15 11:8 12:2, 20 15:22 16:14 18:24 24:9 28:8 29:2 34:5 36:16, 21 39:22 47:14 49:17, 20 50:3, 20 52:10, 17 57:8 58:18, 22 63:7 68:3, 14</p> <p>departmentwide 25:23</p> <p>dependent 17:8</p> <p>deployed 68:5</p> <p>deployments 66:12</p> <p>deport 37:1</p> <p>deported 38:3</p> <p>deporting 36:22</p> <p>deposition 33:7, 10</p> <p>Depot 24:23 40:16 45:7 57:5 69:13</p> <p>depots 18:3</p> <p>depreciate 22:16</p> <p>depth 14:16</p> <p>Deputy 2:7, 12 9:1 19:18 20:13 31:22</p> <p>describe 64:12</p> <p>described 73:14</p> <p>deserve 7:7 26:1</p> <p>deserved 6:7</p> <p>design 69:6</p> <p>designed 43:21, 23</p> <p>Despite 38:24</p> <p>destructive 43:21</p> <p>detail 57:13</p> <p>detailed 16:21</p> <p>determine 59:22</p> <p>devastates 64:15</p> <p>DFAS 17:23 61:24</p> <p>DHS 36:17, 24, 25</p> <p>difference 14:15 16:2 62:17</p> <p>different 3:21 15:9 32:20 47:10 49:10 53:4 59:24 61:11 69:1, 17</p> <p>difficult 3:16</p> <p>dig 16:6</p> <p>diligent 20:25</p> <p>direct 23:7 24:11 55:22</p> <p>directing 7:12</p> <p>direction 11:20</p>
---	--	--	---	--

18:22, 25 53:21
directionally 71:8
directly 30:9 50:11, 13
disbursement 40:25
discipline 4:22, 24 29:17, 19 63:2, 16
disclaimer 38:24 41:25
discovering 23:16 49:25 62:21
discussed 49:17
discussion 38:11 72:6, 8
disrupted 44:11
disruptive 66:10
distinct 39:4
distinguished 9:4
district 45:5
dive 39:7
Dixon 23:21
document 3:10
documents 21:22 26:25
DOD 2:9, 10, 18 3:6, 9, 11, 13 4:2, 11 5:1 6:12, 15, 21 8:6 9:14 10:4, 10, 20 12:14 17:1 21:9 23:8 30:23 32:4, 25 33:1, 11, 19 36:23, 25 40:21 41:11 64:24 66:21 67:16, 20 70:13 71:5
DOD's 4:7
doing 3:20 12:19 14:11 16:9 17:18 18:4 30:7, 12 31:9 32:2, 13 38:22 43:1 55:19 61:22 62:15 64:20 66:5 69:7 71:15 73:4
dollar 4:9 7:22
dollars 4:16 16:8, 16 17:3 57:9 60:19 64:2 70:6
drag 44:9
dragged 38:19
drama 57:6
dramatic 14:17
dramatically 61:11
drill 55:18, 21
drive 7:11 26:1 69:21
driving 4:22 40:1
drop 53:10
dropped 16:19
duplicate 11:22
Duty 36:10, 19

37:2 38:2
 < E >
earlier 20:18 27:15
early 17:21 43:8
earnest 27:16
earning 4:10 12:25
easier 48:13
easy 3:12
edge 12:23
effect 34:7 66:11
effective 7:13 8:4 11:21 30:6 45:23
effectively 9:22
effectiveness 7:20, 23 70:11
efficacy 70:24
efficiencies 7:23 11:23
efficiency 7:10, 17 23:8 39:19 69:21
efficient 42:11
effort 7:4 26:20 27:9 39:17 42:19
efforts 27:16 31:24 64:22
either 21:22 30:11 32:18 61:20
electronic 49:13
electronics 49:22
element 11:15 45:22
eliminated 11:4, 10
eliminating 11:22
emanated 34:6
embracing 12:14
emphasis 15:7 56:5
emphasized 26:21
employ 9:15
employees 61:20 67:20
encourage 3:24
ended 55:25
end-to-end 14:17
enemy 12:8
engage 52:8
engaged 55:11
Engineers 16:18 61:14
enhancing 39:17
ensure 47:17
entail 18:1
enter 40:8
enterprise 11:18
enterprises 12:21
entire 65:4
entity 72:25
entries 40:11
entry 48:25 59:15 71:14

environment 32:24 33:13
environmentally 47:6
episode 28:16
equal 19:2
equally 45:22
equipment 4:4 9:25 10:11 11:4 49:14 50:21
equivalent 11:5
era 70:20
Ernst 1:16 38:6, 7 39:15 41:5, 10, 15 42:15, 22 49:7, 8 50:20 52:1 73:10
ERP 30:5
error 65:12
errors 40:11 41:2 59:25 61:25 71:11
Esper 36:9, 11 45:18
essential 40:4 71:23
estate 11:24
evaluated 3:10
evaluation 26:8, 12
eventually 16:11
everybody 26:7 27:21 66:22 69:3
everybody's 53:3
everything's 7:1
evidence 10:8
exactly 14:8 18:1, 3 42:13
example 4:19 11:8 15:5 22:13 23:13 59:4, 18 62:19 68:21 70:17
examples 10:23 19:1, 23 23:6, 11 24:14 43:2 59:2, 11
Excellent 23:2 31:9
excess 65:21
excluded 22:22, 25
excuse 38:20
execute 65:19
execution 72:12
executive 27:7 53:21
exercise 7:21 44:18 60:14
existence 10:11
expect 20:22 32:11, 13 42:9 52:7, 10, 13, 16 61:17 65:19
expected 17:20, 21 48:9 63:17
expense 22:15 60:15
expenses 71:21

expensive 11:22 15:10 60:10
experience 15:13 16:17 61:15 68:2
experimenting 68:22
expired 11:14 24:13
expiring 42:15
explain 39:10
explaining 57:17
explicitly 4:21
expose 29:6 64:22
expressed 12:3 28:6 33:24
expressing 30:24
extended 65:9
extensive 19:9
extensively 23:12
extent 47:19
external 16:16
extract 48:7
extraordinarily 9:14
extrapolate 59:17
extremely 14:25
 < F >
F.E 58:7
F-35 31:13
face 20:15
facilities 23:16 45:17
facility 45:8
facing 69:14
fact 3:1 6:14 17:9 19:5, 6 22:12 67:16
factual 36:4
fail 42:3
failed 6:23
Failing 56:11 58:11
failings 7:2
failures 5:4
fairness 58:16
falls 52:18
familiar 26:14
families 21:5 38:2 44:10 66:12
Family 19:24 36:10 37:1
fanning 18:2
far 50:24
FASAB 22:5
faster 40:16
Federal 6:14 8:12 14:9 21:24 22:6 61:20
feedback 10:4 15:17, 21 55:11 59:20
feeling 32:1
feet 11:5 38:19

felt 34:13
field 30:5 62:20
fielding 62:19, 22
fieldings 63:3
fifth 56:15
figure 59:21 62:9
figuring 21:14
filibustering 73:17
filling 11:3 30:7
final 53:10
finally 6:6, 20 47:14
financial 4:25 9:7, 20, 22 12:18 14:16 38:17 48:9 66:6 68:18 72:7
find 17:17 18:21 23:18 41:1 42:4, 5, 9 59:6 68:19
finding 7:2 45:21
findings 7:17 10:15, 16 23:5 39:11 41:12 42:6 59:1 63:14
fine 7:1 16:25
firefighting 45:22
firm 30:24 48:10, 14, 15, 18, 20
firms 48:12 50:11 61:8, 12
first 2:10 9:9 14:10 41:19 42:9 43:19, 24 60:5, 9, 11, 14 64:8 65:6 70:13 71:4
fiscal 39:11, 21 41:13 44:14
Fischer 1:16
fit 39:12
five 24:2 52:19
fix 16:15 68:20 69:13
fixed 15:25 17:5, 9, 11, 13
fixing 15:23 17:7 25:21 61:25 62:14
Fleet 10:24 56:16
flexibility 71:1
flies 62:12
floor 8:22
flows 40:9
fly 9:17
foam 45:22 47:4
focus 2:24 53:3
focuses 68:16
focusing 49:10 53:8 55:13
folks 25:24 31:7 47:24 48:16 66:7
follow 18:12 28:2,

7 30:17
following 10:7
follows 13:3 35:2
 37:5 46:2 50:25
 54:2
followup 53:25
force 45:18 47:9
 68:15
forces 7:16
Force's 56:13
forget 34:6
form 26:8
format 72:23
forms 30:8
Fort 18:13 58:25
 59:5 67:5
forum 69:8
forums 32:20 68:14
forward 5:3 8:5, 9,
 19 11:17 17:13
 26:2, 3 32:6, 11
 33:20 34:8 52:14
 65:18 67:2
forwarded 33:22, 23
forwarding 34:4, 24
found 6:24 15:16
 18:23 23:24 24:2
 28:11, 18 38:20
 52:24 59:8
foundational 11:15
four 64:4
fourth 11:24
fraud 10:8
free 39:7
freed 28:13
freeing 11:4
freshman 66:19
Friday 3:17 74:1
friend 2:16
front 38:13 67:11
fronts 11:17
frustrate 66:25
frustrated 66:25
fulfill 33:14
full 4:8 7:8
full-time 67:7
fully 7:7 42:12
 62:2
function 3:13 11:13
functions 69:7
fund 4:12
fundamentally 15:9
funded 64:5
funding 2:23 16:22
 39:23
funds 11:13 40:23,
 24 58:19
further 38:24, 25
 67:12
future 36:17

FY19 3:6 16:8
FY2018 10:15
FY2020 12:4

 < G >
gain 4:8
gained 3:19
gains 12:7
GAO 14:14 21:24
 27:5, 23 32:10
gear 59:7
general 58:10
generated 65:15
getting 15:18, 21
 16:3 38:23 47:10
 52:14 56:1 62:2
 66:8 70:24 71:25
 73:17
give 10:23 21:3
 22:9 23:20 25:25
 28:7 31:7 44:7
 45:23 49:19 71:1, 8
given 14:6 62:25
 70:15
giving 21:7 60:8
glad 19:12 56:8
glamorous 4:5
glean 68:9
global 39:5
go 17:12, 22 18:9,
 22 19:9 22:6, 17
 23:12 25:25 31:14
 32:17 40:13 42:12
 43:8, 20 61:18
 62:1 67:22, 23
 69:2 70:6 71:2, 21
 72:13, 15
goal 16:9
goals 4:23 39:8
goes 18:25 26:3
 29:8 40:23 45:15
going 6:6, 9 15:20
 17:16 18:1, 3
 19:13, 17 20:6, 9,
 20 22:14 23:25
 24:16 25:3, 20
 26:4 27:2 28:11
 30:2 31:15 32:1,
 17 33:20 34:24
 36:20, 21 38:21
 41:24 42:3 44:15,
 24 48:12, 23 53:6,
 24 55:16 56:1, 3, 6
 62:23, 24 64:16
 65:5 66:19 67:24
 68:19 70:7, 15
 71:10, 11 72:8
Good 2:3, 16 6:4
 8:10 12:8 25:17
 38:3 39:8 44:13

47:13 55:8 59:2,
 18 61:25
gotten 55:9
Government 8:12
 22:6 27:5 64:5
 69:19
Governmentwide
 21:25 22:2
Governor 7:18
Grade 56:11 58:11
grappling 21:11
gratified 6:19, 20
great 6:24 17:12
 19:11 59:4 60:3
greater 7:23
great-power 4:13
ground 57:17
group 22:4, 5
grow 56:6
growing 64:13
Guard 52:20, 22
 53:1 67:6, 7
guidance 22:13
 28:8 30:18
guy 64:16

 < H >
habit 29:23
half 16:19 53:18
 62:14
half-a-billion 17:3
hand 26:18, 22
 44:16
handle 22:19 36:5
hands 40:15 64:18
happen 6:18 21:7
happened 3:2
 14:21, 22
happening 45:7
 48:3
happy 2:20 24:15
Harbor 31:8
Harbor-Hickam
 31:3
hard 14:25 15:2
 17:6 30:13 38:23
harder 44:8 65:13
harmful 11:25
hat 22:4
Hawaii 31:4
hazardous-duty
 19:6
headline 56:13
 57:24
headlines 19:22
 56:9, 17
headquarters 68:15
heads 63:25
headstart 44:7
healthcare 11:19

hear 3:1, 20 24:14
 26:19 27:14 67:18
heard 25:14 42:25
 47:21 73:13
HEARING 1:1 2:3,
 21 5:3 23:3, 9
 27:2 36:8 38:8
 74:6
hearings 33:18
 38:21 52:25
heavy 61:16
held 16:25 19:10
 32:15 65:17
help 26:1, 7 42:1
 64:21 67:20 68:2
 73:18
helped 53:3
helpful 43:4 52:25
 53:7 59:20 68:10
helping 7:25 40:5
Hey 6:25 22:14
highest 18:9 22:21
highlight 70:17
highlighting 49:12
highlights 30:14
 66:10
high-priority 40:3
 47:8
high-risk 11:12
 31:12 47:5
Hill 6:10 38:22
 73:2
hire 48:10, 15
hired 71:24
Hirono 1:16 30:21,
 22 31:10, 19 32:24
 34:4, 11, 15, 18, 23
 36:2, 6 38:1
Hirono's 53:13
history 3:4, 7 60:9
holding 53:2, 7
 65:21
holistically 68:8
Homeland 15:13,
 15 36:16, 21 39:6
 41:22 52:18
Hon 1:13 2:1 6:1
 9:1
honest 27:16 32:12
hoops 68:5
hope 4:23 7:15, 18,
 24 33:4 38:1
 42:14 70:24 71:3
hopeful 2:17
hopefully 19:12
 21:3 24:15
House 12:3 20:10,
 11 27:3, 22 33:7,
 17, 24 34:9 44:1, 6
 66:20

housekeeping 39:9
housing 31:13, 17
hundreds 3:8
hypersonic 44:5

 < I >
ICBMs 56:25
 57:19 58:5
idea 7:10 36:7
 71:8
ideas 69:20
identification 67:19
identified 10:25
 31:12
identify 11:12 40:6
 42:7 64:22 70:7
identifying 4:2
 10:21 11:23 71:10
identity 32:5
IG 14:14 22:24
 32:9, 14 41:25
ignore 27:11
II 15:5 56:15
imagine 60:14
immediate 11:2
 24:11
immediately 28:18
 63:20 67:11
impact 43:12
impactful 70:5
impacts 12:1 43:16
 70:14
Impeachment 20:1
 33:9, 18, 25 53:22
implement 28:21
implementation
 62:24
implications 39:5
importance 25:4, 14
 45:6
important 2:21
 3:16 4:8 12:15
 14:7 24:24 28:14
 30:15, 25 31:5
 32:22, 25 33:3
 38:8 47:1 48:8
 58:1 68:12 73:14
importantly 19:13
 24:9
improve 7:2, 19
 12:22 40:13 50:12
 71:4
improved 8:2 59:3
improvement 8:14
improvements 4:6, 7
improving 4:4
 10:21 11:18
inaccuracy 57:21, 22
inappropriate 34:13
incentivize 67:19

<p>include 68:14 included 59:11 includes 9:23 39:25 50:14 including 5:1 28:5 increase 70:21 increased 41:16 increases 30:10 increasing 65:11, 12 incredibly 25:13 40:21 independent 9:21 10:4 indicator 17:8 individual 3:21 40:6 71:15 individuals 20:20 34:3, 10 inefficiencies 11:11 40:1, 6 inefficient 11:22 29:3 information 4:3 21:18, 21 22:10 33:22, 23 34:2, 14 35:2 37:5 46:2 50:25 54:2 72:18 informs 53:20 Inhofe 4:17 initial 20:2 initiative 66:21 innovation 49:2, 3 inquiry 33:9 53:22 INSERT 35:3 37:6 46:3 51:1 54:3 inside 42:4 50:2 Insider 19:23 insidious 64:14 insights 11:12 inspections 3:9 installation 18:13 44:13 installations 18:1 45:20 Intel 67:7 intelligence 44:5 50:5 intend 68:9 intending 34:8 intent 48:11 interacts 64:13 interested 5:6 interesting 2:18 interests 67:5 interoperable 66:23 interpret 41:16 intrinsc 64:19 introduce 53:24 introduced 53:13 inventory 9:18 10:21 11:2 18:11</p>	<p>19:3 23:13, 17 28:13, 24, 25 41:3 44:20 55:21 56:13 65:17, 21, 24 66:2 investigations 11:21 investment 17:20 invoices 55:20 involved 18:7 involving 31:12 issue 12:15 22:12 23:12, 13 28:23 31:19 32:14, 18 36:13, 25 38:19 40:14 41:11 42:17 45:14, 17 47:24 53:7 55:21 57:2, 22 67:15 68:17 73:12 issues 2:14 3:13 7:15 10:9 20:19 21:11 48:5 58:8, 10 65:17 69:13 73:10 item 59:13, 14 60:15 items 3:10 16:1 18:22 22:24 23:17 24:5 40:2, 3 49:11 55:13 59:6, 8 its 3:4, 18 7:17 11:10 39:5 50:6 56:11</p> <p>< J > Jacksonville 10:24 28:12 James 36:15, 25 job 38:23 57:16 63:23 64:20 70:4 jobs 17:6 32:5 Joint 31:3, 8 Jones 1:17 24:19, 20 25:3 26:3, 7, 9, 13, 17 28:1 29:24 30:16, 20 Journal 20:3 judgment 20:7 jump 68:6 June 47:14</p> <p>< K > Kaine 1:16 2:19 5:5 6:1, 3, 9 8:17 9:4 19:15, 16 20:24 23:2 24:13, 17 26:14 31:20 52:3, 4 53:11 60:7 keep 22:3 24:16 42:2, 3, 10 44:8 65:10 71:10</p>	<p>keeping 57:25 key 16:3 kick 43:15 Kind 3:5 14:2, 8 26:14 28:17 41:10 kinds 34:8 knew 58:5 know 5:5 16:17 18:5 20:8, 11 21:5, 11, 13 22:13 24:6, 8, 10 27:19, 20, 24 28:24 29:1, 2 31:23 34:10 36:23 37:4 40:3 43:6 44:13, 24 45:2, 5 47:1 48:20, 22 50:20, 24 52:8 53:8 56:8 57:7, 17 58:23 59:25 60:9, 10, 23 63:18, 22, 23 64:2, 21 66:4 69:18 70:20 72:11 73:12 knowledge 2:14 3:19 known 6:16 knows 62:22 kudos 26:1</p> <p>< L > labor 18:6 30:10, 12 40:9 61:20 62:7 65:11 laborious 60:10 lack 64:20 laid 4:14 landscape 11:16 language 34:25 large 9:14 14:7 40:21 49:23 61:12 larger 48:12 57:10 60:17, 18 largest 3:6 9:19 Laughter 6:8 Laura 31:22 53:16 law 27:19 62:16 65:1 lawyer 33:8, 23 34:1, 13 lays 33:17 lead 7:3, 22, 23 leader 27:22 leaders 26:4 58:17 67:25 73:9 leadership 6:21 8:10 10:4 12:14 25:15, 18 31:6 39:2 42:16 55:7 58:20 72:22 leaps 40:18</p>	<p>learn 3:14 7:19 8:13 19:13 28:15, 21 learned 17:6 23:6 41:22 left 53:2 65:20 legislative 27:4 length 45:11 lesson 41:21 lessons 28:15, 21 lethality 7:10, 13 23:8 39:17, 25 letter 24:22 25:11 33:8, 12 34:5, 22, 23 36:24 49:11, 16 53:14, 17, 19, 25 letters 25:24 34:9 letting 44:9 level 16:22 18:9, 24 22:21 25:21, 22, 23 39:23 56:5 57:13 58:22 63:2, 4 64:18 71:25 72:10 leveraging 67:25 Levin 53:15 lie 25:22 Lieutenant 19:24 20:3, 4 Life 66:2 light 33:17 limit 29:16 limits 39:21 line 6:16 line-item 64:18 lines 39:16 49:9 list 18:14 24:15 25:8 43:2, 5 59:6 62:25 Listed 56:13 little 2:17 16:6 21:15 28:19, 20 39:9 49:9 56:9, 22 60:17 living 63:13 load 65:8 loaded 23:17 loading 66:2 local 25:15, 21, 22 31:6 32:19 59:21 locating 4:3 location 9:24 19:25 locations 26:4 log 29:18 login 68:25 69:4, 5 Logistics 10:24 68:17 71:23 long 4:6 6:11 8:5, 11 17:21 30:23 53:18</p>	<p>longer 8:20 longest 53:10 look 5:3 8:9, 19 18:9, 21 28:7 32:13, 16 36:12 50:4, 5 59:8 60:13 61:24 63:5, 6 67:10 68:8 70:10, 13, 14 looked 22:3 25:11 looking 7:18 19:1 25:9 30:11 67:11 69:4, 11 70:12 71:17 73:8 looks 32:14 68:24 72:3 lose 49:1 loss 58:3 lost 44:19 45:4, 9 70:16 lot 2:16 10:17 16:7 21:9 29:14 30:7 31:17 40:9 49:3 66:23 68:17 69:16 low-priority 11:13 40:2 loyalty 20:7</p> <p>< M > magnitude 2:25 57:10 maintain 12:23 39:4 maintenance 11:3 40:16 45:5, 6 57:1, 6 69:11 71:23 major 9:8 10:11 15:14 majority 52:16 making 6:12 12:18 29:11 34:3 38:16 41:18 45:1 63:14 65:12 67:3 manage 9:18 44:21 72:25 Management 1:8 2:4 10:21 66:20 68:18 manager's 63:1 manages 9:16 mandated 6:14 manipulate 40:21 manner 19:8 68:7 manual 40:11 57:3 65:11 manually 30:7 57:23 manufactured 50:22 March 44:16</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>Marine 31:4, 8 massive 2:25 12:17 match 55:20 59:12, 14 material 9:25 11:1 28:12 matter 27:1, 19, 20 31:20 32:9 Maturity 47:16 maximum 39:25 mayor 7:18 mean 16:23 58:15 61:1 71:10 meaningful 21:17 means 21:8 44:13 64:6 72:8 measures 12:5 20:20 32:17 measuring 16:1 media 20:10 56:8 Medicare 60:16 meeting 72:3 meets 2:6 25:16 48:17 Member 2:19 5:5 9:4 60:7 Members 1:15 9:5 10:10 20:14 21:1 36:10, 22 37:2 47:4 73:25 74:4 men 12:9 67:1, 8 mention 11:25 31:24 mentioned 14:7 23:14 28:11 32:16 55:3 61:1 70:12 message 32:4 33:3 38:1 met 1:12 30:3 58:8 micro-thing 68:23 middleman 50:12 military 2:23 4:12, 18 7:16 9:17, 24 10:10, 11 12:7, 9 18:2 20:14 21:1 31:17 45:17, 19 55:23 64:15, 18 Millington 67:6 million 9:15 11:1, 12 16:15, 16, 24 24:2 28:12, 16, 17, 19 47:3 61:10, 19 62:1 63:6, 7 71:18 minimize 44:15 45:11 Minuteman 56:15 misconduct 32:7 misidentification 56:14 Missile 56:24 57:5, 20, 21, 25</p>	<p>missiles 44:6 56:14, 15, 19, 25 57:17 missing 56:18, 21 59:15 mission 39:13 55:25 66:11 mistake 15:14 misunderstandings 57:11 misuse 44:20 Model 47:16 modernization 12:8 modified 52:15 money 10:21 12:25 15:18, 19, 22 16:7 17:1 29:12 44:14, 17, 21 45:1 62:14, 16 63:5, 14 65:18 70:18, 25 72:16 months 44:17 60:1 65:18, 20, 22 morning 2:3 6:6 27:3 Motors 56:24, 25 57:5, 20, 21 58:1 move 16:21 19:24 26:13 57:18 61:15 65:19 movement 52:14 moving 6:21 8:4 11:13, 17 40:2 52:15 72:19 multiple 11:17 14:14 65:11</p> <p>< N > N4 23:21 name 7:9 NASA 22:13 National 4:11, 23 11:16 39:3 40:12 67:6, 7 natural 56:3 nature 21:18 36:3 Naval 28:12 67:6 Navy 10:24 23:13, 15, 20 28:11 45:20 63:6 68:15 69:10, 12 NDAA 6:17 21:11 NDS 4:14, 17, 21 39:12, 16 70:15, 23 nearly 9:15 necessary 16:23 19:25 necessity 67:13 need 4:15 7:3 8:1, 3 12:3 17:15, 18 18:15 22:7 30:1, 2, 6 31:15 39:15 44:2 45:10, 11</p>	<p>47:4, 5, 17 48:2, 13, 24 50:8 55:13 59:2 64:6 68:6 needed 2:23 11:12 needs 10:5 39:22 Negative 59:2 neighboring 24:10 nervous 21:6 network 48:17, 18 networks 48:7 never 3:2, 3, 4 14:6, 21, 22 23:17 55:25 new 24:8 28:2, 6 30:5 43:24 47:14 62:20 newly 31:12 nominated 2:11 nomination 19:20 36:8 noon 74:1 normal 65:7, 25 normally 41:23 65:3 Norquist 2:7, 10, 11 3:2 6:4 8:5 9:1, 3 13:3 14:12, 20, 22, 24 15:4, 6 16:10, 13 18:6 20:16 21:19 23:10 24:15 25:2, 5 26:6, 8, 10, 16 27:18 28:23 30:2, 19 31:9, 18 32:8 33:21 34:10, 12, 16, 20, 25 36:1, 3 37:3 38:9 39:14, 16 41:6, 14, 19 43:19, 23 45:25 47:1 48:4 49:3, 21 50:23 52:12 53:14 55:9 56:20, 23 58:2, 4, 6, 13, 15 59:4 61:5, 10, 14 62:6, 11 63:13 65:2, 23 68:11 71:9 note 32:2 72:19 noted 31:1 notice 1:12 41:12 notification 27:25 noting 31:5 November 1:4 24:22 Nuclear 56:14, 19 nuclear-armed 56:15 number 7:15 16:20 17:3 18:16 19:21 31:2 41:15 45:16 52:24 53:5 57:9 59:11 60:13, 20 68:5 71:6</p>	<p>number-counting 7:21 numbers 17:1 39:20 42:12 number-two 19:19 34:18 numerous 8:8</p> <p>< O > objection 54:1 obligation 27:8 obligations 11:10 28:9 33:15 obliged 65:1 obsolete 64:25 obstinance 55:5 obvious 33:4 60:25 obviously 28:18 57:25 occasionally 57:7 occur 32:20 October 33:6 44:3, 18 Office 1:13 21:6 26:20 29:21 officers 26:10 38:17 official 19:19 20:1 33:19 officially 6:23 off-the-shelf 49:13 Oh 34:16 Okay 6:18 15:2 16:6 20:10 30:19 52:1, 23 57:24 59:12, 15 OMB 27:4, 13 30:18 once 29:21 40:8 onerous 64:15 ones 49:25 55:10 66:5 one-thirtieth 16:24 ongoing 12:1 31:17 online 66:23 Open 23:23 39:7 55:4 opened 23:18 OPENING 2:1 5:7 8:19 52:5 53:1 operate 39:19, 22 40:10 operational 39:12 70:10 operations 7:20 9:22 39:6 68:3 operative 53:18 opinion 3:19 8:5 10:12, 14 15:18 16:4, 18, 19 22:14 27:13, 18 38:24</p>	<p>39:1 52:6, 15, 17, 19, 21 53:5 opinions 58:19 opportunity 9:5 opposed 30:1 optimize 68:3 order 2:5 4:12 12:23 23:20 29:15 43:23 44:4 48:2 65:3, 6, 24 69:13 ordered 24:7 orders 57:9 organization 3:7 9:14 10:12 17:10, 13 18:9 58:21 72:7 organizations 32:23 52:13 58:16 69:1 organization's 17:12 organize 40:25 original 10:19 originally 63:16 outcome 56:3 outlast 14:25 outside 45:14 overall 3:19 4:23 58:13 overdue 4:7 overhead 70:18 71:20, 22, 24 overlooked 38:10 overseas 39:6 oversight 2:20 5:2 25:18 26:24 overview 69:10 overwhelming 2:12 owes 12:24 ownership 18:19</p> <p>< P > page-and-a 53:17 paid 10:9 15:19 19:4 61:2 paper 30:7 55:19 paperwork 19:7 55:18, 24 65:8 69:2 paragraph 53:18 parochial 58:24 Parole 36:9 part 3:23 6:19 20:18 24:6 26:11 32:10 40:12, 17 44:10 48:11, 21 53:19 57:16 66:4 67:14 68:18 70:21 71:12 72:2 participate 26:5 53:22 participates 33:2 participating 33:9</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>particular 12:16 14:15 20:25 27:2 28:16 45:25</p> <p>particularly 23:22 27:1, 2 49:22 56:18</p> <p>parties 38:18</p> <p>partnership 12:21</p> <p>parts 19:2 23:18, 19 40:14, 15 50:10, 14 53:5 61:6 65:11</p> <p>pass 12:4 15:12 41:24 58:15 59:10, 18 63:18 71:14</p> <p>passed 23:5 24:23</p> <p>patience 63:18</p> <p>patriotic 20:5</p> <p>patriotism 20:7</p> <p>pay 15:10 16:11, 16 19:4, 7 61:7, 17</p> <p>paying 16:12 42:13 63:1, 10</p> <p>payment 40:25</p> <p>payroll 45:1</p> <p>Pearl 31:3, 8</p> <p>penetration 50:7</p> <p>Pentagon 3:3 6:6 7:7 8:1 14:5, 13 15:2 19:14, 20 38:15, 17, 21 55:8 56:10 72:3 73:10</p> <p>penultimate 53:18</p> <p>people 2:16 4:15 17:9, 15 18:2 20:22 23:11 25:25 28:25 30:7, 12 32:11 43:6 44:8 47:25 52:15 65:19 66:4 73:1</p> <p>people's 40:15</p> <p>percent 10:16 16:24 23:25 24:23 25:10 31:5 41:12 45:13 58:7 59:24 70:18, 19, 20</p> <p>Perdue 1:16 2:17 60:4, 5 61:9, 13 62:4, 10 63:12, 21 65:21 66:14 67:12 69:25 70:1 73:1, 6, 11</p> <p>performance 26:11</p> <p>performed 31:3</p> <p>period 53:23</p> <p>perseverance 60:6</p> <p>person 24:7 34:19 62:22</p> <p>personal 20:19, 21</p> <p>personnel 4:4 36:14 37:2 53:21</p> <p>perspective 3:25</p>	<p>14:5 58:25</p> <p>PFAS 45:17</p> <p>phrase 7:9</p> <p>pick 23:12 62:19</p> <p>picked 59:8</p> <p>piece 15:17 16:15 56:10, 12 59:15</p> <p>pieces 16:13 50:15</p> <p>pin 53:10</p> <p>place 28:20 29:25 36:9 44:4 47:12, 18 65:3 67:17, 19 68:25</p> <p>places 25:9, 19 30:11 50:9 56:5</p> <p>plagiarism 69:19</p> <p>planning 72:12</p> <p>plans 42:8</p> <p>played 12:18</p> <p>plugging 29:25</p> <p>point 17:21 34:12 40:8 42:11 43:4, 14 66:24</p> <p>pointed 31:11 47:8</p> <p>poke 29:5</p> <p>policy 36:18</p> <p>policymakers 7:3</p> <p>political 38:18</p> <p>posed 49:12</p> <p>position 8:7 14:4</p> <p>Positive 59:2</p> <p>possibility 60:20</p> <p>possible 8:4 12:11 45:11</p> <p>possibly 50:21</p> <p>post 62:21</p> <p>potential 70:15 71:5</p> <p>potentially 60:1</p> <p>power 11:18</p> <p>PPBA 72:15</p> <p>PPBE 72:11</p> <p>practice 18:8 27:20, 24 28:3, 4 32:9 41:2 64:3</p> <p>practices 8:1 12:22 18:8 41:7 67:10, 17 69:8, 12, 18 70:11</p> <p>preaching 12:2 43:9, 10</p> <p>precisely 16:1</p> <p>predecessors 38:14</p> <p>prepared 13:3 19:23</p> <p>preparing 4:18</p> <p>presence 67:7</p> <p>Present 1:15 22:20 49:15</p> <p>President 12:13</p>	<p>27:22</p> <p>presiding 1:14, 15</p> <p>press 6:5 73:23</p> <p>pretty 56:16 60:14 61:2 66:12</p> <p>prevents 69:6</p> <p>previous 44:16</p> <p>primary 10:19</p> <p>prime 4:19</p> <p>prior 17:6</p> <p>priority 4:21 6:13 38:16</p> <p>private 40:18 41:3 61:1 68:1 69:9, 17</p> <p>private-sector 41:7 69:10 72:23</p> <p>privatized 31:13</p> <p>problem 17:14 18:7 29:5, 6 57:20 66:13 68:19</p> <p>problems 15:23 16:15 17:7, 11 42:3 45:1 53:6 62:15, 25 68:4, 13</p> <p>procedure 33:18</p> <p>proceedings 33:2</p> <p>process 4:5 7:25 8:14 11:10 17:17 19:3, 8 22:11 23:7 25:18 26:2, 3 33:25 42:1 50:17 52:7 55:13 60:10 61:24 62:5 66:9 67:9, 17 69:21 70:22</p> <p>processes 4:25 5:2 40:1 63:15 66:21 68:2</p> <p>procurement 5:1</p> <p>produce 4:5 19:8</p> <p>produces 72:22</p> <p>producing 26:24, 25</p> <p>product 49:23</p> <p>products 50:6</p> <p>professional 36:4</p> <p>program 14:15 31:13 36:16 37:1 38:3 47:16, 17 63:1 72:12</p> <p>programming 72:17</p> <p>programs 21:10, 16 31:13, 16 64:24</p> <p>progress 5:3 10:17 38:25 41:18 49:20 67:3</p> <p>prohibit 33:21</p> <p>prohibiting 33:8, 19</p> <p>promise 8:11</p> <p>promote 4:1</p> <p>promoted 19:6</p>	<p>promotions 10:3</p> <p>promptly 74:3</p> <p>proof 18:19</p> <p>proper 56:23</p> <p>properly 29:8, 19</p> <p>property 9:25 52:22</p> <p>protected 21:23 32:6</p> <p>protecting 21:1</p> <p>protects 47:4</p> <p>proud 19:20 24:25</p> <p>proven 9:20</p> <p>provide 32:21</p> <p>provided 11:11</p> <p>provides 10:4 48:20 50:1</p> <p>providing 2:23 10:22</p> <p>public 6:11 23:3 33:18 61:7</p> <p>publicly 21:8</p> <p>pull 18:12 23:15 25:6 58:21 67:22</p> <p>pulled 57:1 59:23</p> <p>punished 20:14</p> <p>purchase 49:10</p> <p>purchasing 50:21</p> <p>purpose 10:19 16:1 70:9</p> <p>purposes 70:10</p> <p>pursuant 1:12</p> <p>push 65:18 72:2</p> <p>pushback 56:1</p> <p>pushing 55:17</p> <p>put 24:3, 5 33:4 38:12 57:1 66:1, 23</p> <p>puts 68:12</p> <p>putting 29:1 50:17</p> <p>< Q ></p> <p>QFR 53:25</p> <p>qualify 19:6</p> <p>quality 41:8 48:11</p> <p>quality-versus-quantity 41:11</p> <p>quantify 60:25 70:8 71:6</p> <p>quantitative 60:23</p> <p>quantitatively 61:3 63:25</p> <p>quantity 65:13</p> <p>quarter 64:8</p> <p>quarterly 11:9</p> <p>question 7:3 14:2 17:4, 25 19:17 22:15 29:25 36:6 37:4 45:25 49:10 53:1 55:12 58:25 59:17 60:20 71:2</p>	<p>questions 9:8 30:17 31:14 53:14 55:2 60:12 74:1, 3</p> <p>quick 49:19 60:11 63:21</p> <p>quicker 60:21</p> <p>quickly 12:11 25:16 55:22 70:17</p> <p>quite 33:4</p> <p>quote 4:8 19:23 33:12 36:12 53:19, 21, 23 56:18</p> <p>quoting 33:16</p> <p>< R ></p> <p>race 44:9</p> <p>raise 73:12</p> <p>Ranking 2:19 5:5 9:4 60:6</p> <p>rate 59:10, 18</p> <p>rationalization 70:16 71:5</p> <p>reached 12:11</p> <p>read 19:22 27:3 57:6</p> <p>Readiness 1:7 2:4, 24 3:25 12:7 29:10 36:15 40:13 45:4 55:22, 24</p> <p>reads 53:19</p> <p>ready 15:8, 11 16:5 70:8 71:6</p> <p>real 4:1 21:17 63:21</p> <p>realigning 11:19</p> <p>realistically 8:6</p> <p>realize 67:14</p> <p>really 6:15 27:12 28:17 33:3 38:8, 14 53:9 56:21 67:19 68:1</p> <p>reason 39:19</p> <p>reasonable 52:7, 9</p> <p>reasons 14:24 25:24</p> <p>rebuild 2:23</p> <p>RECEIVE 1:1 2:6 3:18 36:13 39:24</p> <p>received 10:12 33:23</p> <p>receiving 33:12</p> <p>recognize 12:2 48:12</p> <p>Recommendations 41:12</p> <p>record 6:11 8:21 25:23 37:4 45:24 46:1 50:23 53:13, 24 61:4 74:1</p> <p>recorded 29:8, 19</p>
---	---	--	--	---

59:14
recordkeeping 4:4
records 10:2 19:5
recover 44:19 45:7
 63:8
recovering 63:11
redacted 21:22, 23
redactions 22:1
red-teaming 50:7
reduce 7:11 12:23
reduces 30:10
reference 53:17
references 57:8
referred 35:2
 36:24 37:5 46:2
 50:25 54:2
reform 11:16 39:18
reforming 11:19, 20
reforms 9:11 41:6
refrain 33:18
regard 56:18
regarding 24:22
 30:18 31:21
regardless 39:23
regards 61:3
regular 12:19
 57:22
regularly 4:17
reinstate 37:1
reinstated 38:4
reinstating 36:9
relate 20:19
related 56:7
relating 31:14
relatively 19:9
released 47:14
relevant 53:19
reliable 17:7
reliance 61:16
relocated 57:19
rely 41:9
remain 32:3
remainder 43:13
remarkable 3:5
remarks 5:7
remediation 17:4
remember 57:11
remiss 11:25
repairs 12:6
repeat 3:3
repercussions 33:11
replacement 45:21
reply 49:17
report 6:25 7:5
 22:20 26:22 27:3,
 5, 8, 11, 16 28:9
 32:6 60:23 72:5, 6,
 20, 21
reported 10:8
reporting 20:2

reports 32:10 57:12
represent 4:19
reprisal 32:14
reprisals 20:15
Republicans 44:2, 6
requested 73:25
required 3:8
requirements 48:14
requires 29:7
requisitions 11:3
research 44:4 62:8
 67:23
researching 47:2
resident 20:4
resistance 55:5
resolution 12:1
 33:17 43:13 64:6,
 9, 11, 12, 14 65:1
resolutions 63:22
resources 3:24
 7:13 8:2, 3 29:4
respectfully 74:2
respecting 21:17
respects 33:16
respond 20:17 74:3
response 36:13
 53:13
responsibilities
 21:15
responsibility 2:20,
 22 4:8 20:17
 26:21, 22 39:11, 23
responsible 3:24
 12:25
responsibly 20:17
responsive 20:22
rest 63:14
restoring 2:24
result 25:17 43:3
results 3:13 9:10
 10:7 38:12 55:12
retail 9:20
return 4:18 17:20
Reuters 19:25
 56:10
reveal 3:13
review 11:9
Richardson 63:24
rifle 18:4
right 22:21 24:17
 25:2 26:6, 9, 17
 29:18 30:16 34:22
 42:6 43:22 47:11
 49:1, 4 56:20 58:6
 61:9, 13 62:10, 12,
 18, 21 63:3, 12
 64:23 65:14, 24
 66:9 68:3, 20
 71:25 72:8, 13
risk 50:15 55:17
risks 49:16

role 12:17 19:18
 20:13 45:15
Room 1:13 21:12
rotary-wing 59:7
rotates 24:7
roughly 3:11
routinely 60:18
run 55:4
running 67:13
runs 68:24
rush 65:25
Russell 1:13
Russia 4:13
 < S >
Safe 19:25 32:3
 33:3 47:6
safety 32:5
sample 3:10 59:16,
 24 60:1
samples 18:12
 23:15 25:6, 19
sampling 16:21
 19:2 61:16
satellites 22:15
satisfied 29:24
saved 63:6
saves 10:20
saving 7:22
savings 17:19
 24:11 40:9 63:17
 67:20
saw 6:5
says 17:10 43:24
scale 14:17
scan 30:9
scheduled 33:7
SCIF 48:15
scope 22:25
scoring 55:7
scrubs 63:8
search 41:1 71:16
SECNAV 63:23
second 3:18 9:10
 39:22 56:11 60:16
 62:14
secondarily 71:4
Secretaries 64:1
Secretary 2:7, 9, 11,
 12 3:2, 15 6:4 8:5,
 18 9:1 14:1 19:12,
 17, 19 20:13 24:18,
 21 30:17 31:22
 36:8, 11, 14 38:9
 39:10 42:20 45:18
 47:9 48:22 49:9
 50:18 52:5 53:14
 55:1 60:8 63:24
 66:18 69:9 70:3
 73:7, 12 74:2

sector 41:3 68:1
 69:9, 17
sector's 40:18
security 10:1 15:13,
 15 20:1, 19, 21
 22:7, 12, 21 32:16,
 18 36:16, 21 50:6
 60:16
see 17:20 18:15
 24:10 25:17 28:8
 39:20 42:13 43:17
 52:14, 16, 24 53:4,
 5, 6 55:12 56:1, 6
 60:20 61:17 65:16
 67:3 71:17
seeing 7:16 11:7
 26:23 63:19
seen 10:20 17:19
 27:13, 18 55:18
 56:4
self-reporting 17:7
Senate 1:6, 13 2:13
 4:20 27:23 44:1, 6
 73:9
SENATOR 2:1, 3,
 16 5:5 6:1, 3, 9
 8:17 14:1, 19, 21,
 23 15:2, 5 16:6, 11
 17:24 19:11, 15, 16
 20:24 23:2 24:13,
 17, 19, 20 25:3
 26:3, 7, 9, 13, 17
 28:1 29:24 30:16,
 20, 21, 22 31:10, 19,
 20 32:24 34:4, 11,
 15, 18, 23 36:2, 6
 37:3 38:1, 6, 7, 10
 39:15 41:5, 10, 15
 42:15, 22, 23, 24
 43:22 45:12 47:13
 49:1, 4, 5, 7, 8
 50:20 52:1, 3, 4
 53:11, 13 54:1
 55:1 56:7, 21
 57:24 58:3, 5, 11,
 14, 24 60:3, 4, 5
 61:9, 13 62:4, 10
 63:12, 21 65:21
 66:14, 16, 17 67:12
 69:22, 24, 25 70:1,
 11 73:1, 6, 10, 11
Senators 1:15
send 32:4, 22 34:1,
 7, 20, 21 35:1 72:20
Senior 26:10
sense 44:14 57:14
sensitive 22:24
sent 25:11, 24
 49:11, 16 53:15
sentence 20:18

separate 21:13
separations 10:3
sequence 66:1
sequestration 43:16,
 20 44:22, 23 45:2
serial 18:16 59:11,
 13
series 18:22 68:22
serious 22:23 66:12
seriously 2:20, 22
 20:16, 21 26:21
servant 33:13
servants 26:10
service 6:11 47:4
 63:25
servicemembers
 9:15 36:11, 19 38:2
Services 1:9 9:17
 48:21 69:15
serving 2:9 36:22
SES's 26:11
session 21:12
set 34:22 41:22
 48:8, 16 52:10
 62:13 68:13
setting 21:14
seven 3:22 58:16
Shaheen 1:16
 42:23, 24 43:22
 45:12 47:13 49:1, 5
share 43:5 69:15
shared 34:14
shares 69:8
sheer 14:16 18:6
 58:20
sheet 60:16
shelf 66:1
ship 45:5, 7, 8
ships 45:6, 8
shooter 73:3
short 9:13 10:3
shout-out 31:7
show 17:4, 10
 18:10, 17, 23 25:15
 59:10 62:23 65:14
showed 7:5 15:16
 25:10
side 17:1 62:3
 66:8, 11 73:16
sides 2:13
sign 27:20
signal 32:22 58:21
signature 53:15
signed 33:8
significant 10:9
similar 49:9 61:19
 69:3
simple 73:20
simplify 66:21
simply 40:2

single 53:7 71:14, 19
sir 71:2
site 3:9 10:7 31:2 58:6
Sites 56:13
six 9:19 24:2 59:11, 15, 22 69:1
size 3:12 9:19 61:11
skepticism 6:25
slowest 53:9
small 48:13, 18, 23 59:16 71:10
smaller 47:25
Smith 23:21
snuff 31:16
social 20:10 60:16
society 39:7
software 68:23
soldier 19:5
solution 9:21 30:13 47:11 68:20
solved 25:21
somebody 14:10 19:4 23:19 24:6 57:14 62:8 69:4, 6 71:17 72:20, 21
somebody's 65:5
somewhat 59:16
Soon 2:10
sooner 42:7
sort 6:17 42:17 70:13 71:22
sorts 32:9
sound 64:15, 17
source 34:11
spare 23:18, 19 40:14, 15
specific 2:24
specifically 49:14
speeds 30:13
Spencer 69:10
spend 7:11 16:25 21:13 44:25 61:20, 25 62:7, 14 63:15 64:16, 25 70:18
spending 7:12 12:25 15:20, 22 16:14 62:16, 17 63:9 64:23 66:7
spends 61:24
spent 4:9, 16 47:3 70:6, 25 71:18
spotlight 68:12
spreads 4:24
square 11:5
squares 27:15
SR-222 1:13
staff 12:16 32:4

stand 47:7
standard 32:21
standardized 67:9
standards 19:10 22:5, 10 47:15, 23 48:8, 25 50:6 62:16
start 7:1 14:13 16:20 18:11 19:17 44:3, 19 49:24, 25 52:24 60:10, 22 62:2, 21 72:10
started 15:1 16:14 23:15, 24 56:2 58:18 66:20
starts 4:24 43:25
State 25:12
stated 27:4 33:12
STATEMENT 2:1 6:1 8:19, 20 9:1, 7, 20, 23 12:18 13:3 14:16 39:1 48:9
states 4:17, 21 12:9 39:4 60:9
Station 28:13 67:6
step 16:3 39:8 71:3, 9, 11
steps 32:3 36:23 67:2 71:10
Stewart 36:15, 25
sticks 25:25
stop 30:12 41:24 73:17
stopgap 12:5
storage 23:16
store 28:25
stored 24:8
stories 23:4 57:15
storm-damage 12:6
story 57:8
straight 73:3
strategic 4:18 39:8
Strategy 4:11, 20 11:17 39:3 40:12
streaming 6:5
streamline 68:2
Street 20:3
strong 73:22
stronger 56:5
struggling 26:18
Subcommittee 1:7, 12, 14 2:4, 6 5:2 35:3 37:6 46:3 51:1 54:3
subcontract 47:25
subject 8:13 27:1
subjective 60:24
subjects 14:15
submit 73:25
submitted 8:20
subpoena 33:12

subscribe 48:19
substantial 60:14
success 17:16 23:4 25:23
successes 5:4 43:2
successful 10:15 15:21 43:6
successor 29:2
sudden 50:2
sufficiency 7:4
Sullivan 1:14, 15 2:1, 3 8:17 9:4 14:1, 19, 21, 23 15:2, 5 16:6, 11 17:24 19:11 24:19 30:21 38:6, 11 42:22 49:7 52:3 54:1 55:1 56:7, 21 57:24 58:3, 5, 11, 14, 24 60:3 66:16 69:24 73:6
summarize 21:24
summary 19:2 72:6
summer 12:12
sums 40:21
sun 38:20
supplies 9:25 24:3 29:15
supply 18:3 48:6 50:5, 8 57:2, 3, 22 58:10 65:3 69:13
Support 1:8 2:4, 13 4:20 17:1 19:7, 20 61:21 62:3 71:23 73:22
supposed 18:16, 20
supremacy 39:5
sure 3:1, 20 6:12 14:3 15:19 20:14 28:10, 23 29:11, 18 32:2, 15 36:12 39:14, 24 42:7 43:19 45:16 48:4 49:21 55:8 59:4 61:5 63:14 68:11 69:4 71:9
surprise 55:15
surprised 63:5
surprising 6:23
surprisingly 56:9
sworn 45:19
system 10:1 11:2 18:24 23:18 24:3, 5 29:1, 7, 18 40:9 41:17, 19 49:24 57:2, 3 59:15 62:19, 20, 23 63:2, 16 65:8 66:2, 22 67:19 72:19

systems 4:3 10:2 11:23 25:21 29:24 30:1, 3, 5 40:6
systemwide 67:24

< T >
tablets 30:8
take 2:20, 22 3:23 16:13 20:16, 20, 21 23:25 27:10 28:15 32:17 37:3 39:8 42:18 43:19 45:3, 8, 24, 25 50:12, 23 65:5 67:1, 2 69:20 71:12 72:18
taken 32:4, 13 36:23 63:23
takes 53:8, 9
talk 7:15, 24 17:16 21:15 25:14 40:7 43:16 47:19 48:2 56:17 67:8 69:9
talked 21:23 23:9 26:19 43:2 53:14 58:9 60:24 61:5 63:22, 24 67:12
talking 68:17 70:5
tank 18:5, 15
task 3:12, 16 14:10, 25 45:18 47:9
tasks 15:3
taxpayer 4:9 8:11 10:18 12:6, 24 24:12 29:4 63:3, 20
taxpayers 7:6 9:12 29:12 44:21
technological 4:6
technologies 44:5
technology 4:3 30:6 44:9
tell 15:24 24:24 28:20 42:4 61:3 62:18 66:19 73:2
tend 48:7 57:18
tends 29:15
Tennessee 67:5
tens 40:22
terms 16:12 40:19 63:10 64:3
test 16:22 18:18 22:24 23:15 24:23 50:5 59:5 62:23
testified 31:23
testify 7:8 9:6 19:12 33:7 73:2
testifying 31:24 33:11 38:10
TESTIMONY 1:1 2:6 26:19
testing 25:7 50:7
tests 9:25 24:25

thank 2:14 6:3, 10 8:16, 17 9:3, 5 12:13 13:2 14:1, 12 19:11, 16 20:24 21:19 24:18, 20, 21 30:16, 20, 22, 24 31:5, 9, 10 36:2 38:5, 7, 9 39:2 41:10 42:20, 21, 22, 24 45:12 47:13 49:5, 6, 8 52:2, 4 53:11 60:3, 5, 8 66:14, 15, 17, 18 69:22, 24 70:1 73:5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 24
thanks 8:18 38:22 42:16 73:4
thing 19:3 38:3 42:4 43:24 49:23 59:20 62:12 64:14 65:24 67:25 69:3
things 6:9 7:11, 12, 19 15:20 17:6, 10 18:18, 23 22:16 23:6 24:4 25:13 26:18 27:10 28:14 31:15 32:9, 20 40:3, 4, 15 41:3, 21 47:20 55:21 59:2, 11 67:8 68:12, 13 70:14 71:24
think 6:24 7:20 14:6 16:2, 4, 8, 23 18:10 20:6, 8, 9, 12 21:2 23:4 28:1, 2, 3, 12 29:13 32:18, 22, 24 33:3 34:7 36:1 38:8 39:11 41:6, 20, 23 42:2, 5 43:10 47:2 55:9 56:4, 6, 12 57:5 59:19 62:7 65:2 66:25 67:15 68:4 69:19 70:7, 15 71:5, 9 73:14
thinking 63:1 71:8
third 9:11 39:18 67:25 68:18 70:22, 23
third-largest 60:15
thought 6:6
thoughts 27:14
thousands 3:10 71:13
threat 49:12 50:4
threatened 32:1
threats 31:21
three 9:8 17:14 39:16 61:6 68:14 73:8

thrilled 38:12
thumbs 58:7
thwarting 26:23
ties 64:18
till 17:17 52:18
TIM 6:1
time 3:23 6:18
 11:3, 11 14:10
 16:20 20:25 24:13
 28:10, 24 36:7
 41:22 42:15 44:19
 45:6, 7, 9 48:13
 53:4 60:20 64:6
 66:7
timeframe 47:22
timely 2:21 19:8
 68:7
timer's 28:10
times 9:19 64:4
tip 22:4
title 56:23 57:6
Today 2:6, 15 7:15
 9:6 38:9 64:23
 66:18 70:9 73:13
tomorrow 64:10
tone 34:22
tool 11:9, 10
top 6:12 32:25
topic 2:19 38:10
 39:2 56:7
top-line 44:12
 70:12
total 70:18
totally 70:9 71:7
touch 62:12
touched 26:14
 31:20
track 41:1 57:25
tracked 11:1
tracking 57:3
training 17:15
 44:10, 14, 18
trajectory 52:12
transaction 62:7
 71:19 72:10
transaction-level
 72:1
transactions 40:22
 65:15 71:13, 15, 22
transfers 40:11
translate 57:15
transparency 10:20
 16:23
travel 23:22
treat 22:10
tremendous 25:23
 42:1 64:19
tried 34:21 36:1
trigger 43:15
trillion 3:11

trillions 57:9
troops 4:20
truly 42:19
Trump 12:13
trust 4:10 41:4
 72:9, 24
truthful 20:22
 32:12
try 36:3 48:7, 18
 52:6 57:15
trying 15:8 23:19
 28:21 33:14 40:13
 42:17 66:21 69:6
 73:19
turn 5:6 69:2
turned 55:22
turns 68:25
twice 14:19, 20
 45:8
two 10:23 19:22
 31:2 67:1
twofold 39:20
type 29:15 59:20
types 22:16 32:20
 41:6 49:13, 18
 50:10 56:20 57:10
typical 9:16

< U >

U.S 1:6 2:1 6:1
 20:1
U.S.-based 50:1
Uh-huh 16:10
Ultimately 12:8
 47:11
ultimatum 6:20
unaccounted 28:17
unaccounted-for 4:3
unclassified 22:4, 20
unclean 62:8
uncovered 43:3
undergo 30:23
undergoing 31:15
undermines 44:23
understand 34:2, 15,
 16 36:19 39:21
 50:8, 14 55:23
 70:9 71:7
understanding
 45:20
undertaking 3:1, 15
 4:5 12:17
undertook 14:10
undocumented
 36:10, 22 37:1
unfamiliar 48:4
uniform 67:1
Uninstalled 56:24
 57:5
Unit 67:7

United 12:9 39:4
 60:9
units 68:4 72:4
universal 43:11
unmet 24:4
unmodified 10:14
unneeded 11:4 24:4
unquote 4:10
unsecure 49:10
update 45:23 49:19
updated 57:23
upgrade 30:1, 2
upgrades 4:6
upwards 64:2
urge 12:10 20:25
urged 36:25
urgent 12:3
usable 24:2 68:21
 72:22
use 3:24 11:2, 8, 14
 20:10 23:13 25:25
 28:18 29:3, 11
 30:6 40:19 61:21
 63:7 65:22 69:20,
 21 72:11
useful 57:25
user 69:5
uses 9:21 11:8

< V >

validates 10:2
valuable 15:20
 25:13 29:10, 11
value 4:9 28:23
 29:4, 20 30:14
various 26:4
vendor 50:13, 14
 65:13
veracity 7:4
verify 48:11
verifying 9:23
version 28:6
versus 40:10
vibrancy 39:7
Vice 23:21
Vietnam 70:19
view 15:9, 18
views 33:24 55:23
Vindman 19:24
 20:3, 5 31:21 32:3
Vindman's 20:1
violation 27:25
violations 27:6
VIRGINIA 6:2
Virginian 20:4
virtually 45:16
visit 58:7
visited 24:1
visits 10:7 31:2, 3
 59:19
volume 65:15

vote 64:11 73:18,
 20
vulnerabilities 4:2
 10:1, 22 48:5 49:18
vulnerability 50:10

< W >

Wainwright 18:13
 59:1, 5
wait 17:17, 23 44:4
 45:2 63:18
waiting 36:12
 52:20 69:1
walk 18:20 23:10
walks 25:16
Wall 20:3
Walmart 9:19
want 6:10 8:19
 14:9 20:12 24:13
 25:25 26:13 27:11
 31:7 38:2 40:20
 42:3, 16 43:8, 24
 45:14 48:25 49:1
 60:5, 8 62:22
 64:25 66:7, 24
 71:20 72:2, 25
 73:7, 8, 24
wanted 34:1 39:1
 52:6 59:6
wants 4:12 21:24
War 15:5 39:13
warehouses 23:16
warfighters 7:6
Warren 58:7
warriors 60:7
Washington 1:10
wasteful 12:5 64:22
way 7:12 12:19
 18:12 22:3 29:3
 32:22 36:4 39:18
 40:10 44:21 52:25
 73:14
ways 49:17
wealth 2:13
Wednesday 1:4
week 6:22 7:5
weeks 65:6, 10
welcome 6:10
well 6:16 7:24
 10:19 11:23 14:24
 17:2, 24 19:14
 20:18 28:1 30:16
 36:19 38:1 40:2,
 21 42:15, 24 44:17
 55:7 56:12 58:15
 59:12, 23 60:5
 70:1, 22 71:19
 73:1, 7, 24
went 16:18 18:13,
 14 22:11, 14 23:14
 27:21, 22, 23 59:5, 9

we're 16:9 19:10,
 13 21:11 30:2, 11
 34:23, 24 38:11
 39:24 41:18, 25
 42:2, 13 47:10
 50:17 56:6 62:15
 63:9, 10, 13 64:19,
 23, 25 65:21 68:19
 69:3, 6, 17 70:5, 7
 71:10, 11, 15 72:7
 73:18
we've 22:15 28:5
 38:16, 21 47:21
 56:4 58:23 60:22,
 23 64:4, 8
whined 38:18
whistleblower 31:25
whistleblowers 33:1
White 12:3 20:10,
 11 27:22 33:24
 34:9
willing 55:4
wisely 4:16
withhold 44:14
witness 7:8 20:1
 23:8
witnesses 26:25
witness's 7:9
women 12:9 67:1, 8
won 15:5
Wonderful 52:1
word 26:4 55:7
words 4:11 21:2
work 3:15 43:1
 47:21, 25 48:13, 16,
 23 50:16 52:7
 55:4 60:1 63:2
 65:16
worked 41:25
workflow 11:10
workforce 12:14
working 8:9 18:17,
 19 36:17 39:17
 41:17, 20, 24 47:9,
 19 50:11 66:20
works 69:3
world 2:19 12:21
 15:5
world's 9:19
worried 21:4, 5
 41:17
worse 44:22
worth 11:1 24:2
written 8:20 30:17
 57:12, 13
Wrong 56:13
 57:16 62:9

< Y >

Yeah 25:5 41:5
 58:15

year 2:9 3:7 10:6,
8, 14 15:24 29:5,
15, 21, 22 41:13, 20,
21 43:13 45:9
52:14 55:9, 10
62:23 64:7, 8, 17
65:4, 23 66:19 71:3
year-end 65:17
years 14:5 38:25
40:24 42:9 52:15,
19, 21, 22 58:20
60:7 63:17 64:3, 4,
5 72:18
year's 9:10 44:16
yesterday 38:11
56:12
yield 69:23