

## V. NATO ALLIANCE

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) remains the most successful political-military alliance in history and provides our nation a critical link to Europe at a time when cooperation is essential to our success in the Global War on Terrorism. The meaningful participation by the United States in the Alliance continues to yield benefits far beyond the costs of our contribution. NATO transformation efforts, begun in earnest following the Prague Summit in 2002, continue apace today, and are yielding tangible results in the form of an enhanced military capability that is deployable to the trouble spots of the globe.

As we continue to refine the critical relationship between Allied Command Operations (ACO) in Mons, Belgium, and Allied Command Transformation (ACT) in Norfolk, Virginia, we have already made great strides in doctrine development and process improvement. As ACO articulates operational requirements as identified by commanders serving in Afghanistan and participating in NATO exercises throughout Europe, ACT has begun developing the framework to turn this vision into measurable capabilities. This close cooperation enables the infusion of research and technology to address training, equipment, or doctrine shortfalls and provides the first ever process by which to certify NATO forces as ready to conduct the full spectrum of military operations.

We have seen similar success in recent NATO's commitment to conduct operations beyond the traditional boundaries of the Alliance. NATO has embarked upon an expansion of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan, has begun the NATO Training Mission in Iraq (NMT-I) to provide assistance to the Iraqi Interim Government, and has completed the largest round of expansion since its inception. All these accomplishments have been achieved since testimony before this committee last March.

### Value of U.S. Leadership

U.S. contributions of forces and resources to the Alliance, despite a gradual decline in relative levels, still comprise the largest share when measured by dollars and capabilities. This sustained level of commitment permits the United States to occupy the key military leadership posts of the Alliance, which include Supreme Allied Commander Europe and Supreme Allied Commander Transformation. The advantages of leadership within NATO's military structure are clear and provide an avenue by which to suggest

changes for the direction of the Alliance. Unfortunately, if the level of U.S. contributions continues to decline, our claim to leadership posts will inevitably be challenged.

The recognized linkage of EUCOM and NATO transformation efforts is a clear dividend brought about by our persistence, focus, and leadership within the Alliance. NATO's force structure has begun to transform from a reflection of 20<sup>th</sup> Century realities, when massive armies were necessary to blunt a Warsaw Pact thrust into Central Europe, to a more agile, expeditionary and responsive force. These formations were manned by conscript soldiers who served in units that were almost purely defensive and located in their own homelands. As a result, they were not designed with expeditionary capabilities, strategic lift or robust support infrastructure. Few nations have trained, equipped, or organized their forces to operate beyond their own borders. Since ships and aircraft possess inherent mobility, the transformation of NATO naval and air forces has been much easier to accomplish than the armies of Europe; therefore, the focus has been, and must remain, on the transformation of ground force components. NATO's recognition of this challenge was clearly expressed at the Prague Summit in 2002 and re-affirmed at the Istanbul Summit in June 2004.

The initial round of NATO transformation began with the elimination of unnecessary layers of command structure, including the deactivation of 12 sub-regional Headquarters during 2004. Another major step occurred in March 2004 in Lisbon, when Joint Headquarters Lisbon was established under the command of U.S. Vice Admiral Harry Ulrich, Commander of the U.S. Sixth Fleet.

NATO also made remarkable progress in creating and developing the NATO Response Force (NRF), the primary vehicle for transforming the Alliance's force structure. With the critical assistance of Allied Command Transformation, the NRF reached initial operating capability in October 2004 and conducted its first significant command-post exercise, Exercise ALLIED WARRIOR 04, in November 2004. As a result of these dramatic changes to NATO's command and force structure, and the overall willingness of Allies to support commitments to the NRF, NATO stands poised to act on the global stage, as an operationally-focused, mobile and deployable force.

#### **Transformation Initiatives and Operations**

NATO has made encouraging progress this past year. Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia became full members of the Alliance. The Istanbul Summit produced an agreement to begin training Iraqi

security forces. Following a September 2004 decision by the North Atlantic Council (NAC), initial training commenced in November 2004 in Stavanger, Norway. Following the successful Iraqi elections there has been a renewed interest within the Alliance to increase the commitment to train the Iraqi Security Forces. This year, NATO will open a Training, Education, and Doctrine Center in Iraq to provide mid-grade to senior officer training courses, with plans to expand training to senior noncommissioned officers. This is the institution we expect to produce the guardians of the Iraqi people's government and through which a liaison to the West is established and maintained. Another significant development was the NATO Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear Task Force deployment to Greece during the 2004 Summer Olympic Games, manned by troops from Belgium, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Poland, and Spain.

Finally, the decision to expand the ISAF mission in Afghanistan further underscores the level of transformation occurring in the Alliance. The generation of forces required for the implementation of Stage 2 expansion in Western Afghanistan has been achieved. National contributions will facilitate the establishment of several more Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) and Forward Support Base requirements. Additionally, several Nations have informally offered to establish PRTs in the Southern part of the country (Stage 3). Based on these developments we can be optimistic that upon NAC approval, and with continued support of the Member Nations, the expansion of NATO operations will complete its final expansion to Eastern Afghanistan (Stage 4) in due time.

NATO member nations have begun to examine important facets of their tactics, techniques, and procedures, including the professionalization of their non-commissioned officer (NCO) corps. The backbone of the American military is our NCO leadership. Our NATO partners have begun to realize that they can increase capability by capitalizing on the experience of the U.S. military. Under the leadership of the Allied Command Operations Sergeant Major Alford L. McMichael, USMC, the former Sergeant Major of the U.S. Marine Corps, NATO has established three levels of NCO leadership training: preliminary, intermediate, and advanced. Working with the Marshall Center, an International Senior NCO course is being developed for Sergeants Major. The appetite for this training is far greater than we envisioned.

Another major development in the Alliance was the result of two years of concentrated effort to improve the manner by which the Alliance matches political will with actual military capabilities. Forces for NATO operations

and missions, such as the Kosovo Force, Stabilization Force, and ISAF, have traditionally been provided by Alliance members through individual force generation conferences. The growing demands on NATO's military forces have made balancing the varying requirements of each operation increasingly difficult. To address this inefficiency, NATO held the first ever Global Force Generation Conference in late November 2004. Led by the Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, General Sir John Reith, British Army, this conference accomplished two important objectives: identifying long-term requirements, including current gaps; and establishing the ability for individual nations to accomplish more effective long-term force planning. Additionally, this initiative bolstered the case for Alliance transformation by highlighting capability shortfalls in a timelier manner, and spotlights the limitations, or "national caveats," that nations use to limit the "usability" of their force contributions.

NATO continues to promote security in other ways. One of its most successful outreach programs is the Partnership for Peace (PfP). PfP has increased stability and built stronger security relationships in Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia through political consultations and individual national programs. EUCOM involvement and leadership in PfP training, exercises, and bilateral programs with participating nations help make this program a success.

Thirty nations have joined the PfP since it was launched in 1994, with 10 achieving NATO membership. Seven of these 10 nations were accessed via the NATO Membership Action Plan (MAP). The MAP provides for concrete feedback and advice from NATO to aspiring countries on their own preparations directed at achieving future membership. Currently, EUCOM continues to help three MAP nations (Albania, Croatia, and Macedonia) meet membership requirements, especially in the areas of civil-military relations and making appropriate military contributions to the Alliance.

NATO has also reached out to the nations of North Africa and the Middle East through the Mediterranean Dialogue program and the recently announced Istanbul Cooperation Initiative. These programs, though less extensive than PfP, provide for political dialogue and practical cooperation with participating countries and help foster democratic and military development with countries important to the U.S. and NATO in the war on terrorism.

NATO continues to strengthen relationships with Russia and Ukraine. The NATO-Russia Council and the NATO-Ukraine Commission focus on a variety of issues including counter-proliferation, peacekeeping, theater missile

defense, civil emergency response and responses to terrorism. At the military level, the NATO-Russia Interoperability Program explores avenues to facilitate meaningful Russian participation in NATO-led operations. A recent agreement on the modalities for Russian naval support to NATO's anti-terrorist maritime interdiction mission, Operation ACTIVE ENDEAVOR, is expected to yield Russian participation beginning later this year.

NATO successfully concluded the Stabilization Force mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 2 December 2004 after achieving the military objectives outlined in the Dayton Peace Accords. The European Union mission comprised of approximately 7,000 troops has assumed the predominately police enforcement mission to ensure continued stability in the country. The United States continues to demonstrate its firm commitment to the region by sourcing a portion of a new NATO Headquarters (NHQ) in Sarajevo. The new mission requirements for NHQ Sarajevo decrease NATO sourcing levels to less than 250 personnel, including a one-star general/flag officer who will serve as the senior military representative. NHQ Sarajevo will focus on the execution of defense reform, partnership for peace activities, counterterrorism operations, and apprehension of persons indicted for war crimes (PIFWC). The United States acceptance of the Bosnia and Herzegovina offer to allow continued use of Eagle Base is another sign of commitment to the country and to the region.

NATO's Kosovo Force continues to provide critical security to this region in support of the United Nations' Interim Administration in Kosovo. Currently, Task Force Falcon has approximately 1900 soldiers from both the active and reserve components deployed as part of Multi-National Brigade - East to enforce the "Military Technical Agreement" and to conduct operations to further deter hostilities and promote a stable environment. NATO's troop strength was reduced to 17,730 in 2004 with U.S. forces contributing nearly 12 percent (2,010) of the personnel. While it is anticipated that the U.S. footprint will be adjusted in the coming the year as part of the NATO Periodic Mission Review process, continued U.S. presence remains essential.

#### **Challenges for NATO**

The development of the European Union's (EU) Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) requires that the EU and NATO coordinate closely their plan and operations. The development of greater European capabilities in support of peace and security is to be welcomed, and a good working relationship has developed between the NATO Staff at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe

(SHAPE) and the EU planning cell. But there remains only one set of forces, regardless of the number of assigned missions or institutional affiliations, a truth applicable to both European and to U.S. forces. We seek to ensure that unnecessary duplication of NATO capabilities by the EU is kept to a minimum and that EU missions not degrade NATO readiness.

While political ambition is expanding and improvements are being made in important military aspects of NATO, cumulative Alliance defense spending has declined over the past few years. Seventeen of the 26 member nations spend less than the agreed upon benchmark of a minimum of two percent of their gross domestic product on defense. Additionally, antiquated acquisition processes seriously impede progress and limit operational effectiveness. The Alliance is being inhibited by funding difficulties, lack of suitable investment in new technologies, and business practices that are outdated and inefficient. Sharing industrial benefits and open competition are desirable but must be balanced against the risks of operational failure. True transformation cannot be achieved until these conditions are addressed.

A shortfall exists within the Alliance for theater strategic and operational intelligence. The NATO Intelligence Fusion Center (NIFC) proposal, discussed previously, has been spearheaded by EUCOM leadership to address this capability deficiency. As NATO creates more permanent standing formations, the NIFC will support the NRF with timely, fused, and predictive network-enabled intelligence.

The ongoing transformations in EUCOM and NATO are inextricably linked to the challenges of today's security environment and are complementary and mutually supporting. Together, they will produce an effect greater than the sum of its parts. By leadership and example, EUCOM supports NATO transformation and serves as a model for the Alliance and its member nations.

## **VI. CHALLENGES FOR TOMORROW'S MILITARY**

The complexity of today's security environment requires new methodologies to promote conflict prevention and conduct post-conflict operations. A military approach alone will not deliver the desired outcome in countries or regions where there is little or no experience in responsible governance. Integrated interagency and international action is necessary to achieve long-term strategic goals.

Afghanistan, Iraq, the Balkans, and Liberia provide numerous examples of the post-conflict challenges that present themselves and require the resources and skill sets of multiple U.S. government agencies and the

international community. Regardless of scope or scale of any given conflict, U.S. involvement encompasses elements codified in interagency coordination doctrine.

While the requirements for successful post-conflict resolution are not easy to predict, our experience in operations in Somalia and Iraq reaffirms the axiom that success requires unity of effort, both within the U.S. government and the international community. It hinges upon the long-term stability of the social, political, and economic systems of societies. The absence of a comprehensive, integrated strategy can prolong conflict or even a regression to pre-conflict conditions.

As we increase the agility and responsiveness of our military capabilities through transformation, we must also adjust our decision-making process. Interagency coordination and cooperation are key to attaining desired end states. Each solution must be tailored to the existing geopolitical and demographic situation of the given region or conflict.

Integration of EUCOM and other U.S. agency activities throughout our AOR continues to mature and is a key element of theater transformation. By including representatives of governmental and non-governmental agencies and organizations early in the planning process, military planners have been able to develop more comprehensive plans at the strategic and operational levels. Additionally, these representatives gain a better understanding of the military and its operational techniques, capabilities and limitations.

As you know, EUCOM has already implemented the Standing Joint Force Headquarters (SJFHQ). The EUCOM SJFHQ has largely been carved from existing staff to provide a standing, cross-functional command and control element that maintains a daily focus across the full spectrum of warfighting. EUCOM has elected to call our SJFHQ the European Plans and Operations Center or EPOC. The EPOC has brought intelligence, logistics, communications, political military affairs, and operations closer together and serves as a vital component to our transformation as we move toward a more agile, cross-functional headquarters, synchronized with interagency and multi-national partners in support of our U.S. National policy and strategic objectives.

On the counterterrorism front, EUCOM and other government agencies have worked together to develop the Trans-Sahara Counterterrorism Initiative, a long-term strategy to counter terrorism in the Sahel region of Africa. In preparation for the 2004 Summer Olympic Games in Athens, the State and Justice Department representatives to EUCOM's Joint Interagency Coordination Group (JIACG) shaped operational planning and support mechanisms for the U.S.

intelligence and operational fusion element in Athens. They also worked to educate the EUCOM planners and operators regarding potential counterterrorism and consequence management operations in the event of a terrorist attack. At the same time, the Treasury Department's representative from the Office of Foreign Assets Control provided substantial sustained support to the theater's counterterrorism efforts and the apprehension of persons indicted for war crimes in the Balkans and elsewhere.

EUCOM has already begun to modify our JIACG to better integrate all the elements of national power. We have developed strong ties with the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization at the Department of State, sharing deliberate planning information on several areas of concern and jointly developing doctrine, techniques and procedures for mutual operational and planning support. Exercise FLEXIBLE LEADER 05 validated our standing joint force headquarters and transformational planning constructs by exercising participation by State, Justice, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture departments. The lessons learned during this exercise will help shape the nature of collaboration between non-traditional partners in military planning and operations. EUCOM is also pursuing closer coordination with the Department of Homeland Security to reinforce its ability to defend the homeland from forward locations.

Unprecedented challenges and change are the only consistent characteristics of the post-Cold War. Institutions that are not adequately equipped or organized to confront the realities of an extremely fluid and complex security landscape will become increasingly unsuccessful in protecting U.S. interests. The application of national power must include the widest array of national resources and capabilities. The determination of requirements, the development of policies, and the implementation of strategies require the synchronization of all of the elements of the government that have a stake in the success or failure of the outcome. As the Combatant Commands of the U.S. military become increasingly involved in a broadening range of national security activities, we must be organized in a manner that is reflective of the inter-agency process that produces the strategies to be implemented.

At EUCOM we continue to seek new and innovative ways to transform not only our force posture, but also our thinking. We will continue to reach out to multiple stake-holders in governmental, as well as non-governmental activities in our broad, diverse, and challenging AOR, to maximize our ability to achieve our national objectives. Preparing for the urgent



challenges before us will require institutional innovations and the creation of new capabilities which will yield a more comprehensive security apparatus and enable greater coordination and cooperation throughout the United States government and the international community.

## VII. CONCLUSION

Today's security environment requires operational capabilities that are more agile, expeditionary, and responsive. The implementation of EUCOM's Strategic Theater Transformation Plan, which arrays forces throughout a much wider portion of Europe and Africa, will increase our strategic effectiveness within our own area of responsibility while simultaneously enhancing our ability to support adjacent commands.

NATO, which has been at the center of trans-Atlantic and inter-European security since its inception, continues to transform in order to remain the preeminent security alliance. NATO and U.S. presence in this important theater must continue to evolve in order to shape and influence an uncertain world.

It is a privilege to represent this proud nation. The challenges we now face are enormous, yet our past is replete with examples of how we have overcome daunting, seemingly insurmountable barriers that tested our resolve. Our history demonstrates our commitment to the principles of freedom. What lies before us is the opportunity to advance our leadership role in global affairs, define the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and extend peace and prosperity throughout the world. The indispensable influence attained by our forward presence provides the best chance for success in meeting these goals and fighting the Global War on Terrorism.

We look forward to working with the members of this committee as we continue to refine our plans for transformation and improve our capabilities in the new strategic era.



## Enclosure 2: Eight Assumptions

EUCOM's theater transformation is based on the assumptions that the United States:

1. Desires to maintain its current position as a nation of global influence through leadership and the efficient and effective application of informational, military, economic, and diplomatic power
2. Remains committed to its friends and allies through global, regional and bilateral organizations and institutions, and supports treaties and international agreements to which it is a signatory
3. Pursues a global strategy, a cornerstone of which is increased access and forward presence in key areas, which contributes to the first line of defense for peace, stability and order
4. Supports in-depth transformation of its armed forces and basing structure to respond to 21<sup>st</sup> century asymmetrical threats and challenges
5. Seeks ways to mitigate or offset obstacles posed by 21<sup>st</sup> century sovereignty realities through a re-orientation of its land, maritime, air and space presence
6. Recognizes current U.S. basing within EUCOM may not adequately support either the strategic changes attendant to an expanded NATO Alliance, or the national requirements of a rapidly changing AOR
7. Seeks to preserve those assets which have enduring value to its missions, goals, and national interests
8. Continues to enhance and build defense relationships enabling the United States, allies, and friends to respond effectively

These assumptions serve as the cornerstone which underpins EUCOM's Strategic Theater Transformation Plan.

### Enclosure 3: Lexicon of Terms

Our **Main Operating Base (MOB)** is an enduring strategic asset established in friendly territory with permanently stationed combat forces, command and control structures, and family support facilities. MOBs serve as the anchor points for throughput, training, engagement, and U.S. commitment to NATO. MOBs have: robust infrastructure; strategic access; established Command and Control; Forward Operating Sites and Cooperative Security Location support capability; and enduring family support facilities. As previously stated, these are already in existence.

A **Forward Operating Site (FOS)** is an expandable host-nation "warm site" with a limited U.S. military support presence and possibly prepositioned equipment. It can host rotational forces and be a focus for bilateral and regional training. These sites will be tailored to meet anticipated requirements and can be used for an extended time period. Backup support by a MOB may be required.

A **Cooperative Security Location (CSL)** is a host-nation facility with little or no permanent U.S. presence. CSLs will require periodic service, contractor and/or host nation support. CSLs provide contingency access and are a focal point for security cooperation activities. They may contain prepositioned equipment. CSLs are: rapidly scalable and located for tactical use, expandable to become a FOS, forward and expeditionary. They will have no family support system.

A **Preposition Site (PS)**, by definition, is a secure site containing prepositioned war reserve materiel (Combat, Combat Support, Combat Service Support), tailored and strategically positioned to enable rotational and expeditionary forces. They may be collocated with a MOB or FOS. PSs are usually maintained by contractor support and may be sea based. They are an important component to our transformation efforts.

**"En Route" Infrastructure (ERI)**, is a strategically located, enduring asset with infrastructure that provides the ability to rapidly expand, project and sustain military power during times of crises and contingencies. ERI bases serve as anchor points for throughput, training, engagement and U.S. commitment. They may also be a MOB or FOS.

Enclosure 4: Theater Investment Needs

Component	Country	Location	Project	FY 2006 Request (\$ millions)
<b>LINE-ITEM MILITARY CONSTRUCTION/FAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS</b>				
AMC <sup>1</sup>	Italy	Livorno	Ammunition Storage Facilities (AMC)	5.3
DLA <sup>2</sup>	Greece	Souda Bay	Marathi Fuel Depot, P120	7.1
DoDEA <sup>3</sup>	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	Expand/renovate Elementary School	2.3
DoDEA	Germany	Landstuhl Regional Medical Center	Classroom Addition Elementary/Middle Schools	5.6
DoDEA	Spain	Naval Station Rota	Multipurpose Bldg Elementary School/High School	8.0
USAFE	Germany	Ramstein	Munitions Maintenance Facility (USAF)	3.1
USAFE	Germany	Ramstein	Replace Family Housing (101 units)	63.0
USAFE	Germany	Ramstein	Airfield Maintenance Compound	8.6
USAFE	Germany	Spangdahlem	Replace Family Housing (79 units)	45.4
USAFE	Germany	Spangdahlem	Large Vehicle Inspection Station Gate	5.4
USAFE	Germany	Spangdahlem	Control Tower	7.1
USAFE	Italy	Aviano	Consolidated Support Center	10.9
USAFE	Italy	Aviano	Family Support Center	4.0
USAFE	Italy	Aviano	Air Control Squadron Warehouse	7.8
USAFE	Portugal	Lajes	Fire/Crash Rescue Station and Tower	12.0
USAFE	Turkey	Incirlik	Consolidated Communications Facility	5.8
USAFE	Turkey	Incirlik	Replace Family Housing (100 units)	22.7
USAFE	UK	Lakenheath	Small Dia Bomb Facility Storage (ACC <sup>4</sup> )	2.5
USAFE	UK	Lakenheath	Small Dia Bomb Maint Facility (ACC)	2.6
USAFE	UK	Lakenheath	Replace Family Housing (107 units)	48.4
USAFE	UK	Mildenhall	Base Civil Eng Complex	13.5
USAREUR	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	Urban Assault Course	1.6
USAREUR	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	Shoot House	1.8
USAREUR	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	Barracks Complex	13.6
USAREUR	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	Barracks Bn 1	40.0
USAREUR	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	Brigade Complex Forward Support	41.0
NSA	UK	Menwith Hill Station	Operations and Technical Building	41.7
<b>LINE ITEM MILCON TOTAL</b>				<b>430.2</b>

<sup>1</sup> Army Materiel Command

<sup>2</sup> Defense Logistics Agency

<sup>3</sup> Department of Defense Education Activity

<sup>4</sup> Air Combat Command (US Air Force)

Enclosure 4: Theater Investment Needs

Component	Country	Location	Project	FY 2006 Request (\$ millions)
<b>NON LINE-ITEM MILITARY CONSTRUCTION/FAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS</b>				
USAFE	Portugal	Lajes	Improve Family Housing	16.2
USAFE	Spain	Moron	Replace Family Housing	7.1
USAFE	Turkey	Incirlik	Improve Family Housing	20.1
USAFE	UK	Mildenhall	Improve Family Housing	2.0
USAREUR	Germany	Bleidorn	Ansbach (WNR <sup>5</sup> 60 units)	9.0
USAREUR	Germany	Garmisch	Garmisch (WNR 25 units)	5.0
USAFE	Germany	Ramstein	Improve Family Housing	4.5
USAREUR	Germany	Grafenwoehr/Vilseck	South Camp--Family Housing (WNR 134 Units)	11.4
USAREUR	Germany	Stuttgart	Robinson Barracks (WNR 108 unts)	17.5
USAREUR	Germany	Stuttgart	Moehringen (WNR 96 units)	23.0
USAREUR	Germany	Stuttgart	Robinson Barracks (Bath/laundry 126 units)	4.7
USAREUR	Germany	Wiesbaden	Aukamm (WNR 80 units)	13.2
USAREUR	Germany	Wiesbaden	Crestview (WNR 96units)	13.8
USAREUR	Germany	Wiesbaden	Aukamm (WNR 95units)	15.5
USAREUR	Germany	Wiesbaden	Hainerberg (WNR 108 units+ sporting facilities for 506units)	20.0
<b>NON LINE ITEM TOTAL</b>				<b>183.0</b>
<b>TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION/FAMILY HOSUING PROJECT FUNDING REQUEST</b>				<b>613.2</b>

<sup>5</sup> Whole Neighborhood Revitalization

Enclosure 4: Theater Investment Needs

ADDITIONAL KEY THEATER INVESTMENT NEEDS		
Description	Component/Program	Page #
Cooperative Security Locations	(EUCOM-All Components )	9;14-15;19
Forward Operating Sites	(EUCOM-All Components )	8-9;13-14
Efficient Basing Grafenwoeher (EBG)	U.S. Army Europe	9,12
Full Modular Airborne Brigade Combat Team (173 <sup>rd</sup> Airborne)	U.S. Army Europe	9,13
Establish Rotational Task Force in Eastern Europe	U.S. Army Europe	12-13
Deployment of Stryker Brigade in Germany	U.S. Army Europe	12-13
Radar network in Gulf of Guinea	U.S. Naval Forces Europe	16
Reconstitute and Modernize Maritime Preposition Force	U.S. Marine Forces Europe	17-18
Reconstitute and Modernize Marine Corps Preposition Program-Norway	U.S. Marine Forces Europe	17-18
Trans-Sahara Counter Terrorism Initiative	U.S. Marine Forces Europe	17,28,39
SOF Consolidation (Planning and design funds)	U.S. Special Operations Cmd	18-19
Strategic Airlift/Mobility	Strategic Mobility Maneuver	19
Theater Support Vessel	U.S. Naval Forces Europe	19-20
Littoral Combat Ship	U.S. Naval Forces Europe	20
C4 Upgrades	Theater C4ISR	20
Intelligence, Surveillance & Reconnaissance Assets	Theater C4ISR	20
NATO Intelligence Fusion Center	Theater C4ISR	20-21,38
Long-Range Precision Non-Lethal Capabilities	Non-Lethal Capabilities	21