

OLC Detailed Guidelines for Preparation of Legislative Proposals for the Fiscal Year 2016 DoD Legislative Program

Contents

I. TIMELINE AND REVIEW PROCESS FOR DOD LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.....	1
II. REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF A PROPOSAL	2
III. DETERMINATION OF BUDGET IMPLICATIONS FOR EVERY PROPOSAL	4
IV. PROPOSALS THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED PREVIOUSLY.....	7
V. GENERAL LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING GUIDELINES	8

I. TIMELINE AND REVIEW PROCESS FOR DOD LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

As directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense in his memorandum of July 11, 2014, captioned “Call for Legislative Proposals for FY 2016” (generally known as the “Call Memo”), all legislative proposals for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 legislative cycle must be submitted to the Office of Legislative Counsel (OLC) by August 4, 2014. Any proposal submitted after this date will be considered late and subject to the process set forth in the accompanying memo on the disposition of late submissions. The full timeline for the FY 2016 Department of Defense (DoD) legislative program is set forth in the accompanying document captioned “Timeline for FY 2016 DoD Legislative Program.”

To reiterate long-standing Departmental policy, every FY 2016 legislative proposal from any element of the Department must be coordinated through the DoD legislative program as described in the call memo. Further, only the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs may transmit a DoD legislative proposal to Congress. The transmittal of any legislative proposal outside of the legislative program is unauthorized. A component responsible for any such unauthorized transmittal should be aware that the Department may state its opposition to the proposal in communications with Congress.

Each proposal submitted by one of the military departments, a combatant command, or another component outside of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) will be reviewed by the OSD component with the responsibility for the subject matter to ensure that the proposal aligns with OSD priorities. OSD components will have a set period of time in which to review and render an opinion on each such proposal. A non-OSD proposal will not move forward without the concurrence of the relevant OSD component, so it is in the interest of non-OSD components to work with the relevant OSD component before the submission of a proposal to OLC.

Each year, components submit a significant number of legislative proposals related to building partnership capacity (BPC). In light of the transition of the Armed Forces to a non-combat role in Afghanistan and the proliferation of BPC authorities, components should carefully review the need for any proposed new BPC authority, as well as the continued need for each existing BPC authority. As in the FY 2015 cycle, all legislative proposals related to Building Partnership Capacity will be considered in one meeting of the Legislative Review Panel (LRP) to ensure that

the transmission to OMB and Congress includes only those BPC proposals of the highest Departmental priority.

Please note that any authorization provision that may in the past been included in either the NDAA “shell” or the Military Construction “shell” – including a request for multiyear procurement authority, a request for new use of unobligated funds, and a request to extend the use of funds beyond the current fiscal year – must be submitted to OLC as a regular legislative proposal by the above date. Any such provision submitted only as part of one of the “shells” (which will not be submitted to OLC until several months after the above deadline) will be subject to the process for the disposition of proposals that are submitted late. However, this requirement does not apply to the recurring, core provisions of either shell – those that either authorize appropriations for regular Department of Defense accounts or that prescribe military personnel strengths.

Lastly, the LRP will enforce firm deadlines (both for the submission of proposals and for budget information) to ensure that only proposals submitted in response to actual exigencies or unforeseeable needs are accepted late. Failure of a sponsoring component to identify an issue or a needed extension of expiring authority does not qualify as either an actual exigency or an unforeseeable need. Further information is available in the “Guidelines -- Coordination Disposition of Late Props LRP” document.

II. REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF A PROPOSAL

A component sponsoring a proposal must ensure that the proposal includes all of the required elements when the component submits the proposal to OLC and that the elements set forth below are formatted as shown in OLC’s “Template for Sample Proposal”.

First, the proposal should set forth the proposed legislative language. This language should be drafted to achieve the desired policy objective, either by amending existing law or by proposing a new provision of law. The proposed text should include a title of what the proposal substantively accomplishes (e.g., “TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF ABC PROGRAM”, not “AMENDMENT OF XYZ ACT”). In drafting legislative language, a component should use previous NDAs as enacted into law as a reference, particularly on how to draft a potential amendment to an existing law, and should review the accompanying “OLC Drafting Hints” document.

Second, the proposal should include a section-by-section analysis. The section-by-section analysis should summarize specifically what the proposal would accomplish, explain the problem the proposal is designed to solve, elucidate why a legislative solution is needed, describe the changes proposed to address the problem, and explain the consequences of these changes. If the proposal amends an existing law, the section-by-section analysis first should include a brief description of the current law and then a description of how the proposal would change that law. In the section-by-section analysis, a component should avoid the use of footnotes, jargon, and program-specific language and should spell out each acronym the first time it is used. The section-by-section analysis should be written so that it would be understandable by a layman not familiar with the proposal or the policy background affected by

the proposal. The section-by-section analysis should be drafted to persuade the reader of the need for the proposed change. In particular, it should include any information from Sections IV and V (below) that the sponsoring component believes would be of use to Congress (since Sections IV and V will not be included in the proposal as transmitted to Congress).

Third, the proposal must include a budget implications section. Each proposal must have a budget table as outlined more fully in Section III below. Please note that all of the proposal's budgetary implications must be identified and included in the proposal. If a proposal has no budgetary implications, the sponsoring component must explain why that is so. If the component had submitted the proposal to the Unified Legislation and Budgeting (ULB) process, the component also should identify the ULB proposal number; otherwise, the proposal should state this element is not applicable.

Fourth, the proposal must have a priorities section. The sponsoring component must identify whether it considers the proposal to be a "must have" for the FY 2016 cycle and explain why that proposal **must** be enacted during the FY 2016 cycle, including the anticipated consequences of non-enactment. If a proposal is not identified as a "must have" proposal, the component may characterize it as "desirable". If a component has more than five "must have" proposals, the component must identify whether a particular "must have" proposal is among its top five "must have" proposals. Further, each component must prioritize its "must have" proposals (or its top five, if there are more than five), in terms of their relative priority with each other (i.e., 1 of 5, 2 of 5, etc.).

Fifth, the proposal should explain whether it has been previously submitted (by the sponsoring component or a different component) and, if so, explain why the Department should pursue the proposal during the FY 2016 cycle. If a proposal was submitted to the OLC process during a prior NDAA cycle, the sponsoring component should identify each such cycle and the applicable proposal number (available on the OLC website) for each previous cycle. In addition, the component must identify the outcome when the proposal was previously submitted and any barriers that were encountered (internal DoD non-concurrence, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) disapproval or deferral, Congressional opposition, Committee jurisdiction issue, Congressional staff questions, etc.). To ensure that the component has addressed these barriers, the component should identify any changes made to the proposal most recently submitted and explain how those changes would overcome any barriers previously encountered, or note external factors whose changes make passage more likely. Finally, the component should provide a justification for the resubmission, including, if the proposal was previously submitted to Congress, why Congress would enact the proposal in this legislative cycle. If a proposal has been submitted three or more times previously and has not been enacted, there is a presumption that the proposal will likely not be enacted and, therefore, should not be transmitted to Congress. If a proposal was not previously submitted to the OLC process for a prior NDAA cycle, in this section the proposal should state that "This proposal is being submitted for the first time."

Sixth, the proposal should provide contact information for the proposal. Each proposal should list the name and contact information for the sponsoring component's subject matter expert (SME), as well as the name and contact information for the person who will be the point of contact for OMB. The proposal should also state the name and contact information for the

component or OSD/Office of General Counsel attorney who reviewed and approved the proposal prior to its submission to OLC. Finally, if the proposal is funded by military department appropriations, the proposal must list the name and contact information for the Assistant Secretary for Financial Management & Comptroller (FM&C) point of contact(s) for the appropriate military department(s); if the proposal is funded by Defense-wide appropriations, the proposal must list the name and contact information for the Defense-wide Agency headquarters comptroller point of contact. In neither case may the proposal list an individual from the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) (OUSDC) as the point of contact. Instead, the designated point(s) of contact must have worked on the related appropriation for submission to OUSDC.

Finally, if the proposal would change the text of an existing law, the proposal should show the changes the proposal would make to existing law. If the legislative proposal would change the text of an existing statute, the proposal should show how the text of the statute would be changed if the proposal were enacted. However, when setting out existing law, a sponsoring component should not incorporate any legislative provision currently pending before Congress that would amend existing law. The component should identify all of the changes the proposal would make to the text of existing law (no matter how small). Deletions from existing law are shown as struck through (~~old~~); additions to existing law are shown as underlined (new). There are two exceptions. First, if the proposal will add a completely new section to title 10, United States Code (or another law), it is not necessary to repeat the text of the new section in the Changes to Existing Law section. Second, an amendment to a table of contents (or a Code table of sections) does not need to be shown. If the proposal would not change the text of an existing statute, the proposal should state that “This proposal would not change the text of existing law.”

III. DETERMINATION OF BUDGET IMPLICATIONS FOR EVERY PROPOSAL

In light of the current budget environment, a legislative proposal should be submitted only if the component considers it to be necessary to the operation of the Department and the highest and best use for the Department’s resources. For the FY 2016 cycle, overall funding levels must be within the FY 2016 Revised Discretionary Spending Limits for the security category of the Bipartisan Budget Control Act of 2013. As a result, legislative proposals must reflect the funding associated with implementing the authorization legislation and any requested increases in funding must be offset from lower priority activities within the same programs. The OUSDC will assess the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 effects of all legislative proposals submitted to OLC.

The Department will not submit to OMB a proposal that does not specifically explain how it would be incorporated into the President’s Budget. Therefore, each proposal must identify the specific funding for any authority requested, as well as the specific program and budget line identifiers (e.g., program element, appropriation, budget activity, and Dash-1 line item) and the legislative title and the funding profile across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) for those proposals funded in the component Program Objective Memorandum/Budget Execution Submission (POM/BES). To expedite review by the OUSDC, all required budget information must be included in the timely submitted proposal and the information must be the same as the information included in the PB-16 exhibit due in September 2014.

When components submit their legislative proposals to OLC, they also must submit – as a separate document – a copy of the PB-16 exhibit they will submit to OUSD(C) (specifically, Pam Bell in OUSD(C)/B&AA) in the attached Excel format (pursuant to Volume 2B, Chapter 19 of the DoD Financial Management Regulation and the FY 2016-FY 2020 Integrated Program/Budget Submission Guidance) in September 2014 with the President’s Budget submission. A component must list all of their legislative proposals in one PB-16 exhibit, rather than a separate exhibit for each proposal. The PB-16 exhibit is required for all legislation being submitted for consideration by Congress in the President’s Budget submission.

- In the PB-16 exhibit, amounts should reflect costs or savings included in the budget submission if the proposal is approved by Congress.
- It also should include a total for each proposal, a total for each appropriation/fund, and a grand total.
- All proposed legislation, including those submitted through the ULB process, should be included in the component’s budget submission.
- Each proposal must be fully funded for FY 2016 and throughout the FYDP.
- If the proposal affects manpower, the PB-16 exhibit must provide the end strength and workyear adjustments (average strength for military and full-time equivalents for civilians) by type of employment status.
- Finally, the proposal title listed in the PB-16 exhibit should reflect the same title of the proposal that the component submits to OLC.

Similar requirements for legislative proposals are set forth below. If none of the component’s legislative proposals have budget implications, the PB-16 exhibit should reflect that the requirements for cost information are not applicable.

For the Department to maintain control of future costs, the sponsoring component must submit all of its legislative proposals on time and expressly address all of the budget implications, including specific costs and savings, for each proposal it submits. The sponsoring component must work closely with the Assistant Secretary for FM&C for the military department, WHS or Defense-wide Agency headquarters comptroller office, before it formally submits its proposals to OLC, to ensure that (1) each proposal contains complete and accurate budgetary information and (2) the legislation is accounted for in the component’s POM, PB-16 exhibit, and its submission for the President’s Budget. In particular, if the proposal is funded by military department appropriations, the budget implications must be approved by the appropriate Assistant Secretary for FM&C.

The sponsoring component must address the budget implications of each of its proposals, whether or not a given proposal actually has budgetary implications. If a proposal has no budgetary impact, the proposal should so state, along with the specific rationale for that

determination. Please be aware that a proposal has budgetary implications even if it does not propose a funding level for FY 2016 in excess of the funding level for the program for FY 2015. As OMB has consistently stated, simply stating that a proposal would be funded within existing resources is not sufficient.

Because only the OUSD(C) can determine whether a proposal ultimately has budgetary implications, the sponsoring component must include a budget table with each proposal. The budget table must include an explanation of how the component proposes to fund the proposal (including program element, appropriation, budget activity, and Dash-1 line item). If a proposal is determined not to have budgetary implications, it will go forward without a budget table. Components should also be aware that, if a proposal has budgetary implications, OMB, with very few exceptions, will not clear the proposal unless it is consistent with the President's FY 2016 budget. Components should include five-year funding information for each proposal. Additionally, if a proposal is identified by the sponsor or by OUSD(C) as having budget implications, the budget information must be reflected in the component's FY 2016-2020 Integrated Program/Budget Submission due to OUSD(C) in August 2014 and in the PB-16 exhibit due in September 2014. Any proposal submitted after September 2014 will not be submitted to the LRP for possible inclusion in the FY 2016 legislative program unless OUSD(C) has already assessed the proposal's budget implications and the proposal is included in the PB-16 exhibit.

These budget tables are critical during the OMB coordination process because OMB uses them to identify the budgetary resources that will be directed to support the proposed authorization (either budgeted or as the source for offsets). During OMB's coordination process, OMB may modify a budget table to help clarify the budgetary impacts of a given proposal or, in rare instances, may determine that a budget table should be deleted for final submission of the proposal to Congress.

Each proposal should set forth the following budgetary impact elements:

- The account from which the sponsoring component would fund the specific costs for the proposal, including the program element, appropriation, budget activity, and Dash-1 line item from which the proposal would be funded (note that components should identify the exact cost of the proposal, not simply the total amount of the relevant line item):
 - Program Element -- For example, 0603502N. The first and second digits are the DoD Major Force Program; the ending is the Service or a 1-3 digit code for the Agency.
 - Appropriation From -- Examples include: Operation and Maintenance, Navy; Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army; Other Procurement, Air Force; Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide; etc.
 - Budget Activity -- This is the budget activity from which the effort is funded. Examples include: 01, 02, 03, 04, 06, and 07.

- Dash-1 Line Item -- This is the budget line item that is assigned when the FM&C military department or Defense-wide Agency headquarters comptroller develops the FY 2016 budget for submission to OUSD(C). This information is important because it will be the same number that the Hill uses in the House, Senate and conference reports.
- A five-year projection (FY 2016 - 2020), with year-by-year costs or savings, for the entire Department of Defense, with a breakdown by military department where applicable.
- A five-year projection (FY 2016 - 2020), with year-by-year estimates, of the specific number of personnel (both military and civilian) who would be affected by the proposal.
- The cost methodology used to calculate the above figures, including, as appropriate, an explanation of why a proposal that would increase spending authority would not generate an increased top line.
- If the proposal is funded by military department appropriations, the name, email address and telephone number for the Assistant Secretary for FM&C point of contact(s) for the appropriate military department(s); if the proposal is funded by Defense-wide appropriations, the name, email address and telephone number for the Defense-wide Agency headquarters comptroller point of contact. In neither case may the proposal list an individual from OUSD(C) as the point of contact. Instead, the designated point(s) of contact must have worked on the related appropriation for submission to OUSD(C).
- The ULB proposal number, if applicable. The ULB number should be provided on the Comment Card for the proposal on the OLC website, rather than within the text of the proposal itself.

As set forth in Section V below, all legislative proposals should be drafted for general application throughout the Department. The sponsoring component is responsible for compiling all of the budgetary information required for the entire Department. However, if a proposed authority is not required for the entire Department, or for all of the military departments, the sponsoring component must include in the proposal a justification for this treatment.

IV. PROPOSALS THAT HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED PREVIOUSLY

A sponsoring component should provide a detailed justification for any proposal that is being resubmitted from an earlier legislative cycle, including the fiscal year(s) for which the proposal was submitted, the proposal number for each prior submission, and a description of any changes the component has made to the proposal.

If the proposal was previously submitted and was not approved for transmittal to Congress, the sponsoring component should describe in detail the changes made to the proposal as submitted for FY 2016 in response to the previous non-concurrences and any discussions with the non-concurring parties that have mitigated the prior concerns.

A proposal that has been submitted repeatedly by the Department to Congress and not enacted will bear close scrutiny from, and is unlikely to be approved by, Departmental leadership, absent compelling justification accompanying the proposal to indicate that Congress would be expected to give it favorable consideration. Therefore, if the proposal was previously submitted to Congress, but not adopted by it, the sponsoring component should articulate a convincing legislative strategy explaining what has changed – specifically including how the proposal has been altered, what issues Congress raised in objection to the proposal, how those issues have been addressed, and why Congress could be expected to enact the proposal in this legislative cycle. If a proposal has been submitted three or more times previously and has not been enacted, the presumption will be that the proposal will likely not be enacted and, therefore, should not be transmitted to Congress.

If a sponsoring component has made any changes for FY 2016 to a proposal that was cleared by OMB in a previous cycle, the component needs to provide a description of, and rationale for, the changes.

All previously submitted proposals will be sent to the appropriate Legislative Affairs Team Chief to review, to identify whether the information in the resubmission justification is consistent with the feedback received from Congress, and to provide a view on how Congress will likely respond to this resubmission. If the information is consistent and the Team Chief indicates the proposal has a good likelihood of success, then the proposal may proceed to full Departmental coordination. If, however, the information is inconsistent or the Team Chief indicates that the proposal has a low likelihood of success, the proposal will be returned to the sponsoring component for revisions and to reevaluate whether it is an identified Departmental need.

The submission deadline is earlier than the anticipated completion of Congressional action on the FY 2015 NDAA. Therefore, each component should include with its FY 2016 submission any of its FY 2015 Administration-cleared proposals that remain Departmental priorities and are pending in the NDAA bill as passed by the House of Representatives or the Senate (or both). Those FY 2015 pending proposals that are resubmitted for the FY 2016 cycle, pending the outcome of the FY 2015 NDAA, will be referred to as “carryover” proposals. When a component submits a carryover proposal, it should: (1) identify the proposal as an FY 2015 carryover proposal; (2) note whether the proposal was adopted by the House or Senate (including the section number(s) in the House or Senate NDAA); and (3) update the proposal as necessary (including the budget information). Once the FY 2015 NDAA is enacted, each carryover proposal will be reviewed and, as warranted, will either be dropped from the FY 2016 legislative program or be referred back to the sponsoring component for reconsideration and possible modification in view of the congressional action.

V. GENERAL LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING GUIDELINES

(For specific submission requirements, see separate “Checklist for Preparation of Legislative Proposals for Submission to OLC for the FY 2016 Legislative Program”)

- Each proposal must be consistent with the Department’s priorities. To this end, the sponsoring component should explain why the proposal is important to the component and to the Department.

- The legislative language of a proposal should be drafted for general application with broad authority to act. A proposal may not propose a limitation on the Secretary of Defense's authority to manage DoD, nor may it propose the creation of a new reporting requirement or the extension of an expiring reporting requirement.
- To continue the Department's efforts to reduce the burden of congressional reports, each component should review existing reporting requirements and submit recommendations to repeal outdated reporting requirements, consolidate duplicative requirements, make the preparation of existing reports more efficient, or otherwise reduce the administrative burden on the Department of congressionally-mandated reporting requirements. As explained more fully in the separate "Directions for Reporting Requirement Submissions", a component may submit their recommendations by filling out the "Information Required for Submission to Repeal, Modify or Consolidate Statutory Reporting Requirements". OLC will consolidate all of the items submitted in this manner into a single legislative proposal for processing through the DoD legislative program. However, if the proposed change(s) are significant or potentially controversial, a component instead should submit a legislative proposal that would accomplish their goals.
- DoD components should review all of the existing laws they regularly utilize and submit legislative proposals to extend any of the laws they wish to extend if existing authority would expire on or before December 31, 2015.
- Legislation is to be used sparingly when required to meet specific requirements or goals and, then, only after all other avenues (including administrative remedies) have proven unsuccessful. If a legal determination is made that a proposal includes unnecessary legislation, such a proposal will be returned to the respective sponsor with a request for further explanation of why it should be included in this year's DoD legislative program.
- A section-by-section analysis should set out – in as much detail as is necessary – the factual and legal problems that necessitate the proposed legislative change, describe the proposed changes, and explain the beneficial consequences of these changes. Each analysis must follow the legislative language and be written in a style that would be understandable and persuasive to a layman. It should also be clear, concise, and convincing. In many instances, a poorly written analysis loaded with technical language and acronyms – or an analysis that fails to adequately address every significant issue raised by the proposal – will prevent a proposal from clearing DoD or OMB coordination.
- As stated above, each proposal needs to address expressly any and all budget implications, including new and recurring costs and savings. An assertion that a proposal will not cost more than last year – or that it would be funded with existing resources – does not absolve the need to provide all budgetary information. Each proposal should be budgeted for or, for a new proposal, a specific offset should be identified should such authority be enacted. OUSD(C) will work with the sponsoring component's Assistant Secretary for FM&C's point of contact or Defense-wide Agency headquarters comptroller point of contact, as appropriate, to address the budgetary information required for each proposal.

- The sponsoring component for each proposal must certify that the component's own general counsel has reviewed and approved, and the agency head has cleared, each proposal. Approval by the agency head must be shown by a memorandum accompanying the proposal that is signed by the agency head. Please note that the reviewing attorney is not an attorney from the Office of Legislative Counsel, but the component's own counsel.
- Each sponsoring component must include every element listed in the "Checklist for Preparation of Legislative Proposals for Submission to OLC for the FY 2016 Legislative Program." OLC will return to the sponsoring component any proposal that fails to meet these requirements and will not coordinate any such proposal until all of the elements have been addressed.
- Each proposal must conform to the format as set forth in the "Template for Sample Proposal" OLC provides to each component.
- Before a sponsoring component submits its legislative proposals to OLC, the component should consider combining any proposals that involve similar issues to help streamline the coordination process not only within DoD, but also with OMB.
- Pursuant to Executive Order 13175 (November 6, 2000), agencies may not transmit legislation to Congress that has "substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes, on the relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities between the Federal Government and Indian tribes" unless the agency satisfies certain requirements set forth in section 3 of the executive order. OMB will not provide the Department with final clearance to transmit any proposal to Congress until the Department provides this certification. Therefore, a sponsoring component must review each of its proposals and inform OLC – at the time of submission to OLC – whether the requirements of Executive Order 13175 apply to any of them.