



# **Observations on the 2024 Unfunded Priority Lists**

Elaine McCusker and John G. Ferrari  
*American Enterprise Institute*

AEI Foreign & Defense Policy Working Paper 2024-02  
April 2024

The White House recently submitted to Congress a budget request for defense totaling \$850 billion for the fiscal year that begins this coming October 1.<sup>1</sup> Though consistent with the caps set in May 2023 by the Fiscal Responsibility Act, the proposed budget does not keep pace with inflation and is acknowledged even by those attempting to defend it as not enough for the long term readiness or modernization of the force necessary for our national security.<sup>2</sup>

The President's budget, while important, is only the start of the legislative process that determines the final level of funding for the military. Under the Constitution, the Congress has the responsibility to "raise and support Armies" and to provide funding for that military.<sup>3</sup> To do this job, the Congress has public hearings with key defense leaders, private meetings with experts, and internal deliberations among staff. It also requires submission of the often-misunderstood unfunded priority lists (UPLs).<sup>4</sup>

In all of these, the civilian appointees of the President are expected to hew closely to the President's budget request. However, the military leadership is supposed to give their best professional military judgement to the Congress, even when it disagrees with the presented budget. This is why the UPL lists, with one exception, come from the uniformed military leadership to the Congress, unaltered by civilian leadership. As expected, these lists have caused tension within the Pentagon over the years, with the uniformed military taking different approaches than their civilian leaders. This year is no different.

It should also be noted that Congress has been formalizing these previously informal lists more and more each year. In particular, after the Congress funds the items, they are now asking the Pentagon to brief them on how the money is spent as part of the budget submission in subsequent years:

Therefore, the Committee reiterates direction included in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2022, and directs that any submission of unfunded requirements by the military services, defense agencies, and combatant commands with the fiscal year 2024 President's budget request be accompanied by updated requirements and programmatic and execution plans for unfunded requirements that received appropriations in fiscal year 2023. Further, the Committee directs the Assistant Secretaries (Financial Management and Comptroller) for the Air Force, Navy, and Army to incorporate in the congressional budget brief templates distinct programmatic and execution data for appropriations provided in the previous 3 fiscal years for unfunded requirements pertaining to the program/effort.<sup>5</sup>

Twelve lists have been made public to date this year for a total of \$28.7 billion in noted budget shortfalls.<sup>6</sup> These unfunded priorities equate to about 3.4 percent of the \$850 billion budget request. Given that inflation remains at about 3.2 percent in the United States and the pay raise for military members is 4.5 percent, the 1 percent topline increase in the budget request, when combined with the 3.4 percent in additional funding within the UPL lists, would keep the Pentagon at a roughly zero real growth rate.<sup>7</sup> Given that there are two major wars ongoing, several shadow wars, and the potential for a major conflict with China, we can expect the Pentagon may also have a 2025 Emergency Supplemental in the works. Even with this context,

the UPL lists contained several interesting surprises.

It should be noted that this analysis does not include Special Operations Command (SOCOM), Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), European Command (EUCOM), the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), or Africa Command (AFRICOM) as those are either not submitted or classified in total. These, however, are only a fraction of the overall list historically, and therefore their absence does not materially change the analysis.

## INDOPACOM Monopolizes the Lists

The first observation is that the Commander of Indo-Pacific Command (INDOPACOM) monopolizes the list in asking for \$11 billion, which is 38 percent of the entire UPL request, and tops its own previous year needs by more than \$7.5 billion.

**Table 1. Service and Command Breakouts**

Service and Command	2023		2024		2025		Change Between 2025 and 2024
	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	
INDOPACOM	\$1,509.0	6.9%	\$3,481.0	20.6%	\$11,041.0	38.4%	\$7,560.0
Navy	\$4,020.0	18.3%	\$2,533.8	15.0%	\$3,694.0	12.8%	\$1,160.2
Air Force	\$4,613.4	21.0%	\$2,452.5	14.5%	\$3,500.4	12.2%	\$1,047.8
National Guard Bureau	\$463.0	2.1%			\$2,662.1	9.3%	\$2,662.1
Marine Corps	\$3,477.5	15.9%	\$3,671.9	21.7%	\$2,382.0	8.3%	(\$1,290.0)
Army	\$5,120.7	23.4%	\$1,930.4	11.4%	\$2,220.3	7.7%	\$289.8
SPACECOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$0.0	0.0%	\$1,213.9	4.2%	\$1,213.9
Space Force	\$638.1	2.9%	\$477.3	2.8%	\$1,148.7	4.0%	\$671.4
CENTCOM	\$35.0	0.2%	\$278.8	1.7%	\$449.6	1.6%	\$170.8
SOUTHCOM	\$267.9	1.2%	\$278.3	1.6%	\$322.7	1.1%	\$44.4
USD (R&E)					\$81.5	0.3%	\$81.5
NORTHCOM	\$135.0	0.6%	\$376.7	2.2%	\$34.7	0.1%	(\$342.0)
SOCOM	\$656.3	3.0%	\$847.3	5.0%		0.0%	(\$847.3)
AFRICOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$397.8	2.4%		0.0%	(\$397.8)
EUCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$159.5	0.9%		0.0%	(\$159.5)
CYBERCOM	\$236.0	1.1%	\$0.0	0.0%		0.0%	\$0.0
MDA	\$748.0	3.4%	\$0.0	0.0%		0.0%	\$0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,919.9</b>		<b>\$16,885.4</b>		<b>\$28,750.8</b>		<b>\$11,865.3</b>

Source: Authors' calculations based off the fiscal year 2023-2025 unfunded priority lists (UPL). Note: INDOPACOM is Indo-Pacific Command, SPACECOM is Space Command, CENTCOM is Central Command, SOUTHCOM is Southern Command, USD (R&E) is Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, NORTHCOM is Northern Command, SOCOM is Special Operations Command, AFRICOM is Africa Command, EUCOM is European Command, CYBERCOM is Cyber Command, and MDA is Missile Defense Agency.

Given that China and the Pacific are the Pentagon’s stated pacing challenge and top priority, it is somewhat surprising to see it as also the largest unfunded need.<sup>8</sup> The INDOPACOM request is broken out in the following table by major appropriation category.

**Table 2. INDOPACOM Breakout by Appropriation Category**

<b>INDOPACOM</b>	<b>Total: \$11,041</b>
MILCON	\$3,689
O&M	\$1,282
Procurement	\$2,630
RDTE	\$3,440

Source: Authors' calculations based off INDOPACOM's fiscal year 2025 unfunded priority list.

Note: Dollars are in millions. O&M is operation and maintenance.

Most would assume that a combatant commander operates in the near-term, conducting operations, and thus their UPL would reflect operating readiness dollars as its greatest near-term need. However, the INDOPACOM request looks much more like a service request, with large asks for military construction (MILCON), procurement of weapons, and research, development, test and evaluation (RDTE). It is also interesting that there is little overlap between what INDOPACOM is asking for and the services’ unfunded needs. This may indicate a potential disagreement in priorities during program and budget decisions or it could indicate that this particular command has a more unrestrained view of the process than the service chiefs. It also means the department could be gaming the Congress a bit, knowing INDOPACOM has special status in getting support for requested increases during the legislative process.

The distant second and third spots on the organizational shortfall list are held by the Air Force and Navy, followed by the Marine Corps and National Guard. Interestingly, although the Army’s list is higher than last year’s submission, it is still lower than expected given the trajectory of the ground service’s budget and its role in ongoing support for priorities in Europe and the Middle East.

### **The National Guard Bureau (NGB) and Aircraft**

Much like INDOPACOM, the UPL list for the NGB reflects more of what we would expect to see from a service chief, with \$1.6 billion requested to procure F-15EX and F-35 aircraft. Overall, about \$2.2 billion of the Bureau’s request can be characterized as shortfalls similar to those befalling military departments while about \$470 million is geared to more traditional National Guard requirements, such as guard specific construction, recruiting, and state partnership programs.

### **Investment Versus Readiness**

When we look at the UPL requests over the past several years, we see consistent prioritization—about 80 percent of the request—for what we categorize here as investments, meaning military construction, procurement, and RDTE appropriations. The FY 2025 lists are no different. This

would seem to indicate that the department is fitting within budget constraints by trying to meet current readiness needs at the expense of its future. It is also a realization that Congress is much more likely to fund projects and weapons that are tied to specific states and districts than to the amorphous readiness accounts. Therefore, the UPL lists are also a strategic bet that Congress will come to the rescue.

**Table 3. Appropriation Category Breakout**

Appropriation Category	2023		2024		2025		Change Between 2025 and 2024
	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	
<b>Investments</b>	<b>\$17,436.8</b>	<b>79.5%</b>	<b>\$13,974.1</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>\$22,424.2</b>	<b>78.0%</b>	<b>\$8,450.1</b>
Procurement	\$11,708.9	53.4%	\$7,120.1	42.2%	\$8,489.9	29.5%	\$1,369.8
Infrastructure	\$3,842.7	17.5%	\$3,415.3	20.2%	\$7,662.9	26.7%	\$4,247.6
RDTE	\$1,885.2	8.6%	\$3,438.8	20.4%	\$6,271.4	21.8%	\$2,832.6
<b>Readiness, MILPERS, and Defense Security Cooperation Agency</b>	<b>\$4,483.0</b>	<b>20.5%</b>	<b>\$2,911.3</b>	<b>17.2%</b>	<b>\$6,326.6</b>	<b>22.0%</b>	<b>\$3,415.3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$21,919.8</b>		<b>\$16,885.4</b>		<b>\$28,750.8</b>		<b>\$11,865.4</b>

Source: Authors' calculations based off the fiscal year 2023-2025 unfunded priority lists.

Within the investment accounts, there is a very notable shift in the UPL lists away from procurement and into military construction and RDTE. This effect is even more pronounced once you look into each category below.

Taking a broader view of the three year-trends among these appropriation breakouts, while the procurement shortfalls listed in 2023 are the highest of the three years for that account, the gaps in RDTE and operation and maintenance (O&M) are the highest in 2025. Again, this is counter to what we would expect given the lower procurement request this year. However, it also shows the unproductive “bouncing ball” of a procurement budget that has in part created the vulnerable industrial base we now have, which lacks the steady state capacity, resilience, and surge abilities the nation needs.<sup>9</sup>

### **Procurement, Dominated by INDOPACOM and NGB**

In 2023, procurement made up 53 percent of the UPL lists. In 2025, that is down to 30 percent, with well over half (54 percent) not even submitted by the military departments but instead coming from INDOPACOM and NGB.

**Table 4. Procurement Breakout**

Service and Command	2023		2024		2025		Change Between 2025 and 2024
	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	
INDOPACOM	\$496.4	4.2%	\$333.0	4.7%	\$2,630.4	31.0%	\$2,297.4
National Guard Bureau	\$349.4	3.0%			\$1,987.0	23.4%	\$1,987.0
Marine Corps	\$2,780.1	23.7%	\$2,804.7	39.4%	\$1,051.7	12.4%	(\$1,753.0)
Navy	\$2,176.6	18.6%	\$967.6	13.6%	\$986.0	11.6%	\$18.4
Army	\$2,584.9	22.1%	\$1,064.0	14.9%	\$869.0	10.2%	(\$195.0)
Air Force	\$2,110.5	18.0%	\$1,058.6	14.9%	\$592.1	7.0%	(\$466.5)
SPACECOM					\$304.5	3.6%	\$304.5
Space Force	\$526.5	4.5%	\$36.3	0.5%	\$69.2	0.8%	\$32.9
SOCOM	\$426.3	3.6%	\$301.0	4.2%		0.0%	(\$301.0)
NORTHCOM	\$34.9	0.3%	\$262.8	3.7%		0.0%	(\$262.8)
CENTCOM	\$35.0	0.3%	\$123.8	1.7%		0.0%	(\$123.8)
EUCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$114.9	1.6%		0.0%	(\$114.9)
AFRICOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$46.9	0.7%		0.0%	(\$46.9)
SOUTHCOM	\$188.4	1.6%	\$6.6	0.1%		0.0%	(\$6.6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11,709.0</b>		<b>\$7,120.1</b>		<b>\$8,489.9</b>		<b>\$1,369.8</b>

Source: Authors' calculations based off the fiscal year 2023-2025 unfunded priority lists.

With procurement the known bill-payer for this year's stated budget focus on readiness and the near-term fight, the UPLs were expected to make up for the lack of funding to actually buy the ships, planes, ground vehicles, and space systems we know we need to remain competitive and to sustain our industrial base and supply chains struggling under uncertain and insufficient budgets.<sup>10</sup> As such, the lack of emphasis on these shortfalls in the UPLs from the military departments is even more puzzling.

Diving into the next level of detail, there are a few themes to note within the procurement shortfall lines. The single largest request of \$766 million comes from INDOPACOM for the latest Navy Standard Missile variant. The National Guard stated shortfall of aircraft noted above takes the second and third spots with request for 6 additional F-15 EX (\$690 million) and 6 more F-35 (\$660 million) planes. The Air Force's request for \$592 million in "fighter force re-optimization," which supports a "one-time purchase of equipment to create 9 new deployable mission generation force elements" captures fourth place, followed by the Navy's submarine industrial base gap of \$403 million rounding out the top 5 for \$3 billion of the total procurement shortfall.

Examining procurement gaps another way, shortfalls specific to long range fires, missiles, and munitions total \$2.2 billion and those geared toward procuring unmanned systems add up to \$370 million.

## RDTE Dominated by INDOPACOM and Space

**Table 5. RDTE Breakout**

Service and Command	2023		2024		2025		Change Between 2025 and 2024
	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	
INDOPACOM	\$322.4	17.1%	\$2,117.9	61.6%	\$3,440.0	54.9%	\$1,322.1
SPACECOM					\$909.5	14.5%	\$909.5
Space Force	\$0.0	0.0%	\$441.0	12.8%	\$847.7	13.5%	\$406.7
Navy	\$283.4	15.0%	\$196.3	5.7%	\$565.0	9.0%	\$368.7
Army	\$69.0	3.7%	\$117.6	3.4%	\$290.7	4.6%	\$173.1
USD (R&E)					\$81.5	1.3%	\$81.5
Marine Corps	\$83.2	4.4%	\$109.6	3.2%	\$71.0	1.1%	(\$38.6)
CENTCOM					\$66.0	1.1%	\$66.0
SOCOM	\$66.3	3.5%	\$235.7	6.9%			(\$235.7)
NORTHCOM	\$50.9	2.7%	\$101.8	3.0%			(\$101.8)
Air Force	\$262.0	13.9%	\$90.7	2.6%			(\$90.7)
SOUTHCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$28.1	0.8%			(\$28.1)
MDA	\$748.0	39.7%	\$0.0	0.0%			\$0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,885.2</b>		<b>\$3,438.8</b>		<b>\$6,271.4</b>		<b>\$2,832.6</b>

Source: Authors' calculations based off the fiscal year 2023-2025 unfunded priority lists.

When we look at RDTE, it is notable that 83 percent of the shortfalls are in areas most crucial for strategic level deterrence and competition in the Pacific and in space.

INDOPACOM is again far above any other component with nearly 55 percent of the total in stated gaps in this investment category, followed by the combined Space Force and Space Command (SPACECOM) UPLs at 28 percent. Notable capability gaps within this account include: numerous classified programs totaling \$2.5 billion, a non-traditional find, fix, track, and target effort (\$345.4 million), acceleration of the Hunter extra-large unmanned underwater vehicle (\$184 million), and the Guam defense system (\$181.3 million).

### **Military Construction: Maritime and the Pacific**

For military construction, the dollar request is up \$4 billion from 2024, most of which which is for INDOPACOM's \$3.5 billion increased request over last fiscal year. The other large addition is the Navy at \$725 million more than last year. The high dollar requirements listed include: facilities in Guam, harbor improvements in Palau, runways, wharfs and harbor projects in Micronesia, and water treatment and hanger projects in Hawaii.

**Table 6. Military Construction Breakout**

Service and Command	2023		2024		2025		Change Between 2025 and 2024
	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	
INDOPACOM	\$47.6	1.2%	\$131.0	3.8%	\$3,689.1	48.1%	\$3,558.1
Navy	\$144.9	3.8%	\$511.3	15.0%	\$1,450.0	18.9%	\$938.7
Air Force	\$1,146.1	29.8%	\$1,223.4	35.8%	\$1,115.7	14.6%	(\$107.7)
Army	\$1,777.9	46.3%	\$635.9	18.6%	\$540.7	7.1%	(\$95.2)
Marine Corps	\$614.2	16.0%	\$757.6	22.2%	\$492.4	6.4%	(\$265.2)
National Guard Bureau	\$37.1	1.0%			\$225.0	2.9%	\$225.0
SOUTHCOM	\$1.0	0.0%	\$0.0	0.0%	\$90.0	1.2%	\$90.0
Space Force	\$0.0	0.0%	\$0.0	0.0%	\$60.0	0.8%	\$60.0
SOCOM	\$24.6	0.6%	\$149.1	4.4%		0.0%	(\$149.1)
NORTHCOM	\$49.3	1.3%	\$7.0	0.2%		0.0%	(\$7.0)
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,842.7</b>		<b>\$3,415.3</b>		<b>\$7,662.9</b>		<b>\$4,247.6</b>

Source: Authors' calculations based off the fiscal year 2023-2025 unfunded priority lists.

### Near Term Readiness – Operations and Security Assistance

In the readiness category, which includes appropriations for operation and maintenance and military personnel along with partner efforts for Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) funded through the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the Air Force has the largest total request at \$1.8 billion, or more than 28 percent of listed gaps. Despite the 2025 budget request's stated focus on readiness, the Air Force puts forth a single \$1.5 billion shortfall for spares, which it notes is a one-time need for aircraft readiness and was not fully funded in the budget due to fiscal constraints. INDOPACOM lists a \$581 million gap this year for the again nebulously labeled "campaigning" effort for each of its service components to advance "well defined strategy-aligned priorities over time." Translated, this essentially means that the day-to-day operating forces and contracted logistics support functions of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps components in the Pacific are underfunded, at least in the view of the INDOPACOM commander.



**Table 7. Readiness, O&M, MILPERS, and Security Assistance Breakout**

Service and Command	2023		2024		2025		Change Between 2025 and 2024
	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	UPL Dollars (Millions)	Percentage of Total	
Air Force	\$1,094.8	24.4%	\$79.8	2.7%	\$1,792.6	28.3%	\$1,712.7
INDOPACOM	\$642.6	14.3%	\$899.1	30.9%	\$1,281.5	20.3%	\$382.4
Marine Corps					\$766.9	12.1%	\$766.9
Navy	\$1,415.1	31.6%	\$858.5	29.5%	\$693.0	11.0%	(\$165.5)
Army	\$688.9	15.4%	\$112.9	3.9%	\$519.9	8.2%	\$406.9
National Guard Bureau	\$76.5	1.7%			\$450.1	7.1%	\$450.1
CENTCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$155.0	5.3%	\$383.6	6.1%	\$228.6
SOUTHCOM	\$78.5	1.8%	\$243.6	8.4%	\$232.7	3.7%	(\$10.9)
Space Force	\$111.6	2.5%	\$0.0	0.0%	\$171.8	2.7%	\$171.8
NORTHCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$5.2	0.2%	\$34.7	0.5%	\$29.5
AFRICOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$350.9	12.1%		0.0%	(\$350.9)
SOCOM	\$139.0	3.1%	\$161.5	5.5%		0.0%	(\$161.5)
EUCOM	\$0.0	0.0%	\$44.6	1.5%		0.0%	(\$44.6)
CYBERCOM	\$236.0	5.3%	\$0.0	0.0%		0.0%	\$0.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,483.0</b>		<b>\$2,911.3</b>		<b>\$6,326.6</b>		<b>\$3,415.4</b>

Source: Authors' calculations based off the fiscal year 2023-2025 unfunded priority lists.

### What it all Means

In conclusion, four key points stand out. First, the 2025 defense budget request is too low to meet even those readiness requirements it says it prioritizes and it loses ground on crucial strategic innovation, posture, and procurement efforts necessary for U.S. national security and military competitiveness. Second, in balancing the complex equation of near, mid- and long-term requirements that support the people and industry that underpin our national security, Congress is likely to fund elements of the UPL lists as a way to mitigate insufficient defense budgeting. But this support, given the complex political dynamics at play, tells only part of the story about where the next available dollar is likely to have the most positive impact. Third, assessing unfunded priorities over time and by component emphasizes the consequences of budget instability that leads to seemingly disjointed planning and programming and stated gaps from one combatant command—INDOPACOM—that dominate the landscape. And, perhaps most important, a halt to year-on-year delays in enacting final appropriations may do as much to promote our national security as after-the-fact budget augmentation through unfunded priority lists.

## About the Authors

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

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

## Appendix Tables

<b>Table A1. Military Construction Breakout</b>	
Air Force	
ADAL Child Development Center (Louisiana)	\$22.0
Aeromedical Evacuation Facility (South Carolina)	\$33.0
Air Traffic Control Tower Planning and Design (Mississippi)	\$25.0
Basic Military Training (BMT) - Classroom/Dining Facility 4 (Texas)	\$215.0
Combat Arms Training and Maintenance Complex (North Carolina)	\$41.0
CTC Munitions Storage Area (Rygge, NO)	\$8.0
CTC: Base Entry Complex (Arizona)	\$7.0
CTC: Construct VM and AGE Complex (Wyoming)	\$4.0
CTC: Corrosion Control Facility (Colorado)	\$4.0
CTC: DAVS-FEV Storage (Rygge, NO)	\$8.0
CTC: European Defense Initiative (EDI) Munitions Storage Area (Spain)	\$7.0
CTC: European Defense Initiative (EDI) RADR Storage Facility (RAF Fairford UK)	\$20.5
CTC: European Defense Initiative (EDI) RADR Storage Facility (RAF Lakenheath UK)	\$15.0
CTC: F-35 T-7A East Campus Infrastructure (Utah)	\$28.0
CTC: PDI TACMOR Utilities and Infrastructure Support (Palau)	\$20.0
CTC: Small Arms Range (Ohio)	\$6.0
CTC: Special Tactical Complex - 1 (Oregon)	\$7.0
CTC: Special Tactical Complex - 3 (Oregon)	\$10.0
Fire/Crash Rescue Station (Florida)	\$48.0
Fuel Cell Hangar (Maine)	\$48.0
Large Vehicle Inspection Station (DC)	\$50.0
Multi-Domain Operations Complex (California)	\$148.0
Planning and Design Air Force Reserve (various)	\$9.0
Prior (FY20-23) CTC Wedge (various)	\$174.0
SAOC Planning and Design (unspecified)	\$158.2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,115.7</b>
Army	

Aviation Support Facility Fort Knox, Kentucky	\$138.0
Collective Training Enlisted Barracks, Devens Reserve Training Area	\$39.0
Construct Motor Pool # 70 (3/1 Cavalry Division) Texas	\$69.0
Construct Motor Pool # 71 (3/1 Cavalry Division) Texas	\$78.0
Hawaii Facilities and Utilities Infrastructure	\$20.0
Planning and Design for Barracks to 35% Design	\$47.7
Planning and Design for Construction Army National Guard	\$57.6
Readiness Center Fort Campbell, Kentucky	\$18.0
Readiness Center Lima, Ohio	\$26.0
Unspecified Minor Military Construction	\$47.4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$540.7</b>
<b>INDOPACOM</b>	
Construction	\$3,323.5
Guam Defense System	\$248.0
Project Design and Planning (MILCON P&D)	\$117.6
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$3,689.1</b>
<b>Marine Corps</b>	
P101 USMC MILCON Planning and Design	\$61.0
P1050 Whole Hangar Repair TX	\$75.0
P239 CTC F-35 Flightline Utilities NC	\$150.0
P475 CTC Aircraft Maintenance Hangar SC	\$112.1
P968 Electrical Distribution Modernization HI	\$94.3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$492.4</b>
<b>Navy</b>	
P209 Dry Dock 3 Replacement, Hawaii	\$214.0
P2301 HSC-25 Hangar Replacement of Facility	\$581.0
P448 Range Training Complex Improvements, Fallon, NV	\$45.0
P716 Water Treatment Plant, Hawaii	\$505.0
Planning and Design, Pearl Harbor Waterfront Facility	\$105.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,450.0</b>
<b>National Guard Bureau</b>	
Air National Guard MILCON (Maine)	\$48.0
Army National Guard MILCON (Missouri)	\$38.0
Army National Guard MILCON (Puerto Rico)	\$63.0
Army National Guard MILCON (Virgin Islands)	\$76.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$225.0</b>
<b>SOUTHCOM</b>	
JIATF-S C2 Facility	\$90.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$90.0</b>
<b>Space Force</b>	
Buckley Space Force Base Power Independence	\$60.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$60.0</b>

<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,662.9</b>
--------------	------------------

<b>Table A2. Military Personnel Breakout</b>	
National Guard Bureau	
ANG Increase to Recruiter and Wing Manning	\$110.4
ARNG Increase to Recruiter Manning	\$80.4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$190.8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$190.8</b>

<b>Table A3. Operation and Maintenance Breakout</b>	
Air Force	
Fighter Force Re-optimization	\$20.3
PACAF Exercises	\$266.3
USAF Spares	\$1,506.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,792.6</b>
Army	
Commercial Off the Shelf (COTS) Uncrewed Aerial System	\$25.0
Hawaii Facilities and Utilities Infrastructure	\$77.1
INDOPACOM Campaigning	\$103.5
Joint Counter small Unmanned Aerial Systems (JC-sUAS) University Training and Training Support	\$84.5
Missile Repair and Recertification	\$30.3
Organic Industrial Base Construction Planning	\$11.5
R2E Pilot Program Expansion	\$188.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$519.9</b>
CENTCOM	
CENTCOM Data Analysis and Artificial Intelligence Initiative	\$8.0
Cloud Computing Environment /Cloud Transition	\$20.0
Force Protection Equipment Sustainment	\$295.6
Maven Smart System (MSS) Enterprise License and AI Enhancements	\$44.0
Mission Data Platform Enterprise Licenses	\$16.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$383.6</b>
INDOPACOM	
AI Enabled Planning and Wargaming (STORMBREAKER)	\$18.0
Asia Pacific Regional Initiative (APRI)	\$5.5
Campaigning	\$580.7
Cyber Security and Network Defenses	\$42.5
DragonWorks	\$10.0
Economic Warfare Analysis Capability	\$10.0
Hammerhead Mines (USN)	\$15.0
HQ Manpower Enhancements	\$77.5
Information Operations (MISO)	\$28.0
International Security Cooperation Program (ISCP)	\$37.0

Joint Experimentation and Innovation	\$11.1
Joint Interagency Task Force - West (JIATF-W)	\$4.3
Joint Task Force Indo-Pacific (JTF-IP)	\$9.2
Joint Task Force Micronesia (JTF-M)	\$40.1
Joint Training Team (JTT)	\$49.0
Joint Training, Exercise, and Evaluation Program (JTEEP)	\$129.1
Mission Network	\$106.5
Pacific Multi-Domain Training and Experimentation Capability (PMTEC)	\$30.0
Repair and Minor Construction (O&M)	\$35.0
Service Tactical SIGINT Upgrades and Processing, Exploitation, and Dissemination (PED) Enhancements	\$43.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,281.5</b>
<b>Marine Corps</b>	
Advertising	\$72.9
Barracks 2030 - Base Operating Support	\$119.0
Barracks 2030 - Restoration and Modernization	\$230.5
Facilities Modernization	\$293.0
High Cut Enhanced Combat Helmet (HC ECH)	\$14.4
Plate Carrier GEN III	\$37.1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$766.9</b>
<b>Navy</b>	
Accelerate Weapons Combat Expenditure Replacement for SM-2	\$93.0
Guam, Repair Glass Breakwater	\$600.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$693.0</b>
<b>National Guard Bureau</b>	
Army National Guard Facility Sustainment Model	\$50.0
Flying Hour Program	\$52.0
Seven New State Partnership Program Partners	\$4.3
Weapon System Sustainment	\$153.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$259.3</b>
<b>NORTHCOM</b>	
Combatant Command Mission Operations	\$34.7
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$34.7</b>
<b>SOUTHCOM</b>	
AGILE BEAR	\$1.5
Air Force Theater Engagement	\$37.1
Crisis Response South	\$10.2
Joint Combatant Command Cyber Assistance Team	\$2.3
Joint DoDIN Operations Center (JDOC)	\$22.7
Joint Exercise Program (JEP)	\$20.0
Mission Partner Environment (MPE)	\$4.9
Security Cooperation - Caribbean Maritime Domain	\$21.1

Security Cooperation - Chile SOF Joint	\$0.5
Security Cooperation - Dominican Republic	\$2.9
Security Cooperation - Ecuador	\$23.0
Security Cooperation - Guatemala	\$12.5
Security Cooperation - Jamaica	\$4.6
Security Cooperation - Paraguay Crisis Response	\$3.7
Security Cooperation - Paraguay Riverine Security	\$3.1
Security Cooperation - Trinidad & Tobago	\$5.8
Security Forces Assistance Brigade (SFAB)	\$5.6
Ship, Special Mission (SSM)	\$30.0
Theater Maintenance Partnership (TMPI)	\$21.2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$232.7</b>
<b>Space Force</b>	
STARCOM Training Facility Improvements	\$12.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$12.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,976.0</b>

<b>Table A4. Procurement Breakout</b>	
<b>Air Force</b>	
Fighter Force Re-optimization	\$592.1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$592.1</b>
<b>Army</b>	
AH-64E Apache Improved Tail Rotor Blade ITRB Acceleration	\$13.3
Company Small UAS	\$10.0
Counter Small Unmanned Aerial System (C-UAS)	\$165.5
Counter Small Unmanned Aerial System Interceptor	\$184.8
Infantry Squad Vehicle (ISV)	\$44.1
Lethal Unmanned System (LUS)/Low Altitude Stalk and Strike (LASSO)	\$10.0
Medium Range Reconnaissance (MRR)	\$34.0
Next Generation Squad Weapon Ammunition, 6.8mm	\$33.2
Phased Array Tracking PAC-3 Patriot MSE Missile	\$138.6
Precision Strike Missile (PRSM)	\$98.0
Proliferated Low Earth Orbit (pLEO)	\$4.0
Short Range Reconnaissance (SRR)	\$26.5
Silent Tactical Energy Enhanced Dismount (STEED)	\$16.0
Stinger	\$91.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$869.0</b>
<b>INDOPACOM</b>	
Clandestine Delivered Mines (CDM) (USN)	\$72.6
Guam Defense System	\$0.8
Hammerhead Mines (USN)	\$359.5
Joint Strike Missile (JSM) (USAF)	\$298.4

Long Range Anti-Ship Missile (LRASM) (USN, USAF)	\$105.1
Maritime Strike TLAM (MST) (US Army)	\$318.5
Maritime Strike TLAM (MST) (USMC)	\$25.8
Maritime Strike TLAM (MST) (USN)	\$189.5
Mission Network	\$17.5
Pacific Multi-Domain Training and Experimentation Capability (PMTEC)	\$24.3
Persistent Targeting for Undersea	\$23.0
Powered Quickstrike (QS-P) USN Mines	\$50.0
Precision Strike Missile (PrSM) Inc 2 & Inc 4 (USA)	\$143.5
Resilient TS-SCI Warfighting Architecture	\$58.3
Robust Resilient Mission Platform (R2MP)	\$176.7
Standard Missile 6 (SM-6) Block IB Variant (USN)	\$766.9
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$2,630.4</b>
<b>Marine Corps</b>	
Air Operations C2 / Composite Tracking Network (CTN)	\$11.7
Amphibious Combat Vehicle-30 (ACV-30)	\$340.9
CH-53K Aircraft, Procure Two More	\$250.0
Common Aviation Command and Control System (CAC2S) Technical	\$15.7
Enhanced Combat Rubber Raiding Craft (E-CRRC)	\$9.7
F-35C Engine Spares & Modules Procure Four More	\$95.0
KC-130J Weapons System Trainer Procure One More	\$37.1
LRASM C3 (AGM-158C-3)	\$90.4
Medical Equipment Modernization	\$12.0
Operational Command Post (OCP)	\$17.0
Osprey Drive System Safety and Health (ODSSHI)	\$90.0
Reducible Height Gunner Protection Kit (RHGPK)	\$7.2
SATCOM Rebroadcast / DCGS-MC GEOINT	\$6.7
SATCOM Terminal and Antenna Network-on-the-Move (NOTM)	\$27.5
Small Diameter Bomb II (SDB II)	\$16.0
Terrestrial Collections Systems	\$7.5
Viper Phones/COMSEC	\$17.3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,051.7</b>
<b>Navy</b>	
Accelerate Mk-48 Heavy Weight Torpedo (HWT) Procurement (+4)	\$50.0
Fund Aviation Critical Planeside Systems	\$208.0
KC-130J Procurement (Adds +1)	\$125.0
Submarine Industrial Base (Delta SIB Supplemental to PB-25)	\$403.0
Surface Warfare Priority Systems	\$200.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$986.0</b>
<b>National Guard Bureau</b>	
C-130J Diminished Manufacturing Supply and Required Support Equipment	\$349.0
F-15EX Conformal Tanks	\$288.0
Procure 6 x F-15 EX Aircraft	\$690.0

Procure 6 x F-35 Aircraft	\$660.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,987.0</b>
Space Force	
Rocket Systems Launch Program (RSLP)	\$59.8
Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) Resiliency	\$9.4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$69.2</b>
SPACECOM	
Consolidated Space Operations Facility (SCOF) Procurement	\$27.1
Special Space Activities - Classified Program A	\$277.4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$304.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$8,489.9</b>

<b>Table A5. RDTE Breakout</b>	
Army	
Command and Control NEXT System Engineering SETA	\$63.6
Family of Counter-sUAS System (FOCUS)	\$10.0
Human Machine Integration - Next Generation Combat Vehicle Experimentation	\$69.6
Human Machine Integration - Platform Integration	\$55.6
Iron Quest (Classified)	\$12.2
Kwajalein Atoll Test and Evaluation	\$25.2
Roadrunner-M, Counter Small Unmanned Aerial System New Capabilities	\$4.5
Spectre (Classified)	\$50.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$290.7</b>
CENTCOM	
Counter-UAS Electronic Support	\$36.0
Maritime/Littoral Domain ISR	\$30.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$66.0</b>
INDOPACOM	
Clandestine Delivered Mines (CDM) (USN)	\$2.0
Cyber Security and Network Defenses	\$24.5
Distributed Electromagnetic Warfare	\$312.0
Guam Defense System	\$181.3
Hammerhead Mines (USN)	\$22.3
Joint Experimentation and Innovation	\$10.0
Joint Fires Network	\$122.7
Machine-Assisted Analytic Rapid-Repository System Object Management Service (MARS OMS)	\$21.6
Maritime Strike TLAM (MST) (US Army)	\$255.0
Maritime Strike TLAM (MST) (USMC)	\$126.0
Maritime Strike TLAM (MST) (USN)	\$154.6
Mid-Term Asymmetric Capabilities	\$701.0
Non-traditional Find, Fix, Track, and Targeting (F2T2) Capability	\$345.4
Operationalize Near-Term Space Control	\$138.4
Powered Quickstrike (QS-P) USN Mines	\$75.0



Precision Strike Missile (PrSM) Inc 2 & Inc 4 (USA)	\$247.2
Space-Based Persistent Custody Sensors	\$701.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$3,440.0</b>
<b>Marines</b>	
Autonomous Low Profile Vessel (ALPV)	\$6.0
Dead Center Automated Detection, Classification, Learning UAS Payload	\$7.3
Marine Littoral Regiment Organic Find, Fix, and Track (F2T)	\$11.1
Medium Range Intercept Capability	\$10.3
PLEO Integration Satellite Comms Terminal	\$16.3
Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities (TENCAP)	\$20.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$71.0</b>
<b>Navy</b>	
Accelerate COPPERFIELD	\$60.0
Accelerate GRANDSTAND	\$30.0
Accelerate Hunter ORCA XLUUV	\$184.0
Accelerate Long Endurance Electronic Decoy (LEED)	\$110.0
Accelerate Nuclear Command and Control (NC3) Recap and New Transmission	\$106.0
Accelerate Subsea and Seabed Warfare (SSW) ROV	\$75.0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$565.0</b>
<b>Space Force</b>	
Classified Program A	\$59.5
Classified Program B	\$66.0
Classified Program C	\$150.0
Classified Program D	\$335.3
Classified Program E	\$63.0
Classified Program F	\$112.3
National Space Test and Training Complex (NSTTC) Large Scale Training	\$19.1
Tranche Demonstration and Experimental Systems (TxDES)	\$42.5
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$847.7</b>
<b>SPACECOM</b>	
Classified Program B	\$366.4
Classified Program C	\$60.0
Enabling Capabilities for Project Lighthouse	\$161.5
Joint Commercial Operations (JCO) Cell, Space Situational Awareness	\$26.0
Marine Corps Electromagnetic Warfare Program	\$10.3
Navy Counterspace Capability Electronic Warfare (EW) Readiness Support	\$60.0
Navy Mobile Counterspace Capability Electronic Warfare (EW)	\$10.0
Navy Space Enabled Indicators and Warning	\$20.0
Radio Frequency Augmentation for Transregional Threats: Classified Programs	\$16.0
SDA Sensors: Major T&E Investment	\$48.0
SDA Sensors: Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site	\$75.0
SDA Sensors: Space Situation Awareness Operations	\$56.3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$909.5</b>

USD R&E	
Directed Energy Testing and Experimentation	\$65.0
Rapid Prototyping - LongShot	\$10.0
Rapid Prototyping - Multi-Domain Unmanned Secure Integrated Comms (MUSIC)	\$6.5
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$81.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,271.4</b>

Table A6. Working Capital Funds Breakout	
Space Force	
Enterprise Space Activity Group Working Capital Fund Cash Corpus	\$159.8
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$159.8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$159.8</b>

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> US Department of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), “DoD Budget Request,” <https://comptroller.defense.gov/Budget-Materials/Budget2025/>.

<sup>2</sup> Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, Pub. L. No. 118-5.

<sup>3</sup> Constitution of the United States, Article I, Section 8.

<sup>4</sup> Brendan W. McGarry, “Defense Primer: Defense and Intelligence Unfunded Priorities,” Congressional Research Service, March 29, 2024, <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/natsec/IF11964.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> US Senate Committee on Appropriations, Joint Explanatory Statement, Department of Defense Appropriations Bill, 2023, 8, <https://www.appropriations.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/DEFY23RPT.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup> US Department of the Navy, *Fiscal Year 2025 Marine Corps Unfunded Priority List*, March 19, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/marine-corps-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Indo-Pacific Command, *FY2025 Unfunded Priorities List*, March 19, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/indopacoms-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Department of the Navy, *Navy FY 2025 Unfunded Priorities List*, March 25, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/navys-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Department of the Air Force, *FY25 Unfunded Priority List*, March 25, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/air-forces-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Department of the Army, *Army FY25 Unfunded Priorities List*, March 22, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/armys-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Department of the Air Force, *FY25 Unfunded Priority List*, March 25, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/space-forces-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Northern Command, *NORTHCOM Unfunded Priority List*, March 19, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/northcomrad-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Central Command, *Unfunded Priorities of the Armed Forces*, March 27, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/breakdown-centcoms-fy-25-upl>; US Southern Command, *U.S. Southern Command FY25 Unfunded Priorities List (\$K)*, March 20, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/southcoms-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US Space Command, *CDRUSSPACECOM FY25 Unfunded Priorities List*, March 22, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/spacecoms-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; US National Guard Bureau, *FY25 CNGB UPL*, April 1, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/national-guard-bureaus-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>; and US Department of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, *FY 2025 Unfunded Priority List (UPL)*, March 25, 2024, <https://insidedefense.com/document/pentagon-re-chiefs-fy-25-unfunded-priorities-list>.

<sup>7</sup> US Bureau of Labor Statistics, “Economic News Release: Consumer Price Index Summary,” March 12, 2024, <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/cpi.nr0.htm>; and US Department of Defense, “FY2025 Budget Request Overview Book, March 2024, 4-5, [https://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/FY2025/FY2025\\_Budget\\_Request\\_Overview\\_Book.pdf](https://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/defbudget/FY2025/FY2025_Budget_Request_Overview_Book.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> US Department of Defense, *2022 National Defense Strategy of the United States of America*, October 2022, <https://media.defense.gov/2022/Oct/27/2003103845/-1/-1/2022-NATIONAL-DEFENSE-STRATEGY-NPR-MDR.PDF>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Elaine McCusker, “Resourcing the Defense Industrial Strategy: What to Watch in the 2025 Defense Budget Request,” March 2024, American Enterprise Institute, <https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/RPT-McCusker-Resourcing-the-Defense-Industrial-Strategy-1.pdf?x85095>.

<sup>10</sup> Department of Defense, “Department of Defense Releases the President’s Fiscal Year 2025 Defense Budget,” press release, March 11, 2024, <https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3703410/departement-of-defense-releases-the-presidents-fiscal-year-2025-defense-budget/#:~:text=The%20Department's%20FY%202025%20budget,modernizing%20to%20meet%20future%20challenges>.