

Summary of ISIS AUMF Proposals

There have been many calls for Congress to pass an AUMF against ISIS,¹ and several members of Congress have released AUMF proposals. To ensure that the United States is empowered to counter the terrorist threat while upholding the rule of law and maintaining global legitimacy, Human Rights First recommends that any authorization to use force against ISIS include the following elements. These elements have garnered bipartisan support² and articulate a prudent approach to drafting an effective ISIS AUMF:

- Specify the Enemy and Mission Objectives**
- Reporting Requirements**
- Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law**
- Supersession/Sole Source of Authority Provision**
- Sunset Clause**

This summary charts the extent to which the most prominent ISIS AUMF proposals are in line with these recommendations. The proposals included are from: Representative Eliot Engel (D-NY);³ Senators Tim Kaine (D-VA) and Jeff Flake (R-AZ);⁴ Representative Adam Schiff (D-CA);⁵ Senator Todd Young (R-IN) (which is the same as Representative Jim Banks' (R-IN) proposal);⁶ Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) (which is the same as Senator Lindsey Graham's (R-SC) proposal);⁷ the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's 2014 proposal;⁸ the Obama Administration's proposal;⁹ and the proposal published on the *Lawfare* blog and co-authored by Benjamin Wittes, Robert Chesney, Jack Goldsmith, and Matthew Waxman.¹⁰

¹ See e.g. <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/05/25/trump-military-powers-senate-response-238817>;
http://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/03/02/time_to_pass_an_aumf_targeting_isis_110889.html;
<http://www.cnn.com/2017/04/27/politics/adam-schiff-isis-war-authorization-aumf/index.html>.

² https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-principles-that-should-govern-any-us-authorization-of-force/2014/11/14/6e278a2c-6c07-11e4-a31c-77759fc1eacc_story.html; <https://www.lawfareblog.com/hasc-testimony-towards-better-aumf>;
<https://www.lawfareblog.com/intellectual-not-political-aumf-consensus>; <https://www.justsecurity.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/ISIS-AUMF-Statement-FINAL.pdf>.

³ https://www.justsecurity.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/ENGEL_Discussion-Draft-AUMF-2017.pdf.

⁴ <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/sjres43/BILLS-115sjres43is.pdf>.

⁵ <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/hjres100/BILLS-115hjres100ih.pdf>.

⁶ <https://www.congress.gov/115/bills/sjres31/BILLS-115sjres31is.pdf>.

⁷ <https://www.congress.gov/114/bills/sjres29/BILLS-114sjres29pcs.pdf>.

⁸ <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/113/sjres47>.

⁹ https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/docs/aumf_02112015.pdf.

¹⁰ <https://www.lawfareblog.com/draft-aumf-get-discussion-going>.

Overview

Key

Green	Satisfactory
Red	Unsatisfactory
Orange	Requires modification
Grey	Not specified

	Clearly Defined Enemy	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with International Law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
Engel	Yes. Clear definition of “associated forces” of ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban	Yes	Robust and frequent	Yes, includes explicit statement	Yes	Yes, 3 years	Yes, 3 years
Flake/Kaine	Yes. Clear definition of “associated forces” of ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban	Should be more clear	Robust and frequent but should be stronger	Yes, but should be more explicit	Not required (see details)	Yes, 5 years	Yes, 5 years
Schiff	Yes. Clear definition of “associated forces” of ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban	Yes	Robust and frequent but should be stronger	Yes, but should be more explicit	Not required (see details)	Yes, 3 years	Yes, 3 years
Young/Banks	No. Includes “successor organizations.” Authorizes force against “associated forces” of ISIS, al Qaeda, the Taliban but does not define this term	No, but requires the president to provide “strategic and operational objectives”	Robust one-time reporting, insufficient regular reporting	Yes, but should be more explicit	Not required (see details)	No	No

	Clearly Defined Enemy	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with International Law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
McConnell/Graham	No. "Successor organizations." Also authorizes force against ISIS and "associated forces, organizations, and persons" but does not define "associated forces"	Yes	Frequent but insufficient	Yes, but should be more explicit	No	No	No
Senate Foreign Relations Committee	No. Authorizes force against "closely-related successor entity" of ISIS. Overbroad definition of "associated persons or forces" of ISIS	No, but requires president to provide "military objectives"	Robust one-time reporting, insufficient regular reporting	Yes, but should be more clear and explicit (see details)	Yes	Yes, 3 years	Yes, 3 years
Obama Admin	No. Authorizes force against "closely-related successor entity" of ISIS. Overbroad definition of "associated persons or forces" of ISIS	No	Frequent but insufficient	Yes, but should be more clear and explicit (see details)	No	Yes, 3 years	No
Lawfare	Yes, but could be more clear. Authorizes force against "associated forces" of ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban but does not define this term	Not specified (see details)	Robust and frequent	Yes, includes explicit statement	Not required (see details)	Yes, 3 years	Yes, 3 years

Engel

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting requirements	Compliance with International Law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Yes</p> <p>Names ISIS and authorizes force against “associated forces” of ISIS.</p> <p>“Associated force” is defined as “an organized, armed group that has and continues to be engaged in active hostilities against the United States alongside al-Qaeda, the Taliban, or ISIL, respectively, as a party to an ongoing armed conflict with the United States.”</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>“To protect the national security of the United States against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and associated forces of ISIL.”</p>	<p>Robust and frequent</p> <p>Frequent reporting (every 6 months) on requiring regular reporting on groups considered covered under the AUMF, civilians and combatant casualties, and legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq or Syria.</p> <p>The president must also provide this information whenever the president uses force against any non-state terrorist actor pursuant to powers not provided in the AUMF, such as under the president’s powers under Article II of the Constitution.¹¹</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>“The authorities granted under this joint resolution shall not be exercised in any way that is inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under international law.”</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p> <p>This AUMF is structured as an amendment to the 2001 AUMF. The amendment sunsets the 2001 AUMF (including the authorization of force against ISIS) in 3 years.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p> <p>This AUMF is structured as an amendment to the 2001 AUMF. The amendment sunsets the 2001 AUMF in 3 years.</p>

¹¹ The president must provide, every six months: A list of associated forces of al Qaeda, the Taliban, and ISIS, including the legal and factual basis for designating these groups as associated forces; an intelligence assessment of the risk to the United States posed by al Qaeda the Taliban, ISIS, and their respective associated forces; the geographic scope; the number of civilian casualties, the number of combatant casualties, and the total number of all casualties; methods used to limit civilian casualties; a description of humanitarian assistance and support provided for displaced civilian populations; actual and proposed contributions, including financing, equipment, training, troops, and logistical support, provided by coalition partners; a diplomatic, military, and development strategy for restoring governance and civil society; benchmarks for assessing progress toward political, diplomatic, and military objectives; and a description of the lessons learned. The president must also provide this information whenever the president uses force against any non-state terrorist actor pursuant to powers not provided in the AUMF.

Flake/Kaine (2017)

Clearly Defined Enemy	Mission Objectives	Reporting requirements	Compliance with International Law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Yes</p> <p>Names al Qaeda, the Afghan Taliban, ISIS, and authorizes force against “associated persons or forces.”</p> <p>“Associated persons or forces” are defined as “any person or force, other than a sovereign nation, that is a part of, or substantially supports al-Qaeda, the Taliban, or the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria; and is engaged in hostilities against the United States, its Armed Forces, or its other personnel.”</p>	<p>Should be more clear</p> <p>Authorizes force “to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States.”</p> <p>This would be improved by specifying that the purpose is to prevent these future acts by al Qaeda, the Afghan Taliban, ISIS and their “associated persons or forces.”</p>	<p>Robust and frequent but should be stronger</p> <p>Requires the president report to Congress after 60 days on any groups or persons that force is being used against that have not previously been disclosed. The president must also notify Congress each time a new associated person or force is designated and every 90 days, must provide a list of “organizations, persons, or forces” targeted in the preceding 90-day period. Must also provide a “comprehensive strategy” after 90 days and updates on the implementation of that strategy every 180 days.¹²</p> <p>Would be strengthened by also requiring reports on civilian and combatant casualties and explicitly requiring disclosure of legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq, Syria or Afghanistan.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be more explicit</p> <p>Authorizes “necessary and appropriate” force. The Supreme Court held that this implies the use of force must comply with international law.¹³</p>	<p>Not required</p> <p>Folds the 2001 AUMF (against al Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban) into a new AUMF and repeals both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Therefore, there is no need to state that the ISIS AUMF supersedes any preexisting authorization to use force against ISIS.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>5 years.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>De facto 3-year sunset from folding the 2001 AUMF into this new AUMF.</p>

¹² Within 60 days, the president must Congress with a report specifying the persons or forces (other than al-Nusra Front, also known as Jabhat al-Nusra and Jabhat Fateh al-Sham), Khorasan Group, Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, and al Shabaab, considered to be associated persons or forces under the AUMF as of the date of the enactment of the AUMF; Within 90 days, the president must provide a report on the “comprehensive strategy of the United States, encompassing military, economic, humanitarian, and diplomatic capabilities”; Every 180 days, the president must provide Congress with a report on the “current comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the strategy...including a description of the specific authorities relied upon for such actions; the persons and forces targeted by such actions; the nature and location of such actions; and an evaluation of the effectiveness of such actions”; Every 90 days, the president must provide a list of the “organizations, persons and forces against which operations were conducted under the [AUMF] during the 90-day period ending on the date of the report” and “a list of all foreign countries in which the United States conducted operations under the [AUMF] during such 90-day period.”

¹³ See Section 3 of this issue brief, Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.

Schiff (2017)

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with International Law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Clearly defined</p> <p>Names al Qaeda, ISIS, and the Afghan Taliban and authorizes force against “associated groups.” These must be “organized and armed group[s]” that are “co-belligerent with [al Qaeda, ISIL, or the Afghan Taliban] in hostilities against the United States.”</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>“To protect the national security of the United States.”</p>	<p>Robust and frequent but should be stronger</p> <p>Frequent reporting (every 90 days) on targets and locations; who associated groups are, “factual predicate” for determining a group is an associate group. Must also report if ground forces are deployed. May be submitted in classified form if “in the national security interests of the United States to do so”¹⁴, but must also be accompanied by “unclassified written findings to support such a determination.”</p> <p>Would be strengthened by also requiring reports on civilian and combatant casualties, mission progress, and disclosure of legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq, Syria or Afghanistan.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be more explicit</p> <p>Authorizes “necessary and appropriate” force. The Supreme Court held that this implies the use of force must comply with international law.¹⁵</p>	<p>Not required</p> <p>Folds the 2001 AUMF (against al Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban) into this new “consolidated” AUMF and repeals both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Therefore, there is no need to state that the ISIS AUMF supersedes any preexisting congressional authorization to use force against ISIS.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>De facto 3-year sunset from folding the 2001 AUMF into the ISIS AUMF.</p>

¹⁴ **Targets & locations:** Report every 90 days to “appropriate congressional committees” and publish in Federal Register “a list of entities and organized and armed groups against which” force has been used and the geographic location where force has been used; **Associated groups:** If force is used against an organized armed group that is a co-belligerent of al Qaeda, ISIS, or the Afghan Taliban, the President must provide the “appropriate congressional committees” a summary of the factual predicate for concluding a group is associated and co-belligerent with al Qaeda, ISIS, or the Afghan Taliban. **Ground forces in a combat role:** If “ground forces in a combat role” are deployed, notify “appropriate congressional committees at the earliest possible date after such deployment consistent with the national security interests of the United States.”

¹⁵ See Section 3 of this issue brief, Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.

Young/Banks

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with International Law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Could be more clear</p> <p>Names al Qaeda, the Taliban, and ISIS. Also authorizes force against “associated forces” and “successor organizations.” Does not define either of these terms.</p> <p>The term “associated forces” should be carefully defined to prevent this or a future president interpreting the AUMF to apply to groups that Congress did not intend to authorize force against.</p> <p>The AUMF should not authorize force against “successor entities.” This would amount to a substantial delegation of congressional war powers, greatly expanding the scope of the AUMF.¹⁶</p>	<p>No, but requires the president to provide</p> <p>Requires the president to submit “strategic and operational objectives” within 30 days.</p>	<p>Frequent but Insufficient</p> <p>Frequent reporting (every 60 days) but vague requirement to report on “matters relevant” under the AUMF. Robust one-time “comprehensive strategy” required 30 days after enactment.¹⁷</p> <p>Would be strengthened by requiring regular reporting on groups considered covered under the AUMF, civilians and combatant casualties, and legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq, Syria, or Afghanistan.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be more explicit</p> <p>Authorizes the President to use all “necessary and appropriate” force. The Supreme Court held that this implies the use of force must comply with international law.¹⁸</p>	<p>Not required</p> <p>Folds the 2001 AUMF (against al Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban) into this new “consolidated” AUMF and repeals both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Therefore, there is no need to state that the ISIS AUMF supersedes any preexisting congressional authorization to use force against ISIS.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Folds the 2001 AUMF into a new “consolidated” AUMF that does not include a sunset.</p>

¹⁶ See Section 1 of this issue brief, Specify the Enemy and the Mission Objectives, which has subsection on Defining “Associated Forces” and the problem with authorizing force against “successor entities.”

¹⁷ The one-time comprehensive strategy requires the president to report on the U.S. national security interests threatened by ISIS; strategic and operational objectives; milestones for assessing progress; risks for the strategy; public diplomacy, information operations, and cyber strategies to isolate and delegitimize ISIS; actual and proposed contributions of coalition partners; humanitarian assistance and support for displaced civilian populations; mechanisms to cut off or seize ISIS’ financial support; plans for countering the international travel of ISIS terrorists; plans for the law of war detention and interrogation of ISIS combatants; plans for sustainable governance and security in areas retaken from ISIS; an end state and exit strategy for any U.S. ground troops; an estimate of the costs of carrying out the strategy; and plans to inform periodically the people of the United States about the campaign to defeat ISIS.

¹⁸ See Section 3 of this issue brief, Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.

McConnell/Graham

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with international law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Not clearly defined</p> <p>Names ISIS but also authorizes force against “associated forces” and “successor entities.” Does not define either of these terms.</p> <p>The term “associated forces” should be carefully defined to prevent this or a future president interpreting the AUMF to apply to groups that Congress did not intend to authorize force against.</p> <p>The AUMF should not authorize force against “successor entities.” This would amount to a substantial delegation of congressional war powers, greatly expanding the scope of the AUMF.¹⁹</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>“To defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by [ISIS], “its associated forces, organizations, and persons, and any successor entities.”</p>	<p>Frequent but Insufficient</p> <p>Frequent reporting (every 60 days) but very vague requirement to report only on “matters relevant” under the AUMF.”²⁰</p> <p>This is insufficient to keep Congress and the public informed.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be more explicit</p> <p>Authorizes “necessary and appropriate” force. The Supreme Court held that this implies the use of force must comply with international law.²¹</p>	No	No	No.

¹⁹ See Section 1 of this issue brief, Specify the Enemy and the Mission Objectives, which has subsection on Defining “Associated Forces” and the problem with authorizing force against “successor entities.”

²⁰ Report to Congress “not less frequently than once every 60 days ... on matters relevant to this joint resolution, including actions taken pursuant to the exercise of authority granted in section 2.”

²¹ See Section 3 of this issue brief, Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.

Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with International law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Not clearly defined</p> <p>Names ISIS but also authorizes force against “associated persons or forces.” The definition of this term is too broad and includes the ambiguous term “closely-related successor entity.”</p> <p>The term “associated forces” should be carefully defined to prevent this or a future president interpreting the AUMF to apply to groups that Congress did not intend to authorize force against. The AUMF should not authorize force against “successor entities.” This would amount to a substantial delegation of congressional war powers, greatly expanding the scope of the AUMF.²²</p>	<p>No, but requires the president to provide</p> <p>Requires the president to provide mission objectives 30 days after the enactment of the AUMF.</p>	<p>Frequent but insufficient</p> <p>Frequent reporting (every 60 days) but vague requirement to report “specific actions” pursuant to the AUMF. Robust one-time “comprehensive strategy report” required 30 days after enactment.²³</p> <p>Would be strengthened by requiring regular reporting on groups considered covered under the AUMF, civilians and combatant casualties, and legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq or Syria.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be more clear and explicit</p> <p>Authorizes force “as the President determines to be necessary and appropriate.” The Supreme Court has held that the authorization of “necessary and appropriate force” implicitly requires the use of force to comply with international law.²⁴ Subjecting this to a separate presidential determination unnecessary.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>“The provisions of this joint resolution pertaining to the authorization of use of force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant shall supersede any preceding authorization for the use of military force.”</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p>

²² See Section 1 of this issue brief, Specify the Enemy and the Mission Objectives, which has subsection on Defining “Associated Forces” and the problem with authorizing force against “successor entities.”

²³ The comprehensive strategy report must include information on objectives for authorizing force, groups targeted, geographic scope, methods for limiting civilian casualties, costs, benchmarks for assessing progress, and “a realistic end goal and exit strategy.”

²⁴ See Section 3 of this issue brief, Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.

Obama Administration

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting Requirements	Compliance with International law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Not clearly defined</p> <p>Names ISIS but also authorizes force against “associated persons or forces” and defines this term to include a “closely-related successor entity” of ISIS without defining this term.</p> <p>This essentially codifies the Obama Administration’s problematic interpretation that the 2001 AUMF applies to ISIS.²⁵ The AUMF should not authorize force against “successor entities.” This would amount to a substantial delegation of congressional war powers, greatly expanding the scope of the AUMF.²⁶</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Frequent but insufficient</p> <p>Vague requirement to report only on “specific actions” and reports only required every six months.²⁷</p> <p>Would be strengthened by requiring regular reporting on groups considered covered under the AUMF, civilians and combatant casualties, and legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq or Syria.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be more clear and explicit</p> <p>Authorizes force “as the President determines to be necessary and appropriate.” The Supreme Court has held that the authorization of “necessary and appropriate force” implicitly requires the use of force to comply with international law.²⁸ Subjecting this to a separate presidential determination unnecessary.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p>	<p>No</p>

²⁵ <https://www.justsecurity.org/20163/aumf-associated-forces-slippery-slopes-data-points/>.

²⁶ See Section 1 of this issue brief, Specify the Enemy and the Mission Objectives, which has subsection on Defining “Associated Forces” and the problem with authorizing force against “successor entities.”

²⁷ Report to Congress “at least once every six months on specific actions taken pursuant to this authorization.”

²⁸ See Section 3 of this issue brief, Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.

Lawfare

Clearly Defined Target	Mission Objectives	Reporting requirements	Compliance with International law	Sole Source of Authority	ISIS AUMF Sunset	2001 AUMF Sunset
<p>Could be more clear</p> <p>Names al Qaeda, ISIS, and the Afghan Taliban. Also authorizes force against “associated forces” that “are engaged in hostilities against the United States” but does not define “associated forces.”</p> <p>The term “associated forces” should be carefully defined to prevent this or a future president interpreting the AUMF to apply to groups that Congress did not intend to authorize force against.</p>	<p>Not specified</p> <p>However, one of the <i>Lawfare</i> proposal’s authors has noted that the drafters were not in a position to address objectives²⁹ and two of the other authors argue in favor of mission objectives.³⁰</p>	<p>Robust and frequent</p> <p>Frequent reporting (every 90 days) on targets and locations where force is being used. Must also provide “factual predicate” for determining a group is an associate group. If force is used under Article II authority, must provide the same information on targets, location, and factual predicate for using force, as for those entities covered by this AUMF.³¹</p> <p>Would be strengthened by requiring reports on civilian and combatant casualties, mission progress, and legal basis for targeting particular groups or using force in countries other than Iraq, Syria or Afghanistan.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Authorizes “necessary and appropriate” force. The Supreme Court held that this implies the use of force must comply with international law.³²</p> <p>The <i>Lawfare</i> proposal also mandates that the geographic locations where force is used must also be limited to those “where force can be used consistent with applicable international law concerning sovereignty and the use of force.”</p>	<p>Not required</p> <p><i>Lawfare’s</i> AUMF folds the authorization in the 2001 AUMF (against al Qaeda and the Afghan Taliban) into the ISIS AUMF and repeals both the 2001 AUMF and the 2002 Iraq AUMF. Therefore, there is no need to state that the ISIS AUMF supersedes any preexisting congressional authorization to use force against ISIS.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>3 years.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>De facto 3-year sunset from folding the 2001 AUMF into the ISIS AUMF.</p>

²⁹ <https://www.justsecurity.org/20546/intellectual-but-political-aumf-consensus/>

³⁰ https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-principles-that-should-govern-any-us-authorization-of-force/2014/11/14/6e278a2c-6c07-11e4-a31c-77759fc1eacc_story.html; <https://www.lawfareblog.com/hasc-testimony-towards-better-aumf>; <https://www.lawfareblog.com/six-questions-congress-should-ask-administration-about-its-isil-aumf>.

³¹ **Targets & Locations:** Every 90 days must “publish in unclassified form a list of the entities against which” force has been used and, “to the extent not strictly precluded by national security, where such force was deployed.” **Associated groups:** Every 90 days must report to the Senate and House armed services, foreign relations or affairs, and intelligence committees the geographic location where force is being used and a “summary of the factual predicate for concluding that an entity is an ‘associated force’.” **Article II:** If the President uses force under Article II authority against a “terrorist or terrorist organization” not covered by this AUMF, must provide the same information on the identities of the target, where force was used, and the factual predicate for using force, as for those entities covered by this AUMF.

³² See Section 3 of this issue brief on Requiring Compliance with U.S. Obligations Under International Law.