



Increased U.S. Government Procurement of U.S.-Made Products Will Help Boost Recovery

Issue:

Since the recession began in December 2007, the United States has lost 8.4 million jobs and seen its industrial output fall 9.3 percent. The fastest way to create jobs to reinvigorate America's economy is to boost U.S. production of goods and services. But for this to happen, more consumers need to buy U.S.-made goods instead of imports. As an economic bellwether of the country, the U.S. government should lead by example and buy U.S.-made goods and services instead of imports whenever possible. It is imperative for Congress to press this issue by expanding and strengthening the Berry Amendment (Berry) and the Buy American Act of 1933 procurement laws.

Background of the Berry Amendment and The Berry Amendment Extension Act:

The Berry Amendment requires the U.S. Defense Department (DoD) to buy certain products, judged essential to military readiness, with 100 percent U.S. content and labor. These products include textiles, clothing, specialty steel, and food. The Berry Amendment promotes military readiness by ensuring a reliable domestic source for certain vital goods during war times.

The stimulus passed in 2009 included an amendment offered by Cong. Larry Kissell (D-NC) that applies a modified version of the Berry Amendment procurement rules to stimulus funds expended on textile and clothing products by the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and the U.S. Coast Guard within the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). To make this new language permanent, Cong. Kissell has introduced H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act. Including Cong. Kissell, H.R. 3116 currently has 49 cosponsors (31 Democrats and 18 Republicans).

Background of the Buy American Act of 1933 and The Buy American Improvement Act of 2009:

Unlike the Berry Amendment, the Buy American Act of 1933 does not require 100 percent U.S. content. Instead, it requires just 50 percent U.S.-made content and, through a multitude of trade agreements, allows products from 113 countries to be treated as if they were made in the United States.

The stimulus also included language offered by Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND) requiring all iron, steel, **and manufactured goods** used in public works funded by the bill to be made in the United States. The Obama Administration did not oppose this language because nearly all highway and mass transit public works programs are exempt from the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Agreement on Government Procurement (GPA) and the government procurement provisions of other U.S. free trade agreements.

Introduced by Cong. Dan Lipinski (D-IL) and Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI), **H.R. 4351/S. 2890, the Buy American Improvement Act of 2009**, would make the Dorgan language permanent and improve it by raising U.S. content requirements, prohibiting segmentation of contracts to fall below the triggering threshold, and making the waiver process more transparent. Including Cong. Lipinski, H.R. 4351 has 18 cosponsors. S. 2890 has no cosponsors at this time.

Action Request:

- Cosponsor H.R. 3116 and H.R. 4351/S. 2890.
- Urge the Obama Administration to support and promote buying American within the government.



House and Senate Sponsorship Lists for the Berry Amendment Extension Act of 2009

February 26, 2010

Below is the House sponsorship list for H.R. 3116, the Berry Amendment Extension Act of 2009.

Sponsors are listed by state. Republican cosponsors are in *italics*. Lead sponsors are in **bold**.

Including its lead sponsor, there are 49 sponsors (31 Democrats and 18 Republican) on the bill. There is no Senate companion to H.R. 3116 at this time.

1. U.S. Rep. Parker Griffith (R-AL)
2. U.S. Rep. Ed Pastor (D-AZ)
3. U.S. Rep. Mike Ross (D-AR)
4. U.S. Rep. Bob Filner (D-CA)
5. U.S. Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA)
6. *U.S. Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (R-FL)*
7. U.S. Rep. Phil Hare (D-IL)
8. U.S. Rep. Dan Lipinski (D-IL)
9. *U.S. Rep. Donald Manzullo (R-IL)*
10. U.S. Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL)
11. U.S. Rep. Leonard Boswell (D-IA)
12. U.S. Rep. Bruce Braley (D-IA)
13. *U.S. Rep. Brett Guthrie (R-KY)*
14. U.S. Rep. Mike Michaud (D-ME)
15. U.S. Rep. Chellie Pingree (D-ME)
16. U.S. Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA)
17. U.S. Rep. Dale Kildee (D-MI)
18. U.S. Rep. Travis Childers (D-MS)
19. U.S. Rep. Gene Taylor (D-MS)
20. U.S. Rep. Carol Shea-Porter (D-NH)
21. *U.S. Rep. Frank LoBiondo (R-NJ)*
22. U.S. Rep. Michael Arcuri (D-NY)
23. U.S. Rep. Eric Massa (D-NY)
24. U.S. Rep. William Owens (D-NY)
25. U.S. Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-NY)
26. *U.S. Rep. Howard Coble (R-NC)*
27. *U.S. Rep. Virginia Foxx (R-NC)*
28. *U.S. Rep. Walter Jones (R-NC)*
29. **U.S. Rep. Larry Kissell (D-NC)**
30. *U.S. Rep. Patrick McHenry (R-NC)*
31. U.S. Rep. Mike McIntyre (D-NC)
32. *U.S. Rep. Sue Myrick (R-NC)*
33. U.S. Rep. Heath Shuler (D-NC)
34. U.S. Rep. John Boccieri (D-OH)
35. U.S. Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-OH)
36. U.S. Rep. Tim Ryan (D-OH)
37. U.S. Rep. Betty Sutton (D-OH)
38. U.S. Rep. Christopher Carney (D-PA)
39. U.S. Rep. Kathleen Dahlkemper (D-PA)
40. *U.S. Rep. Tim Murphy (R-PA)*
41. U.S. Rep. James Langevin (D-RI)
42. *U.S. Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-TN)*
43. *U.S. Rep. John Duncan (R-TN)*
44. *U.S. Rep. Zach Wamp (R-TN)*
45. *U.S. Rep. Gresham Barrett (R-SC)*
46. *U.S. Rep. Henry Brown (R-SC)*
47. *U.S. Rep. Bob Inglis (R-SC)*
48. U.S. Rep. John Spratt (D-SC)
49. *U.S. Rep. Frank Wolf (R-VA)*



House and Senate Sponsorship Lists for the Buy American Improvement Act of 2009

February 26, 2010

Below are the House and Senate sponsorship lists for the Buy American Improvement Act of 2009. Sponsors are listed by state. Republican cosponsors are in *italics*. Lead sponsors are in **bold**.

U.S. Senate – Including its lead sponsor, S. 2890 has one cosponsor.

1. **U.S. Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI)**

U.S. House of Representatives – Including its lead sponsor, H.R. 4351 currently has 18 cosponsors.

1. U.S. Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-AZ)
2. U.S. Rep. Linda Sanchez (D-CA)
3. U.S. Rep. Pete Stark (D-CA)
4. U.S. Rep. Christopher Murphy (D-CT)
5. U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello (D-IL)
6. U.S. Rep. Phil Hare (D-IL)
7. **U.S. Rep. Dan Lipinski (D-IL)**
8. U.S. Rep. Pete Visclosky (D-IN)
9. U.S. Rep. Bruce Braley (D-IA)
10. U.S. Rep. Mike Michaud (D-ME)
11. U.S. Rep. Donna Edwards (D-MD)
12. U.S. Rep. Mark Schauer (D-MI)
13. U.S. Rep. Carol Shea-Porter (D-NH)
14. U.S. Rep. Eric Massa (D-NY)
15. U.S. Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-OH)
16. U.S. Rep. Betty Sutton (D-OH)
17. U.S. Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-OR)
18. U.S. Rep. Steve Kagen (D-WI)



U.S. – South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS)

Issue:

The United States continues negotiating NAFTA-like free trade agreements (FTAs) with countries that can produce low-cost goods for export but either have virtually no ability to consume or consistently refuse to import American-made products. The U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) is one of several new agreements that have been finalized and now await Congressional approval.

Background:

- The KORUS was concluded on April 2, 2007, just making a procedural deadline allowing it to fall under Trade Promotion Authority (TPA).
- With South Korea's current capabilities as a major producer and exporter of industrial products, its close proximity to China and its traditional hostility to imports, the agreement will be a major blow to U.S. manufacturers. The U.S. trade deficit in goods with South Korea was \$10.6 billion in 2009, with a \$5.5 billion (52 percent) deficit in motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts and a \$708 million (7 percent) deficit in textiles and apparel.
- For industrial products, KORUS will eliminate U.S. tariffs on 95 percent of current trade within three years of implementation of the agreement. Despite this, the agreement does not guarantee reciprocal U.S. access to the South Korean market for key industrial products such as autos. **Virtually all U.S. tariffs on textile and apparel products will be eliminated by January 1 of the 5th year of the agreement.**
- U.S. textile and apparel imports from South Korea are more than four times the value of our exports to that country. In textiles alone, South Korea is particularly competitive, as they are our 4th largest supplier in terms of volume. Furthermore, in the sensitive tariff lines of special purpose/industrial fabrics with Category 229, South Korea was the largest supplier to the United States by volume in 2009, with a 19 percent share of the U.S. import market. The value of those imports from South Korea was \$98 million.
- According to the U.S. International Trade Commission's analysis of the agreement, "The largest gains for Korean exports to the United States are anticipated in textiles, apparel, and leather goods, and other manufacturing (e.g., chemicals and allied products, electronics, and transportation)." In these sectors, U.S. output is estimated to decline by 1.4 percent as a result of the FTA.

Status:

- The recently-released Obama Administration 2009 Trade Agenda Policy stated, "...we plan to establish benchmarks for progress on the Colombian and South Korean FTAs." This implies that while there may be remaining issues to resolve with the KORUS, the Obama Administration plans to work through them and ultimately help pass the agreement through Congress. It is unclear, however, how this process will evolve and whether there even will be a vote on the agreement. There is still significant opposition to KORUS within certain quarters of Congress.

Action Requests:

- Strongly oppose the KORUS due to the lack of adequate safeguards and tariff phase-out periods for sensitive textile and apparel products.
- Oppose the U.S. policy of entering trade agreements with countries that are unable or consistently refuse to buy finished products made in the United States. By providing free access to the U.S. market for producers from low labor cost regions or mercantilist economies, these agreements are fueling the record U.S. trade deficit and undermining our manufacturing base.



CURRENCY MANIPULATION

Issue: Several countries, including China, intervene in foreign exchange markets to artificially lower the value of their currency below what ordinarily would be its fair market value. By illegally misaligning its currency to make it cheaper compared to the U.S. dollar, a country can make its exports more affordable and imports from the United States more expensive, thereby harming U.S. producers. To combat this unfair trade practice, the United States needs to respond with a counterbalancing currency policy.

Background: China is the prime example of a country that misaligns its currency for commercial advantage. The cumulative U.S. foreign trade deficit in merchandise of \$1.6 trillion with China since 2002 should have the natural free market effect of raising the value of the Chinese yuan against the U.S. dollar, making Chinese goods less competitive in the United States and U.S. goods more competitive in China. This has not happened, however, because China refuses to float its currency freely. Factoring in inflation, the yuan barely has risen against the dollar in real terms since 2005. Best estimates show that China's currency still is undervalued by 35 percent or more.

Despite overwhelming evidence pointing to China's blatant and prolonged currency misalignment, for 15 years the U.S. government has refused to designate that country as a violator of the Exchange Rates and International Economic Policy Coordination Act of 1988. By failing to act, the U.S. government is not upholding the rights of those harmed by China's illegal action. A formal designation as a currency violator is the trigger required under U.S. law to direct the U.S. Treasury Department to initiate negotiations with the violating country to eliminate the unfair advantage.

A more direct approach would be to revise U.S. countervailing duty (CVD) law to define currency misalignment as an actionable illegal export subsidy, as U.S. trade remedy law does not currently define currency misalignment in this manner. The fact that currency misalignment is beyond the scope of countervailing duty law prevents U.S. manufacturers who have been injured by China's purposeful undervaluation of its currency from securing reasonable relief in a timely fashion.

Companion bills to tackle the currency problem have been introduced by U.S. Senators Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) and Jim Bunning (R-KY) and U.S. Representatives Tim Ryan (D-OH) and Tim Murphy (R-PA) as H.R. 2378/S. 1027.

In addition, U.S. Senators Charles Schumer (D-NY) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC) organized a letter signed by 15 senators that was sent on February 24, 2010 to U.S. Secretary of Commerce Gary Locke urging him to launch an investigation into whether China's actions with respect to its currency constitute an illegal subsidy.

Action Request:

- Cosponsor H.R. 2378/S. 1027. This legislation is critical to put teeth into the enforcement process. Contacts to cosponsor are Peter Kaldes (peter.kaldes@stabenow.senate.gov), Karin Hope (karin.hope@bunning.senate.gov), Art Hildebrand for Cong. Ryan (art.hildebrand@house.mail.gov), Aric Nesbitt for Cong. Murphy (aric.nesbitt@mail.house.gov).
- Pressure the Executive Branch through actions like the Schumer/Graham letter to acknowledge that China has misaligned its currency in a prolonged and purposeful manner so as to encourage them to take remedial administrative steps to combat the subsidy.



House and Senate Sponsorship Lists for the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act of 2009

February 26, 2010

Below are the House and Senate sponsorship lists for the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act of 2009. Sponsors are listed by state. Republican cosponsors are in *italics*. Lead sponsors are in **bold**.

Including the two lead sponsors, there are 8 sponsors (6 Democrats and 2 Republican) of the Stabenow-Bunning Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act of 2009 (S. 1027) in the **U.S. Senate**.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. U.S. Sen. Jim Bunning (R-KY) | 5. U.S. Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH) |
| 2. <i>U.S. Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-ME)</i> | 6. U.S. Sen. Robert Casey (D-PA) |
| 3. U.S. Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI) | 7. U.S. Sen. Arlen Specter (D-PA) |
| 4. U.S. Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) | 8. U.S. Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI) |

Including the two lead sponsors, there are 78 sponsors (46 Democrats and 32 Republicans) of the Ryan-Murphy Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act of 2009 (H.R. 2378) in the **U.S. House of Representatives**.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>U.S. Rep. Spencer Bachus (R-AL)</i> | 28. U.S. Rep. John Dingell (D-MI) |
| 2. <i>U.S. Rep. Mike Rogers (R-AL)</i> | 29. <i>U.S. Rep. Vern Ehlers (R-MI)</i> |
| 3. U.S. Rep. Marion Berry (D-AR) | 30. <i>U.S. Rep. Peter Hoekstra (R-MI)</i> |
| 4. U.S. Rep. Joe Baca (D-CA) | 31. U.S. Rep. Dale Kildee (D-MI) |
| 5. U.S. Rep. Bob Filner (D-CA) | 32. <i>U.S. Rep. Thad McCotter (R-MI)</i> |
| 6. <i>U.S. Rep. Duncan D. Hunter (R-CA)</i> | 33. <i>U.S. Rep. Candice Miller (R-MI)</i> |
| 7. U.S. Rep. Laura Richardson (D-CA) | 34. U.S. Rep. Gary Peters (D-MI) |
| 8. <i>U.S. Rep. Dana Rohrabacher (R-CA)</i> | 35. <i>U.S. Rep. Mike Rogers (R-MI)</i> |
| 9. U.S. Rep. Brad Sherman (D-CA) | 36. U.S. Rep. Mark Schauer (D-MI) |
| 10. <i>U.S. Rep. Mike Coffman (R-CO)</i> | 37. U.S. Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ) |
| 11. U.S. Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-CT) | 38. U.S. Rep. Michael Arcuri (D-NY) |
| 12. <i>U.S. Rep. Lynn Westmoreland (R-GA)</i> | 39. U.S. Rep. Brian Higgins (D-NY) |
| 13. U.S. Rep. Jerry Costello (D-IL) | 40. <i>U.S. Rep. Christopher Lee (R-NY)</i> |
| 14. U.S. Rep. Phil Hare (D-IL) | 41. U.S. Rep. Eric Massa (D-NY) |
| 15. U.S. Rep. Dan Lipinski (D-IL) | 42. U.S. Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-NY) |
| 16. <i>U.S. Rep. Don Manzullo (R-IL)</i> | 43. <i>U.S. Rep. Howard Coble (R-NC)</i> |
| 17. <i>U.S. Rep. Dan Burton (R-IN)</i> | 44. <i>U.S. Rep. Walter Jones (R-NC)</i> |
| 18. U.S. Rep. Joe Donnelly (D-IN) | 45. U.S. Rep. Larry Kissell (D-NC) |
| 19. <i>U.S. Rep. Mark Souder (R-IN)</i> | 46. <i>U.S. Rep. Patrick McHenry (R-NC)</i> |
| 20. U.S. Rep. Peter Visclosky (D-IN) | 47. U.S. Rep. Brad Miller (D-NC) |
| 21. U.S. Rep. Bruce Braley (D-IA) | 48. <i>U.S. Rep. Sue Myrick (R-NC)</i> |
| 22. U.S. Rep. Leonard Boswell (D-IA) | 49. U.S. Rep. Heath Shuler (D-NC) |
| 23. <i>U.S. Rep. Hal Rogers (R-KY)</i> | 50. U.S. Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D-OH) |
| 24. <i>U.S. Rep. Ed Whitfield (R-KY)</i> | 51. U.S. Rep. Tim Ryan (D-OH) |
| 25. U.S. Rep. Mike Michaud (D-ME) | 52. U.S. Rep. Zach Space (D-OH) |
| 26. U.S. Rep. John Olver (D-MA) | 53. U.S. Rep. Betty Sutton (D-OH) |
| 27. U.S. Rep. John Conyers (D-MI) | 54. U.S. Rep. Charlie Wilson (D-OH) |

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 55. U.S. Rep. Peter DeFazio (D-OR) | 67. <i>U.S. Rep. Henry Brown (R-SC)</i> |
| 56. U.S. Rep. Jason Altmire (D-PA) | 68. <i>U.S. Rep. Bob Inglis (R-SC)</i> |
| 57. U.S. Rep. Christopher Carney (D-PA) | 69. U.S. Rep. John Spratt (D-SC) |
| 58. U.S. Rep. Kathleen Dahlkemper (D-PA) | 70. <i>U.S. Rep. Joe Wilson (R-SC)</i> |
| 59. U.S. Rep. Mike Doyle (D-PA) | 71. U.S. Rep. Gene Green (D-TX) |
| 60. U.S. Rep. Tim Holden (D-PA) | 72. U.S. Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) |
| 61. U.S. Rep. Tim Murphy (R-PA) | 73. <i>U.S. Rep. Rob Bishop (R-UT)</i> |
| 62. <i>U.S. Rep. Joe Pitts (R-PA)</i> | 74. U.S. Rep. Rick Boucher (D-VA) |
| 63. <i>U.S. Rep. Todd Platts (R-PA)</i> | 75. U.S. Rep. Tom Perriello (D-VA) |
| 64. <i>U.S. Rep. Bill Shuster (R-PA)</i> | 76. U.S. Rep. Steve Kagen (D-WI) |
| 65. <i>U.S. Rep. Glenn Thompson (R-PA)</i> | 77. <i>U.S. Rep. James Sensenbrenner (R-WI)</i> |
| 66. <i>U.S. Rep. Gresham Barrett (R-SC)</i> | 78. U.S. Rep. Alan Mollohan (D-WV) |

Former U.S. Representative John McHugh (R-NY) was a cosponsor of H.R. 2378 prior to his resignation from Congress to become U.S. Secretary of the Army. In addition, U.S. Representative John Murtha (D-PA) was a cosponsor of the legislation at the time of his death.

Senate Letter to Secretary Locke

On February 24, 2010, 15 senators sent a letter to U.S. Secretary of Commerce Gary Locke urging him to launch an investigation into the U.S. manufacturing industry’s allegations that China’s actions with respect to its currency constitute a countervailable subsidy. Letter organizers are listed in **bold**. Republicans are listed in *italics*.

- | | |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>U.S. Sen. Sam Brownback (R-KS)</i> | 9. U.S. Sen. Charles Schumer (D-NY) |
| 2. <i>U.S. Sen. Jim Bunning (R-KY)</i> | 10. U.S. Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH) |
| 3. <i>U.S. Sen. Susan Collins (R-ME)</i> | 11. U.S. Sen. Bob Casey (D-PA) |
| 4. <i>U.S. Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-ME)</i> | 12. U.S. Sen. Arlen Specter (D-PA) |
| 5. U.S. Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD) | 13. U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) |
| 6. U.S. Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) | 14. U.S. Sen. Robert Byrd (D-WV) |
| 7. U.S. Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI) | 15. U.S. Sen. Russ Feingold (D-WI) |
| 8. U.S. Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) | |

###



Military Tent Components and Berry Amendment Compliance

Reinterpretation of Berry Amendment; Non-Textile Component Parts of Military Shelters May be Sourced Off-Shore

Issue:

USIFI has long supported the Berry Amendment's application to textile products purchased by the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD). The codified regulation (10 U.S.C. 2533a)¹ as it pertains to textile products, including tents tarpaulins or covers says, "The Contractor shall deliver under this contract only such of the following items, either as end products or components, that have been grown, reprocessed, reused, or produced in the United States."

Background:

Both textile and non-textile components of military shelters purchased by DoD used to have Berry domestic sourcing requirements. In April 2009, however, DLA reinterpreted Berry to cover only the textile components of the shelters. This ruling was based on strict reading of the regulation which uses only the term tents, not tents and their components nor end products, and is interpreted as referring only to textiles, not end products which may be made of non-textile parts. Because some tent components are not made from textiles, the DLA legal team ruled that they did not need to be sourced domestically.

You have requested written clarification as to which textile products and components are subject to Berry Amendment compliance with regard to government-purchased tents and shelter systems. Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) clause 252.225-7012, which you have cited as a source of confusion on this issue, implements DFARS 225.7002. The tent coverage at DFARS 225.7002-1(a)(3) does not refer to tent components, such as metal items used in tents. When components are intended to be covered, the regulation clearly states this, as is done in DFARS 225.7002-1(a)(2), which specifically includes the components and materials of clothing in the domestic source restriction for clothing. Consistent with this distinction, the Procedures, Guidance and Information for DFARS 225.7002 distinguishes between components of clothing items and components of other items, and clearly supports the conclusion that a non-textile component of an item that is not clothing is acceptable unless restricted by another specific provision of the Berry Amendment. Because fabric materials (listed in DFARS 225.7002-1(a)(4), (5), (7), (8), and (9)) are the only tent components we can identify as being subject to the Berry Amendment restriction, only these textile components of tents and shelter systems are subject to the domestic content restrictions of the Berry Amendment.

(excerpted from letter received in USIFI Office on August 25, 2009)

In 2006, the textile and apparel industry succeeded in amending the Berry Amendment language to include components of apparel which were not made from textiles but were an integral part of the product (buttons, zippers, steel toes for boots, etc)¹.

¹ See: http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/dars/dfars/html/current/225_70.htm#225.7002-3

225.7002-1 Restrictions. The following restrictions implement 10 U.S.C. 2533a (the "Berry Amendment"). Except as provided in subsection [225.7002-2](#), do not acquire--

(2) Clothing and the materials and components thereof, other than sensors, electronics, or other items added to, and not normally associated with, clothing and the materials and components thereof. Clothing

The tent issue is similar to that of the military apparel supply chain: tents cannot function properly without their component parts and therefore the entire product should be compliant with Berry Amendment sourcing according to the original intent of the law.

Action Item:

USIFI has requested and received clarification of the DLA interpretation (see above) and has requested that the interpretation be changed to its former meaning (all parts of military shelters should be sourced domestically).

USIFI will work with Congress to pass language which identifies essential tent components and specifies domestic sourcing for these components.

includes items such as outerwear, headwear, underwear, nightwear, footwear, hosiery, handwear, belts, badges, and insignia.