

PART IX

INFRASTRUCTURE DOCUMENTS, 1959-1965

A. Infrastructure Committee (AC/4) and Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee (AC/4(PP))

The earliest records and a description of the earliest activities of the AC/4 and AC/4(PP) Committees covering the period from their establishment in May 1951 through the Council's Session at Lisbon in February 1952 are described in the Consultant's first Report, DES(92)1, paragraphs 173-175. The documents created by the two Committees during this period are listed in Appendix III, I-4/1 to 4/4 of that same document.

Between 1951 and 1958 the two AC/4 Infrastructure Committees issued about 5,000 documents, records of meetings, memoranda, notices, decision sheets and working papers in the AC/4 and AC/4(PP) series. A narrative description of those records and the microfilm copies produced of them is contained in Part IX of the Consultant's second Report, DES(94)2.

Annexed to DES(94)2 were three listings. Annex IX, 1 contains the subject headings used in a declassification proposal (EXS(81)3) listing the AC/4 and AC/4(PP) records for the period 1951 to 1958. Annex IX, 2 lists the various series of records (documents, decision sheets, summary records of meetings, memoranda, and working papers) created by the Infrastructure Committee (AC/4) between the dates of its establishment in 1951 through December 31, 1958. The microfilm roll numbers on which these records can be found is provided on the listing. The roll number for those records which were refilmed is also provided. Annex IX, 3 provides the same sort of listing for the several series of records issued by the Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee (AC/4(PP)) through 1958.

Annexed to this report are three listings which cover the nearly 7800 record items bearing reference numbers in the AC/4 and AC/4(PP) series and which were issued between 1st January 1959 and 31st December 1965 in various series by the Infrastructure Committees.

Annex IX,4 utilizes the subject headings in the 1981 downgrading programme proposal (EXS(81)3, 28.1.81) which include all of the 1951 through 1965 Infrastructure documents of every kind. Annex IX,4 should be viewed as an extension of Annex IX.1 to DES(94)2. It has been modified to identify just those references to items issued between 1959 and 1965. The specific annex, part, and page reference of EXS(81)3 listing the AC/4 and AC/4(PP) record items will serve to identify the specific numbered papers issued by those Committees during this seven-year period which fall under those 75 subject headings. Thirteen of the headings are subdivided by country concerned.

Listings of the record items in the various series issued by the Infrastructure Committee and the Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee between 1959 and 1965

along with the microfilm roll numbers (including refilming roll numbers) are provided in Annex IX, 5 (for AC/4) and Annex IX,6 (for AC/4(PP)) to this Report. They are extensions of Annexes IX, 2 and 3 of DES (94)2.

B. Joint Final Inspection and Formal Acceptance of NATO Infrastructure Projects (AC/4(FA))

The agendas of some regular meetings of the Infrastructure Committee had become filled, from time to time, with Joint Final Acceptance Inspection Reports. In 1957 the Canadian Delegation submitted a proposal to modify the procedures which would provide a basis for discussion of a possible way to improve the Committee's procedures (AC/4-D/757, 7.6.57). The proposal called for the creation of a standing sub-committee to examine the Joint Final Inspection Reports (the terms of reference of the Joint Inspection Teams are in AC/4-D/992 (2nd Revise)). The proposed sub-committee would not assume the responsibility for final decision, but would make recommendations to the Infrastructure Committee. Any delegation would have the right of placing an inspection report on the agenda for consideration by the full Committee.

The Infrastructure Committee considered the proposal at its meeting on 25th June 1957 (AC/4-R/213) where it approved the proposal for a "short" trial period. At the same time it was suggested that after some trial the Committee might consider increasing the powers of the standing sub-committee by giving it power of decision subject to opposition being voiced within a certain period of time.

At several meeting held between May and June 1961, the Infrastructure Committee revisited the question of the Joint Final Inspection and Formal Acceptance reports (AC/4-DS/372, Item II; DS-374, Item IV, and DS/377, Item II). The Committee concluded by asking the International Staff to prepare proposals for modifying the provisions of the statement of principles and procedures which guided the work of the Joint Inspection Teams and also the form of presentation of their report. The draft revisions to AC/4-D/992 (2nd Revise) were circulated as AC/4-D/1530 on 13th July 1961.

The drafted revisions were discussed by the Committee at two meetings in August 1961(AC/4-R/279, Item II and R/380, Item III) where modifications were suggested and approved. The approved text of the principles and procedures relating to the joint final inspection and formal acceptance of NATO Infrastructure projects was circulated as AC/4-D/1530 (Final) on 14th September 1961. The Committee also agreed that the backlog of inspection reports which had been issued but had not yet been approved by the Infrastructure Committee should be handled in accordance with the new procedures. Some 71 outstanding reports were involved.

The newly approved procedures required a major modification of the formal acceptance procedures. Under the procedures approved in 1957, the final inspection reports were first examined by a sub-committee of the Infrastructure Committee and passed on with the sub-committee's recommendations. The new procedures laid down that the reports in the future would first be examined by the Infrastructure Payments and

Progress Committee, where, if necessary, additional authorizations to commit funds may be granted. The Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee would then submit the reports to the Infrastructure Committee with its recommendations regarding formal acceptance of the works included in the final inspection reports.

The Secretariat of the Infrastructure Committee determined that the increasing number of reports made it desirable to establish a distinct special reference series rather than to continue to integrate them into the existing series. The new series number, used since 1961, was AC/4(PP)FA/ . Between 1961 and 1965, some 644 such reports were issued. The microfilm roll numbers on which they can be found are identified in Annex IX, 6.

C. Working Group of National Communications Experts (AC/4 (WG 18))

As early as 1951 the nations had provided to the Infrastructure Committee, experts on signals/communications matters. These individuals first served together as a “Working Party of Signals Experts” under terms of reference (AC/4-D/24) calling for them to review the cost of each signals communications project included in the second slice of the infrastructure programme and to provide revised estimates covering the rights of way and land separately. They also were tasked to estimate how much of cost of each project can be attributed to military use (potential or present), or recommend alternative means of making appropriate allowance for civilian use in distributing the cost of these facilities.

In 1961 the Military Budget Committee and the Infrastructure Committee jointly approved a proposal laying out the composition and terms of reference of a “Working Group of National Communications Experts”. (The relevant approving actions along with revisions to the original 1961 terms were taken at the following meetings: MBC-R(61)6, Item IX and MBC-R(61)22, Item XV and AC/4-R/381, Item IV, AC/4-R/408, Item III and AC/4-R/474, Item VI.) The Working Group (AC/4 (WG 18)) would consist of communications experts placed at NATO’s disposal at national charge for its meetings in Paris by those member nations who wished to take part in its deliberations. The Working Group had a dual mission of providing technical assistance to the Military Budget Committee and the Infrastructure Committee.

When acting under the auspices of the Military Budget Committee (MBC), the Working Group would:

(a) examine from the technical and technical-financial aspects the requests for credits for communications facilities presented by the various NATO Headquarters and Military Agencies for the purposes of fulfilling their operations mission in the framework of the budgets; and also

(b) examine whenever necessary other documents relating to communications matters that the MBC might consider necessary to refer to the Working Group and to report to the MBC the results of its examination.

When working under the auspices of the Infrastructure Committee, the Working Group would:

- (a) examine projects submitted by the host countries for internal signals installations of the NATO war headquarters; and
- (b) examine and report on other matters concerning communications equipment that the Infrastructure Committee might refer to the Working Group from time to time.

In either case, the Working Group was to do everything within its means to avoid any unnecessary duplication in expenditure by NATO, whether that involved Infrastructure or Military Budget funds, on signals equipment for NATO Military Headquarters.

The earliest efforts of the Working Group on behalf of the Infrastructure Committee were to consider the technical aspects of fund requests for communications (mainly for war headquarters, see AC/4-WP/275 and WP/282) and of projects proposed for inclusion in the slice XV programme (see AC/4-WP/267 and WP/274). The Working Group also held several meetings in 1964 to prepare standard specifications for the mobile communications facilities for ACE main headquarters (in response to the Committee's invitation in AC/4-R/407, paragraph 74(1)).

The Infrastructure Committee (AC/4) and the Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee (AC/4(PP)), established and utilized a great many working groups to respond to particular issues and to the more highly technical subjects which came before them. The Working Group of National Communications Experts uniquely created its own series of record items under the serial AC/4 (WG 18).

The 49 numbered record items issued by the Working Group of National Communications Experts (Infrastructure) are listed in Annex IX, 7 to this Report. Their titles give a fuller picture of the variety of technical issues examined by the Working Group and of their operations as a distinct group.

D. Infrastructure Committee Secretariat Memoranda (INFRASEC/YY/###)

The Infrastructure Committee's Secretariat continued to prepare and circulate a large number of memoranda identified by the serial INFRASEC/59/..., INFRASEC/60/... etc. and sometimes by the simplified serial IS/65/.... Some of these memoranda are of historical research value as they record meetings, provide notice of meeting, and meeting agenda matters, refer questions to appropriate agencies for action, transmit to others information or copies of documents received in the Secretariat, inform delegations and individuals of matters of concern, etc.

The INFRASEC memoranda were not consistently retained separately from the subject files for purposes of microfilming. After mid-1958 a few may be found on the chronological rolls of film. Because they were not indexed there is no easy way to identify or locate them. A few of the numbered memoranda in this series were separately maintained and microfilmed in the 1980s in a series especially prepared on behalf of the Infrastructure Committee.

Beginning in 1965, some separately retained INFRASEC/ or IS/ memoranda were microfilmed in series order. Included among the 1965 Infrastructure Secretariat memoranda are those initiated by that office for the General Purpose Working Group (AC/4(WG 21) and for the Working Group on Outstanding Audit Problems affecting Signals Projects (AC/4(WG 5).

From the distribution record we know that some of the following INFRASEC memoranda were received and microfilmed (with many gaps):

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Roll</u>
INFRASEC/59/2 - 161	chron
INFRASEC/60/1 - 211	chron
INFRASEC/61/1 - 168	chron & Infra No. 20
INFRASEC/62/2 - 250	chron
INFRASEC/63/1 - 186	chron
INFRASEC/64/1 - 235	chron
INFRASEC/65/1 - 256	chron & 2145

The INFRASEC memoranda were not listed under the subject headings reproduced in Annex IX, 4. They have been considered as background material to the formal reference numbered series of Infrastructure Committee records, and handled in accordance with the declassification determination made on them.

E. Recommendations for Declassification and Release of Infrastructure Committees' Records

In 1981 the Executive Secretary proposed the downgrading to Unclassified of all of the NATO records in the infrastructure field created between 1951 and 1965 (EXS(81)3, 28.1.81). Included were 1959-1965 documents in the C-M, C-R, PO, and RDC series described in another part of this Report. Documents of the AC/4, AC/4(PP) and AC/158 described in this part (Part IX) were included in the proposal.

The Executive Secretary asked the responsible authorities to consider a number of factors in reaching their decision including the age of the documents and their frequent overclassification. Objections to the declassification of any of the documents identified in annexes A to R of EXS(81)3 were to be sent to the Executive Secretary by 30th June 1981. The German Delegation to NATO requested that all financial reports submitted by Germany (listed on page 127 of Part I, Annex E) retain their original classification (NATO CONFIDENTIAL)¹ In the absence of any other response, Declassification

¹ Sixteen documents dated between 1959 and 1965 are involved: AC/4(PP)D/2437 (21.1.59), AC/4(PP)D/2527 (6.4.59), AC/4(PP)D/2676 (8.7.59), AC/4(PP)D/2871 (29.10.59), AC/4(PP)D/3196 (19.5.60), AC/4(PP)D/3479 (8.12.60),

Notice DN(81)18, was issued on 8th July 1981. That Notice called attention to the exceptions requested by the German authorities and that the remainder were considered NATO UNCLASSIFIED. The proposal (paragraph 3) and the Notice specifically provided that this declassification action should cover:

- (a) all versions of the documents and record of meetings in the list - i.e., draft, original, revised, final, agenda, summary and verbatim;
- (b) all background material to the declassified documents, namely working papers, letters, memoranda and other contributions originated by the International Staff, the Military Authorities and National Delegations.

The 644 Joint Final Inspection and Formal Acceptance of NATO Infrastructure Project reports, reference numbered AC/4(PP)FA (described in sub-part B, above, and listed in Annex IX, 6); and the 49 AC/4(WG 18) reference numbered documents (described in sub-part C, above, and listed in Annex IX, 7) were not specifically listed in the declassification programme proposed in EXS(81)3 on 28th January 1981. They all were considered, however, as background material to the declassified documents (paragraph 3(b) of that proposal). Consequently, they all have been considered as declassified by that same authority, DN(81)18.

The Consultants recommend that all of the documents, notices, records of meetings, working papers, memoranda, Formal Acceptance reports and other associated records created prior to 1966 by or on behalf of the Infrastructure Committee and the Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee and their working groups and groups of experts be released to the public.

F. Ad Hoc Group of Experts to Study the Technical Features of War Headquarters (AC/158)

Representatives of SHAPE and SACLANT briefed the Council on November 10th 1959 (C-R(59)38) regarding wartime headquarters eligible for international financing. These briefing were in explication and expansion on the proposals in SG 137/57. (Copies of these briefing were circulated to delegations under cover of RDC(59)333.) At that meeting the Standing Group Representative expressed the anxiety of the Standing Group to have Council approval as soon as possible in order that work which had been discontinued on certain projects might be resumed. He emphasized that until Council approval was given, work of importance would remain at a standstill.

Among its proposals, the Standing Group had urged the creation of an ad hoc working group to examine into the technical requirements to better assure the survival of war headquarters in the event of a nuclear strike. In response to a question on the work of this group, the SHAPE representative stated that it was impossible to forecast how long it would take for any study to be completed, but that the military authorities were not

AC/4(PP)D/3806 (29.6.61), AC/4(PP)D/4045 (12.12.61), AC/4(PP)D/4355 (4.7.62), AC/4(PP)D/4616 (7.12.62), AC/4(PP)D/4833 (14.5.63), AC/4(PP)D/5186 (20.11.63), AC/4(PP)D/5485 (5.6.64), AC/4(PP)D/5767 (17.12.64), AC/4(PP)D/6046 (14.6.65), and AC/4(PP)D/6363 (15.12.65).

thinking in terms of a permanent group but of periodic meetings of a group of experts for an exchange of information on the subterranean effects of explosions. He emphasized the lack of scientific information on the subject and the importance of obtaining it. He also stated that work could begin--once the Council approved--without waiting for the results of the working group study.

In response to another question, the Standing Group Representative informed the Council that this matter had been discussed with the NATO Science Adviser, Dr. Seitz, who strongly supported the proposed creation of the group and who would help it in its work.

When the Council met on 25th November 1959 (C-R(59)40), it considered the SG 137/57 document more critically and asked a number of questions concerning its implications, particularly those affecting the costs involved. In conclusion the Council approved the categories of headquarters and the proposals in enclosure I of SG 137/57. It also agreed that in the future war headquarters projects would follow normal budgetary procedures.

The Council also approved the establishment of an ad hoc group of experts to study, under the direction of the International Staff, the design of war headquarters with the aim of determining optimum means of blast protection for entrances and other openings and the best method of obtaining maximum protection in those regions where terrain is flat and the subsurface water level is high. The Council accepted that the proposed ad hoc group of experts should be composed of representatives of the three countries represented on the Standing Group (France, United Kingdom and the United States) and that other countries should send representatives if they so desired. The level of representation should be that of technical experts, and the Secretary General would appoint a chairman.

The Ad Hoc Group of Experts to Study the Technical Features of War Headquarters (AC/158) held three meetings between January and June 1960 when it produced its first progress report to the Council (C-M(60)65, 22.6.60). At its first meeting in January, it divided the overall subject it was to examine into 14 topics (listed in AC/158-N/1). Information on the 14 topics was exchanged in advance of the second meeting. There it was discussed and summarized by a drafting group. That draft report prepared at the second meeting in March was distributed as document AC/158-WP/1 and formed the basis of the discussion at the third meeting. A second version was prepared at that meeting where it was unanimously agreed that this report should be submitted to the Council as an interim report taking into account the fact that, in view of the complexity of the problem, the total study might take a long time to complete. The interim report did not cover a number of topics which the Group undertook to examine at its subsequent meetings. The results of those deliberations would be added to the report.

After holding three additional meetings the Ad Hoc Group of Experts submitted a further report, annexed to C-M(61)32, circulated on 21st April 1961. This report was supplemented by a Technical Annex which, for convenience, was given only a restricted distribution (AC/158-D/9). The Group recommended that the study and Technical

Annex be transmitted by the Council to the Standing Group for such action as they considered necessary.

In making this study, a great amount of scientific and technical information was exchanged between members of the Group of Experts. The most relevant of these studies were listed or included in the Technical Annex for future reference. In view of the fact that research and development was being undertaken at that time by various NATO countries in this field, and that progress was rapid, the Group expressed its willingness to be of future assistance to the International Staff, if required, and to revise its own findings in the light of any new scientific or technical achievements on a case by case basis.

When the report was considered by the Council at its meeting on 31st May 1961(C-R(61)22), the Standing Group Representative urged the Council transmit the report to member nations to use as guidance for design personnel and to the Standing Group which would forward it to the Supreme Commanders and to Major Subordinate Commanders as guidance for the design of war headquarters. In July 1961 the Standing Group instructed SACEUR, SACLANT and CINCHAN to make use of the report in conjunction with the criteria as laid down in MC 32/12 (Revised) in all work concerning the construction of NATO War Headquarters (SGM-330-61).

The Standing Group Representative also urged the Council to agree that the Group should remain in existence to facilitate the exchange of technical information; to review, at least annually, its initial findings in the light of new scientific and technical achievements; and to review, when requested by the military authorities and the International Staff, major new war headquarters projects of special importance or complexity. In the conclusion at its May 1961 meeting, the Council noted that the Group might be reconvened by any member or its Chairman if considered useful.

When the Ad Hoc Group of Experts met in Naples in April 1962 to examine the construction of AFSOUTH War Headquarters, it discussed further topics for consideration. Seven topics were selected for examination and members were asked to prepare papers on them (AC/158-N/6, 13.6.62). The visit to the construction site also gave the Group an opportunity to examine the existing criteria and to determine whether there were any omissions in them and whether further clarification or amplification of scientific and technical guidance was needed to improve construction and design in this field. One result was the identification of an urgent need to undertake further studies concerning the protection of personnel and equipment against the effect of underground shock waves.

At the invitation of the Norwegian Government, the Group held meetings at CINCNORTH in June 1963. It visited the combined war headquarters of AFNORTH and TASKFORNOR. On that occasion the Group exchanged views on the design studies for the war headquarters for SHAPE, AFCENT, NORTHAC/2nd ATAF and CENTAG/4th ATAF scheduled to be constructed in France and Germany.

On 7th October 1963 the Ad Hoc Group of Experts forwarded a progress report to the Council (C-M(63)72). It reported on the work undertaken, the meetings held and concluded with the statement,

10. The Group's advice and guidance on the design of underground structures and their protection against effects of conventional and nuclear weapons have so far been of great assistance to the NATO Military Authorities, to the Payments and Progress Committee, and the Infrastructure Directorate.

The Council noted the report at its meeting on 6th November 1963 (C-R(63)63, Item II).

At its meeting in Oslo in June 1963, the Ad Hoc Group was advised that SHAPE had developed a new assessment of the military threat to the war headquarters in Central Europe. After discussing the implications of this change in assumption, the Ad Hoc Group set up a Sub-Group with the task of studying their impact upon the design and construction of the war headquarters on French and German territories then in the planning stage, and to provide solutions for the increase of their survivability. The Sub-Group submitted its report to the Ad Hoc Group in AC/158-D/25/1(Revised) in December 1963. It was approved by the Ad Hoc Group at its meeting in Paris in January 1964 (AC/158-R/10, mtg. 22-23.1.64).

The Ad Hoc Group of Experts met in The Hague on 11th and 12th May 1964 (AC/158-R/11). SHAPE outlined the contents of its newest war headquarters planning directive (SHAPE Directive No. 6120/20 dated 13th April 1964). Up to that time MC 32/12(Revised) was interpreted in such a way that emphasis was placed on hardened facilities. The new SHAPE directive changed this emphasis to reliance on mobility in order to attain an adequate degree of survivability.

The studies carried out by SHAPE which formed the basis for the directive had not been submitted to the Ad Hoc Group. The Group questioned the adequacy of the technical considerations used to arrive at the conclusions contained in the SHAPE Directive. In its view, further studies of the great many problems concerning survivability and cost were necessary to obtain acceptable solutions. The Group was willing to carry out the studies required with the assistance of SHAPE and the SHAPE Technical Center. This preliminary reaction was submitted as a report to the Council (under cover of PO(64)299 on 2nd July 1964) with the request that it be noted and forwarded to the Standing Group.

When the sub-group met in September 1964 to examine the SHAPE Directive in detail, they were joined by a representative of the SHAPE Technical Center which confirmed that they had provided no technical basis for the new SHAPE policy. The sub-group outlined a detailed comment on the SHAPE Directive and its Chairman was selected to draft the report. Their objective was to have an agreed report ready for the Ad Hoc Group of Experts when they met in the spring of 1965 (AC/158-N/11, 8.10.64). The comments were circulated on 23rd April 1965 in document AC/158-D/31. At that same meeting in September 1964, the sub-group continued its work on preparing a report on the design of survivable war headquarters. The results of that effort were circulated as a report in AC/158-D/33 (25.6.65).

The meeting of the full Ad Hoc Group of Experts planned for June 1965 was postponed when SHAPE responded to AC/158-D/31 by raising objection to it. SHAPE's position was restated in AC/158-D/31/1 (21.5.65).

On February 21st through 23rd, 1966, the Ad Hoc Group of Experts held its first meeting (AC/158-R/13) since May 1964. The Chairman asked the Group members what they thought the future activities of this Group should be in the face of the new policy adopted by SHAPE which involved a wider field of study than the site selection and design of hardened underground facilities. The representatives at the meeting expressed a multitude of arguments for continuation of the Group. But it was clear that the ultimate decision was out of their hands. As the German representative stated,

(48) ... the Group's future depended on whether or not the concept in MCM-1-66 was accepted by the Council. He believed that the Group could eventually be enlarged to include experts on mobility and communications but that it would be premature to consider this until they had before them an officially approved concept about War Headquarters.

The Council approved the amended policy for War Headquarters (MCM-44-66) and the International Planning Staff of the Military Committee concluded that the stage had been reached where this Group of Experts has essentially provided all the advice that was expected of them. The Chairman of the Military Committee wrote to the Secretary General on 19th August 1966 that he believed the Ad Hoc Group had served its purpose and should be disestablished (CMC-28-66).

In his response, the Acting Secretary General set out the present status of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts on War Headquarters and suggested that it confine itself to the preparation of an interim report and revised terms of reference for submission to Council by mid-November 1966. Those proposed terms of reference would be made available to the NATO Military Authorities before submission to the Council (PO/66/995, 19.10.66).

Proposals for new terms of reference were drafted in AC/158-D/35 on 28th October 1966, by the Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs who served as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group of Experts. The drafter noted that, inasmuch as the Council had determined (C-R(66)32, Item IV) that responsibility for determining the best combination of survivability measures for War Headquarters projects rested with the Infrastructure Committees, that technical advice would be needed in order for sound decisions be made by the Committee's members. The proposal called for the Group to extend its scope and membership according to its new mandate and the extension of the sub-group into a Working Group which could meet regularly to consider specific technical criteria.

After a postponement, the Ad Hoc Group of Experts met for the last time on 6th and 7th February 1967 (AC/158-R/14). The Chairman observed that it was agreed by all the International Staff members concerned in the matter that the Group could no longer continue to serve a useful purpose with the prevailing terms of reference which did not

meet the new requirements laid down by the Military Authorities. The meeting was convened with the purpose of drafting new terms of reference for submission for the approval of the Council. He went on to state that the NATO Military Authorities had opposed the decision to reconvene the Ad Hoc Group because they believed that any further effort by the Group towards a review of the whole problem of survivability, including consideration of mobility, would not be productive.

Representatives of the Military Committee and SHAPE made presentations on the question of continuance of the Group under the prevailing circumstances. An extended discussion ensued. The Chairman summed up the debate saying that it was obvious that the Group members had been confronted with a request to pronounce on the dissolution of their own Group. They had no instructions from their authorities, and, therefore, could only speak personally. A report prepared by a drafting group during the discussion was approved by the full Group and was submitted for the consideration of the Council, on the understanding that it did not reflect national positions. The Council alone, as the highest NATO authority, was the competent body to take a decision in this matter. (AC/158-R/14)

The Report by the Ad Hoc Group of Experts was circulated to the Council in C-M(67)10 on 22nd February 1967. The Group recommended the Council abolish the AC/158 Group and establish a high level group of national experts under the Chairmanship of the Assistant Secretary General for Scientific Affairs with proposed language for its terms of reference. The proposal invited all interested NATO member nations to participate in this new group which it envisioned would report to the Council or to the Defence Research Group at the discretion of the Secretary General.

The Defence Planning Committee (DPC) discussed the report at its meeting on 14th April 1967 (DPC/R(67)7, Item VI). The DPC agreed to disband the Ad Hoc Group and noted that the question of a possible successor group dealing with basic and long-term aspects of nuclear survivability problems might be raised later by any interested delegation or group of delegations.

The 35 numbered Documents and 19 Working Papers issued by the AC/158 Ad Hoc Group of Experts are listed in Annex IX, 8. They and the 13 Notices and 14 Summary Records of Meetings of the Group were declassified by DN(81)18.

G. NATO Air Defence Ground Environment (NADGE)

MC 54 (Final) "Air Defence Command and Control in NATO Europe" was approved by the Military Committee on 12th December 1955. It set forth the concept of a coordinated system of air defence for NATO Europe. Subsequent experience showed that coordination alone of air defence was not sufficient and that an integrated system was required.

In December 1957 SACEUR produced a study entitled, "Action leading towards the integration of the Air Defence of NATO Europe". This was considered by the Military Committee in December 1957 and a resolution adopted wherein the principle of an

integrated system was agreed. The Military Committee also requested the Standing Group to study the proposal and to prepare a resolution suitable for submission to the Council. At the same time SACEUR was authorized to study with the appropriate national authorities the matter of an organizational concept and a corresponding command and control system for approval by the Military Committee.

By this action the concept of a coordinated air defence was superseded by the concept of an integrated NATO European air defence system within the responsibility of SACEUR. Integration was defined in the decision document, MC 54/1 (9.4.58), as: "The welding of the existing national air defence systems in Europe into one unified system with a NATO as opposed to a national operational command and control organization effective in peace and war." The Military Committee called upon the Council to approve the principles outlined in the revised MC 54 (Final) document and to instruct the Military Committee to initiate action to effect the integration of air defence by directing SACEUR to pursue negotiations with the countries concerned. The Council was also asked to request nations to assign their air defence forces to SACEUR.

At its 21st session on 26th November 1958, the Military Committee in Chiefs of Staff session amended and approved MC 54/1, subject to the reservations of Denmark, France and the United Kingdom. On 10th September 1960 SACEUR reported on the conclusions of negotiations carried out by him at the request of the Council with the French authorities concerning the French reservation on MC 54/1. And on 28th December 1960 the Council approved MC 54/1 subject to the French reservation. In this approval the Council invited the NATO governments concerned to assign their air defence forces in Europe to the operational command of SACEUR (C-R(60)36, paragraph 17).

SHAPE outlined the requirements for the Electronic Ground Environment for the Northern and Southern flanks and for the Central Region in a document dated 28th July 1960 (SHAPE AC/1250 ADEF) with an estimated cost of approximately £93.45M. In an amended version of that paper submitted on 12th August 1960, SHAPE submitted the plan covering only the Northern and Southern flanks (estimated cost of £22.175M) as part of its Slice XII Infrastructure Programme requirements (SHAPE AC/6100/12/1P-140/60 PROG (Amendment No. 2)). The plan covering the flanks was approved by the nations in August 1960.

The principle of common financing for NATO Air Defence Ground Environment (NADGE) was accepted by the Council in January 1961 when the Slice XII programme was approved--and again when the Slice XIII programme was approved. However, the commitment of funds was conditional upon the approval of the overall plan for air defence.

SHAPE submitted a revised plan with details of the Central Region complex on 31st August 1961 (SHAPE AC/1250/13). The total estimated cost of the total plan was now estimated at £97,175M excluding such system survival measures as hardening. This plan was the subject of MC 54/2 of 27th February 1962, submitted to the Council for approval, together with a number of national comments contained in MCM-26-62. In its

conclusion the Military Committee proposed that upon approval by the Council the plan would be furnished to the Infrastructure Committee for implementation.

MC 54/2 was approved by the Council on 28th March 1962 (C-R(62)13, Item VI). One of the effects was to release funds from Slices XII and XIII of the Infrastructure Programme for expenditure in connection with the Allied Command Europe long-term requirement plan for air defence. The Infrastructure Committee referred the document together with the SHAPE plan and the national comments (MCM-26-62) to its Infrastructure Ground Environment Sub-Committee (IGESUCO).

H. Infrastructure Ground Environment Sub-Committee (IGESUCO) (AC/203)

The complexity of implementing the NADGE programme had been recognized and a proposal for the creation of a special organization to fulfill the complex tasks had resulted in an agreement between SACEUR and the Secretary General. By agreement, a procedural document was produced by the International Staff and approved by the Infrastructure Committee (AC/4-D/1430 (Revised-Final) dated 31st July 1961. This document defined the proposed methods of selection, procurement, and installation of the NADGE equipment. It also established the Infrastructure Ground Environment Sub-Committee (IGESUCO) with the symbol AC/203, and the Ground Environment Team of the International Staff (GETIS).

IGESUCO held its first meeting on 3rd October 1961 under the terms of reference and with the object of setting in motion the procedures laid down in AC/4-D/1430 (Revised-Final). At that meeting they invited the Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee to act as its provisional chairman. The Sub-Committee agreed that IGESUCO would take decisions on all points referred to it relating to the implementation of NADGE and would refer to the Infrastructure Committee for decision only matters on which IGESUCO failed to reach agreement (AC/203-R/1).

At its second meeting on 6th October 1961, the Sub-Committee learned of the recruiting problems for GETIS. At that time the Signals Section of the International Staff consisted of just five experts and one vacant post. Two of those experts were retained for conventional signals projects, and one divided his time equally between conventional projects and the new programs. That left just one expert to deal entirely with radar and associated questions. The Head of the Section exercised overall supervision over NADGE as well as the ongoing conventional signal projects. It was obvious that a staff of these proportions was insufficient to deal with this new and complicated programme and it was considered that at least four additional international experts would be required immediately. By the end of the year 1961, the staff was expected to grow to seven or eight experts able to deal with the new (NADGE) programme (statement annexed to AC/203-R/2). At the 4th December meeting of the Sub-Committee, the Head of GETIS estimated that it would be necessary to increase the staff to possibly 15 members by the end of 1962 (AC/203-R/5).

For administrative purposes, the national experts detailed to GETIS would be considered as in the service of and under the administrative control of their

governments. They would be considered as having the same status as members of other NATO Expert Working Groups. The role of this group was to help the International Staff in preparing proposals for the Infrastructure Committee (IGESUCO), particularly with regard to technical specifications and evaluation of bids. However, the final responsibility for these proposals would remain with the International Staff (AC/203-WP/1 as amended at AC/203-R/3). At that 18th December 1961 meeting of the Sub-Committee, it was agreed that the GETIS, in cooperation with SHAPE Air Defence Technical Center (SADTC) and national experts, should initiate the detailed technical study of NADGE beginning with the Northern and Southern Regions (AC/203-R/6).

As for payment of funds, the Infrastructure Committee decided that GETIS should submit a paper to IGESUCO explaining its requirements of funds for planning work on NADGE and that, if the proposal received the agreement of IGESUCO, it might then be submitted for approval by the Infrastructure Payments and Progress Committee (AC/4-R/393, Item V).

During this time (1961-1962) several delegations began expressing serious doubts as to the adequacy of the system for managing of this complex system and the accuracy of the cost estimates provided by SHAPE (AC/203-D/5, D/8 and D/10; AC/203-R/5, R/7, R/9 and R/12). In a statement submitted in September 1962, the U.S. Representative to IGESUCO suggested the system described in the NADGE Plan would cost \$850 million (or approximately £292 million), or virtually three times the cost estimated in the plan. He estimated that when operation and maintenance costs were added, the cost to NATO might be six times the SHAPE estimated cost. The United Kingdom and French Delegations arrived at figures at least 40% higher than those in the SHAPE estimate (or £145M) (AC/203-R/12).

When the Sub-Committee discussed the issues at its meeting on 9th November 1962, it concluded that it was deadlocked and should report the situation to the Infrastructure Committee (AC/203-R/13). A draft report was prepared and circulated on 14th November (AC/203-WP/5). After amending the document at a joint meeting with the Infrastructure Committee (AC/203-R/14, 21 & 23.11.62), a draft report (AC/4-D/1650) was prepared and examined by the Infrastructure Committee on 27 November (AC/4-R/417). A further amended version laying out the disparate viewpoints was presented to the Council on 28th November 1962 (C-M(62)144). At its meeting on 5th December 1962, the Council concluded by recommending that the NATO military authorities examine the problems posed in the report in the light of the entire air defence problem and to report to the Council by the end of the year (C-R(62)57, Item V). Its preparation was delayed through the spring of 1963.

Throughout this period neither IGESUCO nor GETIS had been permitted to proceed with the implementation as defined in AC/4-D/1430 (Revised-Final). In view of all of the doubts expressed, the Military Authorities were requested by the Council to set up a panel to critically examine the plan under the guidance of a SHAPE Steering Committee and to make recommendations (C-M(63)40, 21.5.63). The Panel began meetings on 17th June 1963 and convened daily for about three weeks. It produced a plan with an estimated cost of £172M. It was recognized by SHAPE that this plan would have to be reduced since the Council had approved MC 54/2 at less than £100M.

SHAPE convened meeting of the SHAPE STC and Ministry of Defense experts in late summer 1963 and produced the “Financially Limited Plan,” which was estimated to cost £142M. This plan also had to be rejected by SHAPE as exceeding the financial limit imposed by the Council. All of the detailed cost figures for these plans were developed by SHAPE using the best information available of the cost of similar equipment. The assumption had been made that the total cost would be divided as to 60% hardware and 40% for software, installation, test, initial spares and training. The cost of civil construction, taxes, administration and contingencies had not been included and in some cases specifically excluded. However, all these items were later to be included in the financial ceiling.

On 31st July 1963 SHAPE issued a plan based on an estimated cost of £110M. When submitting the plan, SACEUR stated,

This £110M version does not provide a system which will permit me fully to meet the task with which the Council charged me in MC 54/1. However, I regard it as an important step toward an adequate NADGE within the prescribed fund limitation.

By document C-M(63)91 of 20th November 1963, the Council approved the NADGE plan in principle at a cost of £110M. It also approved the SHAPE plan of 31st July for the Northern Region, and as amended for the Centre and South. That same document agreed that governments with balance of payments difficulties would be protected against adverse balance of payment consequences. [Procedures for bidding to resolve the balance of payment problem were agreed by the Council in C-M(64)50 of 20th June 1964.]

C-M(63)91 also approved the minimal facilities programme (involving AWX fighter control and which was already underway in Belgium, Germany and the Netherlands) which had been provided contingent approval by the Council (in C-R(63)67, Item I) as part of the NADGE plan. The Infrastructure Committee was invited by the Council to study operation and maintenance costs in conjunction with SHAPE. Finally, the Infrastructure Committee, IGESUCO, the International Staff and GETIS were instructed to arrive at a realistic costing of the entire NADGE plan. Proposed procedures for evaluation of the cost of the NADGE project were prepared by December 1963 (AC/203-D/16, 9.12.63).

Implementation of the NADGE plan required agreement on the procedures for requesting proposals “RFP” (AC/203-D/18. 26.2.64). A special working group of IGESUCO worked on this problem and reported its discussions in September 1964. The amended proposal became the master document containing all requirements including the final operational requirements covering the three regions (AC/203-D/26(Final)). It was approved by the Sub-Committee on 9th November 1964. During the summer of 1964, information on NADGE required by industry interested in bidding on the overall project was being developed (AC.203-D/20 and D/24).

At the Council meeting (C-R(64)34) on 10th July 1964, the Council agreed to the implementation of the overall NADGE plan on the basis of document C-M(63)91 on the understanding that the final content would be determined in common by the military

authorities of NATO and the national military authorities and that the cost would not exceed £110 million. At that same meeting the Council agreed that the implementation of the plan would be done by international competitive bidding resulting in contracts which would, subject to the provisions of GM(63)91, give each country a share, in equipment and civil engineering works, approximately equal to its contribution to the plan.

I. Ad Hoc Group on the Proposed Organization for the Implementation of the NADGE Plan (AC/247)

The Council also agreed at the 10th July meeting that an executive committee should be created which would be responsible for directing and controlling the proper implementation of the plan. The Council called for a proposal giving the constitution and mission of such an executive committee for the Council's approval by 15th September 1964.

The French Permanent Representative submitted proposals for the establishment of such an organization on 29th October 1964 (C-M(64)80). At its meeting on 29th October 1964 (C-R(64)48), the Council entrusted the study of these proposals to an "Ad Hoc Group on the Proposed Organization for the Implementation of the NADGE Plan" (AC/247). The Group consisted of the Deputy Permanent Representatives. Its report (C-M(64)132 (Revised) was approved by the Council on 13th January 1965 (C-R(65)1). The result was a revised French proposal (C-M(64)80 (Revised), 14.1.65) which established the NADGE Policy Board to supervise a NADGE Management Office. The Working Group on NPLO Charters was directed to study the organization and propose a charter for Council approval. The Ad Hoc Group (AC/247) was disbanded. Also at the same meeting the Council decided that IGESUCO (AC/203) and the GETIS would continue to operate in order for progress to continue on the NADGE plan.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Revision of NPLO Charters held four meetings before it reached agreement on a charter for NADGE. The proposed charter (C-M(65)70, 10.9.65) was approved by the Council at its meeting on 6th October 1965 (C-R(65)42). The Council Chairman noted in his introduction of the report that the NADGE organization had been functioning since 1st April 1965. The Council agreed to make that the effective date on which it would be considered as having entered into force.

In the meantime IGESUCO (AC/203) agreed that a single contract would be signed for the NADGE system as a whole, and that the whole system would be open to international competitive bidding. It also approved the work programme for GETIS, including the timing of the different stages of implementation of the project up to the receipt of firm technical proposals from consortia bidding on the plan. The text of the request to industry for proposals was also agreed. These and other subsidiary decisions were discussed at the AC/203 meetings held between September 1964 and February 1965 (AC/203-R/23 through R/30).

The system requirements developed by GETIS were distributed to 64 firms in December 1964 inviting them to submit preliminary proposals by February 15th 1965 and technical proposals by May 1st 1965. A symposium was held in Paris on 18th-19th

January 1965 to clarify some procedural and financial problems. GETIS was to undertake the preparation of the evaluation exercise which it hoped would begin in May and be concluded by the end of September 1965. The new NADGE organization was to assume the supervision of this important step of the NADGE project and to establish after its completion, the list of the technically and operationally acceptable proposals (“The NADGE project: summary of past developments and work in progress” a memorandum from the Assistant Secretary General for Production, Logistics and Infrastructure to all Delegations dated 26th January 1965, PLI/ASG(65)32).

The NADGE Policy Board decided at its meeting on 21st May 1965, that it was ready to assume the functions of the IGESUCO. The Infrastructure Committee, at its meeting on 25th May (AC/4-DS/501, Item VIII) decided to dissolve IGESUCO and requested that it submit a final report. The draft report (AC/203-WP/33, 29.4.65) was noted at its meeting on 1st June 1965 and published as an Infrastructure Committee Document (AC/4-D/1777) on 10th June 1965. This 13 page report is an excellent summary of the issues addressed by the AC/203 Sub-Committee.

Bids were called for at the end of 1965 and were submitted by three contractors. On 10th January 1966 the bidders declared their inability to provide a system as defined in AC/203-D/26(Final) within the ceiling of £100 million. The NADGE Policy Board called for SHAPE to revise the plan (19.1.66) and then to cut it by 20% (3.2.66). SHAPE submitted a deletion list (10.2.66) which the Policy Board approved (24.2.66). The Council approved the SHAPE reductions at its meeting on 2nd March 1966 (C-R(66)9; and three months later approved the selection of the low bidder (C-R(66)30, 28.6.66). Nine contracts were signed on 28th December 1966.

The NADGE was not in itself a complete system but an improvement of an existing system consisting of NATO assigned National and NATO-funded radars, data processing systems, communications, etc. The improvement plan sought to provide an integrated air defence system, to improve the radar cover, the intercept capacity (manual and automatic), the ground-air communications and the effectiveness of the system within the limit of a strictly imposed financial ceiling.

J. Conclusions and Recommendations on AC/203 and AC/247 Records

The 43 Documents, 40 Records of Meetings, and 33 Working Papers created by the Infrastructure Ground Environment Sub-Committee (IGESUCO), (AC/203) and the 9 Documents and 7 Notices (all concerning the date and place of formal and informal meetings) created by the Ad Hoc Group on the Proposed Organization for the Implementation of the NADGE Plan (AC/247) are listed or described in Annexes IX, 9 and 10 of this Report.

The AC/247 Group held six meetings. The Secretary of the Group, A. Synadino, took notes and prepared summary records of those sessions. They were not published in the AC/247 series and were, consequently, not microfilmed. They were, however, reproduced and circulated under the symbol S&A(64) or S&A(65). Copies are in the surviving NADGE Registry File 2-2-02 in the custody of the IS Registry. They are listed in Annex IX, 10/2.

These records have not previously been considered for declassification. The consultants recommend that they all be declassified and released to the public.

K. Special Working Group on NATO Communications Security Policy (AC/232)

In August 1963 the Secretary General introduced to the Council a report by the Military Committee (MC 74/1) on the problem of Communication Security Policy within NATO for the protection of “Associated Cryptologic Information.” Because of the complications of the technical aspects of the problem addressed by the report, the Secretary General felt obliged to present some comments and recommendations to help the Council discussion.

In his paper, PO/63/367 of 16th August 1963, the Secretary General provided information on the background of the issues. In January 1962 SACEUR emphasised that deficiencies in cryptologic equipment were jeopardising the security of NATO operational plans and requested the selection and introduction of modern cryptographic equipment to meet the military needs. The Standing Group recognized the need and provided the MC 74/1 report as a statement of the requirements for modern cryptographic equipment and invited nations to offer suitable equipment to meet these urgent needs. All were agreed that for operational efficiency there should be only a limited number of different types of equipment.

The Secretary General recommended that the Council approve the non-controversial resolution on Communications Security Policy of NATO for the Protection of Associated Cryptographic Information within the framework of NATO (Enclosure 1 to MC 74/1) and instruct the Infrastructure Committee and the Military Budget Committee, within their respective areas of jurisdiction, to settle the questions relating to the procurement and the financing of the equipment involved. The Secretary General also recommended that the Council instruct the Working Group on Industrial Property to examine the questions relating to patent rights and proprietary technical information protection. All were to report to the Council not later than 1st November 1963 (PO/63/367, paragraph 9).

When the Council took up the MC 74/1 paper and the Secretary General’s introductory comments (in the PO), the Representatives had difficulty accepting the Secretary General’s suggestions. The United Kingdom Representative suggested that the whole of the Military Committee’s proposals in Enclosure 2 to the report should be remitted not to the Infrastructure Committee and the Military Budget Committee as proposed by the Secretary General, but to a special working group of the Council under the chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary General and composed of appropriate representatives from member countries, the NATO Military Authorities and the International Staff (paragraph 10 of C-R(63)57, meeting on 2.10.63). The delegations were invited to submit proposals for amendments and to revert to the question two weeks later to consider the UK proposal and any other proposals submitted (Ibid., paragraph 14).

The proposals for amendments to MC 74/1 and PO/63/367 were circulated to the Delegations by the Executive Secretary on 15th October 1963 (RDC/63/388 and

Addendum of 21 October 1963) for consideration in agenda Item II. At the Council meeting on 16th October 1963 (C-R(63)60), the Council agreed to the establishment of a Special Working Group to begin by examining Enclosures 1 and 2 of MC 74/1 and to make concrete suggestions, if possible before the end of 1963, as to the action to be taken on these documents by the Council. It was evident from the proposals submitted and the discussion that the principal interest shown was in the operational evaluation and final selection and the financing of the equipment which would be selected for procurement.

The Special Working Group held its first meeting on 14th and 15th November 1963 to discuss the policy questions arising from the Working Group's terms of reference and examined the amendments proposed to Enclosures 1 and 2 of MC 74/1. The Council invited the International Staff to prepare a draft report to the Council for examination at its next meeting and entrusted a drafting group with the task of preparing a new version of certain paragraphs reflecting the various amendments proposed and the discussion which had taken place (AC/232-R/1).

The Secretary of the Special Working Group circulated the requested draft report to the Council on 2nd December 1963 including in brackets certain ideas which had been discussed following the first meeting with the International Staff by a few delegations (AC/232-D/1). A separate paper was circulated that same day containing a revised draft of proposed Annex A to the draft report with the amended language of the troublesome paragraphs in Enclosure 2 of MC 74/1. The new language would give effect to the evaluation and selection procedures recommended in the draft report (AC/232-D/2).

At its second meeting on 9th and 10th December 1963, the Special Working Group examined the draft report and requested the International Staff to prepare a new draft report revised on the basis of the modifications decided at the meeting. The Group agreed on the language of the proposals for recommendation to the Council. Any further suggestions were solicited--otherwise the report embodying the discussions would be considered final. However, the Group had not found it possible to agree on the question of proprietary rights at the meeting and a further session would be required (AC/232-R/2).

A revised version of the draft report was circulated (on 12th December) for comment or approval by 10th January 1964 (AC/232-D/1(Revised)). A flurry of comments and draft changes resulted in a compilation circulated on 17th January 1964 in time for consideration at the meeting scheduled for the 20th (AC/232-D/3). At that meeting the Working Group instructed a Technical Sub-Group to define the technical information needed to ensure compatibility of the various models of encryption equipment to be procured and to proposed new language for the proposed amendment to a particularly troublesome paragraph in Enclosure 2 to MC 74/1 (paragraph 18 of AC/232-R/3). At the same meeting the revised draft of the report was considered and further changes were to be incorporated into a further revised draft for consideration at a meeting scheduled for a few days later (paragraph 36 of AC/232-R/3). The second revised draft of the report was circulated on 22nd January (AC/232-D/1 (2nd Revise)). It attempted to make clearer the main differences between the procedure recommended by the Military

Committee and that favoured by the Working Group. Unresolved was the matter of financing of national terminals. That same day the Sub-Group circulated a report of its findings concerning the technical information required to ensure compatibility (AC/232-D/4).

By the end of the 4th meeting of the Special Working Group, the Chairman announced he was prepared to submit a report to the Council containing a covering report prepared in the light of the discussion, an Annex A containing the amendments to Enclosure 2 to MC 74/1, an Annex B setting out the procedures for the evaluation and selection of the equipment, and an Annex C, defining the technical information required to ensure compatibility. To prepare the final version of their report, a Drafting Sub-Group was tasked to prepare for circulation new language of the troublesome paragraph on proprietary rights which it was hoped would satisfy all of the members of the Special Working Group (paragraphs 36 and 37 of AC/232-R/4).

The Sub-Group met the afternoon of the 23rd January and its report was circulated the following day (AC/232-D/6). On the 25th the Secretary circulated the draft of a covering note to the report to the Council covering the issues and calling attention to the matters needing further consideration by other bodies (AC/232-D/5).

The “Report by the Special Working Group on NATO Communications Security Policy” was submitted to the Council on 19th February 1964 (C-M(64)11). An addendum was added to ensure that the definition on compatibility would also be include in the Council’s conclusions (Addendum dated 24.2.64).

Before the Report was presented to the Council, the Norwegian Delegation submitted a memorandum expressing its reservation over the language of the report as it affects the conclusion proposed for amending Enclosure 2 to MC 74/1 (AC/232-D/7, 4.3.64). The delay by the Council in taking up the Report permitted the U. S. Delegation to submit amendments to the language to shift to the Council the final selection of cryptographic equipment to serve as NATO standard rather than leaving this decision to “appropriate Committees of the Council” as indicated in the Report before the Council. Members of the Working Group--to whom a copy of the proposed amendments was circulated--were asked either to express their concurrence or to voice their desire for a further discussion at another meeting of the Special Working Group (AC/232-D/8, 10.3.64).

The amendments proposed by the US Delegation were accepted and incorporated in a revised version of the Report to the Council (C-M(64)11, 14.4.64) along with clarifying language submitted by the German Delegation in AC/232-D/9 (4.4.64). The Norwegian Delegation took the opportunity in discussion of the report in Council meeting to reiterate its position that the decision at this time should not affect any future requirements for cryptographic equipment for speech circuits and facsimile. And the Turkish Representative again confirmed its understanding that it reserved its right to ask for the common financing of the standard cryptographic equipment which would be needed for Turkish national units under the approved NATO communication plans. (C-R(64)20, meeting 22.4.64)

With the approval of the report by the Council, the Military Committee issued a final decision on MC 74/1 along with a Corrigendum to it on 13 May 1964. In that Final Decision paper (paragraph 11), the Infrastructure Committee and the Military Budget Committee were made responsible, inter alia, for:

- (a) establishing financial policy with respect to responsibility for funding;
- (b) programming, approval and control of funds to meet the communications needs of the Major NATO Commands.

The Chairman of the Military Budget Committee and the Acting Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee prepared a joint memorandum on 22nd February 1965 (MBC-M(65)63/AC/4-D/1764). (seen and agreed by SHAPE) laying out the TROL (Tapeless, rotorless on-line) teletypewriter cryptographic machine equipment procurement program.

The Consultants recommend without reservation the declassification and release of the 9 Documents and 4 Records of Meetings issued by the AC/232 Special Working Group. They are listed in Annex IX, 11, of this Report.

L. High-Level Working Group to Review Military Communications Requirements (AC/251)

At its meeting on 30th April 1963 (C-R(63)22) the Council considered a report by the Military Budget Committee in which that Committee expressed its concern over the constant increase in expenditures for military communications. The MBC recommended that an overall review of military communications requirements should be entrusted to a high-level working group comprising representatives of NATO (International Staff/Secretariat and Military Authorities), representatives of nations and, as required, representatives of host nation's post, telephone and telegraph organizations. The main task of this group would be to screen existing facilities and recommend appropriate measures for meeting the operational requirements of the Allied Command Europe in accordance with a coordinated plan and as economically as possible (C-M(63)23).

Consideration of the question of creation of such a group was deferred inasmuch as studies were under way which might produce recommendations with regard to the kind of NATO machinery which should study the problem referred to by the MBC. That group was the "Joint Meetings of the Civil Communications Planning Committee and the European Military Communications Co-Ordinating Committee and were still in progress in February 1965. A report from the Joint Meeting group was not likely before the end of 1965. [See the narrative description of the activities and records of the AC/244 "Joint Meeting of the CCPC and the EMCCC in Part VI of this Report.]

The MBC returned to the topic again in its 1964 report to the Council (C-M(64)87) where it called particular attention to the fact that the main increases in the military

budget (a 15% increase over the 1964 budget) was in the area of credits for communications (C-M(64)87). When discussing the MBC report at a meeting on 21st December 1964, the Council agreed that the high-level working group recommended by the Military Budget Committee in April 1963 should be constituted and submit its report to the Council as soon as possible (C-R(64)60, paragraph 14(3)).

The Secretary General circulated a memorandum on 24th April 1965 (PO(65)95) providing background information on the problem and setting out draft terms of reference for the High Level Working Group which would avoid overlapping with the work being carried out by the Joint Meeting Group (AC/244). The Council agreed to the Secretary General's suggestion that the High Level Working Group be chaired by the Deputy Secretary General and to the proposed terms of reference at its meeting on 10th March 1965 (C-R(65)11). A few days later the Secretary of the High Level Working Group to Review Military Communications Requirements (allocated AC/251) notified the concerned parties that the Working Group would hold its first meeting in April and called for nomination of representatives (AC/251-N/1, 16.3.65).

The Deputy Secretary General called the first meeting of the High Level Working Group together on April 22nd and 23rd, 1965. The meeting began with a briefing by the NATO military authorities on the present NATO communications systems and on their adequacy to meet present and future operational requirements. This briefing was to serve as a basis for a general exchange of views and for the preparation of the Group's programme of work (AC/251-N/2, 26.3.65 and Agenda at AC/251-A/1, 6.4.65). In advance of the meeting the International Staff prepared for circulation a background statistical analysis of the military communications requirements (AC/251-D/1, 7.4.65).

The texts of the briefings by the three major NATO Commands with appropriate diagrams and charts were later circulated to the participants (AC/251-D/2 through D/4). The High Level Working Group agreed on a programme of work which would require a cost-analysis (both under infrastructure and the military budget relating not only to systems but to tasks), and the submission by delegations of their positions on the information provided which would lead to an International Staff-prepared evaluation and synthesis of the national replies. The major NATO Commands were tasked to prepare presentations of their general concept of their long-term plans in the communication area for presentation at the Group's second meeting (AC/251-R/1).

The AC/251 High Level Working Group issued 14 Documents, 3 Records of Meetings, 5 Notices and 5 Working Papers between March 1965 and August 1966. Information on the Documents and Working Papers is provided in Annex IX, 12. The titles of those papers make clear the direction of the Working Group's efforts.

We recommend without reservation that all of the AC/251 record items be declassified and released to the public.