

**C. STANDING GROUP LIAISON OFFICE (SGLO)
STANDING GROUP REPRESENTATIVE (SGREP)
TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL**

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LONDON BRANCH OF THE STANDING GROUP, 1950-1951

The Director of the Standing Group addressed a memoranda to the International Working Teams (IWT) on 1st December 1950 on the subject of an SG Liaison Secretariat in London (DSGM-210-50¹). He noted that paragraph 34 of SG 70/17 contemplated the establishment of a secretariat in London for purposes of conducting liaison between the Standing Group and the Military Representatives in Washington on the one hand and with the North Atlantic Council Deputies (NACD), Military Production and Supply Board (MPSB) and Defence Financial and Economic Committee (DFEC) on the other. Anticipating acceptance of the recommendations in the SG paper by higher NATO bodies, the SG needed to be prepared to present detailed recommendations as to the membership and terms of reference for this secretariat. The Director requested the International Planning Staff composed of the team members that had worked on SG 70/17 to undertake the necessary study and to submit recommendations.

The Defence Committee agreed to the establishment of a small SG Liaison Secretariat in London for liaison with the Council Deputies, MPSB, DFEC, and other working committees as appropriate (DC 24/3 (Final) para 49(i)). But a report by a working party representing the SG and the SHAPE Advance Planning Group on "Phasing out of the European Regional Planning Groups" stated that the need for a SG liaison secretariat in London would not arise until the Regional Planning Group had been disbanded. That phasing out would not occur until SHAPE was established. At that time, however, in addition to their liaison functions, it would be necessary for this liaison secretariat to assume responsibility for acting as a central distribution center for NATO documents to the NACD and other NATO agencies in London (SG 103/2, 2.2.51; a COSMIC Sub-Registry was established in the London Branch SG Secretariat on 26.7.51, SGM-1189-51). But there were additional pressures to bring this matter forward in early 1951.

On 8th February 1951 the Director SG addressed a second memoranda to the IWT on the same subject as before. He noted that the Council Deputies in discussions had evidenced considerable interest in liaison between Council Deputies and the SG. During their discussion they had noted that no SG action had yet been taken to establish this liaison and it was suggested that the NACD should agree on a resolution stressing the importance of effective liaison. The Director requested the IWT to undertake "as a matter of priority" a study of this subject. He again asked that their

¹ Nearly all of the documents cited in this description of the London Branch of the Standing Group/SGLO in Paris are in the IMS Registry in decimal file 334/SG/NATA/320. Some of the earliest items are indexed on cards citing decimal 334/SG/LS/320, but these documents were subsequently incorporated into the 334/SG/NATA/320 file.

report include recommendations on the composition of the secretariat as well as the terms of reference (DSGM-22-51).

A "Report by the International Working Team to the Standing Group on Standing Group Liaison with the Council Deputies and other Permanent NATO Bodies" was submitted on 20th February 1951 (IWT 31, in decimal 334/SG/NACD/320). In this study the IWT noted that inasmuch as the SG was the steering and executive agency of the Military Representatives Committee, SG liaison with the agencies concerned should provide adequate liaison for MRC also.

The essence of the problem as they saw it was to establish an effective liaison between the SG/MRC and the Council Deputies without establishing a junior or assistant SG in London thereby abrogating some of the powers and responsibilities of the SG in Washington. The IWT presented alternative methods of achieving their objective and concluded that the most suitable liaison between the SG and the Council Deputies could be effected by the designation of an officer (French, U.K. or U.S.) of flag rank for a period of not less than six months at a time. This officer they proposed to be designated by the SG from each of the three SG nations in turn. They enclosed a draft terms of reference with their report.

A preliminary report on the subject of the establishment of a small liaison secretariat in London (referencing D.C. 24/3) was submitted to the Military Representatives Committee on 24th February 1951 (SGM-218-51). The memorandum described the proposed liaison arrangement with the Council Deputies, the DPB, the DFEC, and the other working committees. It asked the Military Representatives to consider whether such a secretariat could perform the liaison functions which would be required of it in connection with the expanding number of permanent NATO bodies in Europe in addition to its secretariat duties. Their views were to be discussed at the next meeting of the MRC.

A few days later the IWT submitted a revised paper (IWT 31/1, 26.2.51, in 334/SG/NACD/320) laying out alternatives and the views of each of the three SG nations along with revised terms of reference. It was for the SG to decide on the method whereby liaison was to be established. The revised IWT report, SG 112 of 27th February 1951, was further revised and submitted to the MRC as SG 112/1.

The MRC at its 6th Meeting on 15th March 1951 approved the establishment, "as soon as possible" of a London Branch Standing Group Secretariat. The proposal called for a Secretariat to be directly responsible to the SG Secretariat in the performance of the functions set forth in the terms of reference (in SG 112/3 (Final)).

To give effect to this decision, the Director SG requested that the SG Secretaries (addressees of DSGM-55-51) place before the SG a proposed organization for the London Branch Secretariat. He requested that this proposal include recommendations as to the number, rank and nationality of officers constituting the Secretariat; and

consider requirements for supporting personnel and space, and also the budget considerations.

The SG agreed on the form of liaison in April 1951. But it was not until 30th June 1951 that the Chairman of the Standing Group addressed a memorandum to Major General Richard C. Lindsay, USAF, following nomination by the U. S. Government, appointing him as Standing Group Liaison Officer (SGLO) to the North Atlantic Council Deputies and transmitted to him the terms of reference under which he would serve (CSGM-3-51, in 334/SG/NACD/320):

1. The SGLO to Council Deputies would be a member of the Staff of the SG.
2. He had a dual objective--he would present the approved positions of the SG to the Council Deputies and would keep the SG informed on those matters of interest to them which were under consideration by the Council Deputies or likely to be considered by them.
3. The Liaison Officer to the Council Deputies would have no power of decision.
4. The Liaison Officer would divide his time between Washington and London as appropriate to the accomplishment of his mission.
5. The SGLO personally would present to the SG problems involving military considerations on which the Council Deputies desired guidance.
6. At the direction of the SG the Liaison Officer would perform similar duties with the other NATO bodies in London.
7. When required, professional or technical assistance would be provided to the Liaison Officer from the staff of the SG in order to assist him in the discharge of these duties.
8. When in London, the Liaison Officer would use the facilities of the Western Europe Regional Planning Group Secretariat until such time as the London Branch, Standing Group Secretariat was established.

The SGLO soon established himself in London in space made available by the U.K. MOD near the Council.² A small staff of assistants provided by Standing Group nations formed the nucleus of his staff. The former Deputy Chief Secretary of the Western Europe Regional Planning Group Secretariat was appointed the head of the LBSG Secretariat (SGM-1269-51, 8.8.51).³ But the strain of providing liaison and support to the growing number of SG agencies and to NATO organizations in London and in Paris and to the Temporary Council Committee in the winter of 1951-52, made it apparent that enlargement of the mission and of the staff was imperative.⁴

² At 15, Belgrave Square, S.W. 1.

³ Major G. G. Stevens served as acting Secretary from early July 1951. Initially the Secretariat consisted of Stevens, a clerical officer, one stenographer and one woman in the registry (LBSG 3/51, 14.7.51). By the end of July 1951, there were 13 persons assigned to the LBSG Secretariat (LBSG 13/51, 24.7.51).

⁴ See LBSGs 56/51, 59/51, 76/51, 82/51, 3/52 and LOMs 5 and 6 listed in annexes to this Part.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF STANDING GROUP LIAISON OFFICE STAFF AND MOVE TO PARIS, 1952-1953

General Lindsay had not hesitated to state the growing requirements the Liaison Office was facing. When he was in Washington in March 1952 he assisted the SG in studying the Liaison Office requirements as they planned for the move to Paris (SG 112/6--based on LOM 5, SG 112/7, a post-Lisbon study on the matter, and LOM 6 which covered various recommendations for implementation). General Lindsay reported to his staff in London that he expected to have military positions fully established prior to his arrival back in London (SECLON 106, 7.3.52).

General Lindsay instructed the SGLO staff in London to continue planning on basis of an international secretariat and that French authorities would assure the provision upon arrival in Paris of the personnel recommended in LOM 5, and that the addition of another Deputy Liaison Officer had been approved. He further instructed them to take into account the furnishing of the military staff requirements to participate in the "TCC type" annual review by the Military Representatives to the SG. These temporary staff assignees would function under the Liaison Officer. General Lindsay also asked his staff to include in their plans a minimum of one planning team on temporary duty as well as for conference rooms for ad hoc groups. These requirements would fall within those of temporary duty requirements for special projects and could be considered complementary to the "TCC type" review project. He wanted the draft study ready by 18th March 1952.

By 3rd April 1952 the IPT had prepared a report on the new requirements (IPT 31/4), "Selection of the Senior Liaison Officer, His Deputies and Assistants for Standing Group Liaison Office at New NATO Headquarters" (circulated to the Military Representatives in MRM-23-52, both in decimal 334/SG/NATA/320). The study was based on the SG's decisions in SG 112/9 (Final) (27.3.52) that the new SGLO should initially consist of a senior liaison officer, three deputies and at least three assistants. The study then examined the problem of developing a method for the selection of the liaison officers for the SGLO at the new NATO Headquarters.

The Senior Liaison Officer and two of the deputies were to be selected from the SG nations. Each nation would provide one of the three. The deputy from the nation in line to provide the next Senior Liaison Officer would be selected with the view that he would move to the senior position.

The third Deputy Liaison Officer was to be selected from among the nations not represented on the SG. Nominations for this position would normally be made by the national holding the chair of the Military Committee. The assistant liaison officers would be drawn from among all of the NATO nations. These appointments were to be made by the Standing Group acting upon the nominations submitted after consulting with the Military Representatives and the Senior Liaison Officer as appropriate. Nominations were to fall successively to the nations in alphabetical order beginning with the nation furnishing the third Deputy Liaison Officer. Their tour of duty was to be not less than one

year nor greater than two years. Whenever possible nominees for the liaison officer positions were to be graduates of the NATO Defense College (MRM-23-52, paragraphs 3-9).

A list of the staff officers of the SG Liaison Office in Paris on 26th June 1952 (and the date they joined) is provided in DSGM-83-52:

Senior Liaison Officer:	
Rear Admiral R. M. Dick (UK)	15 Apr 52
Deputy Liaison Officers:	
Col. Dwight O. Monteith (USAF)	15 May 52
Col. Henri Mesnet (FR Army)	19 May 52
Brig. Gen. Van Rolleghem (BEAF)	27 May 52
Assistant Liaison Officers:	
Commander C. ter Poorten (NE Navy)	23 May 52
Col. Ugo Vicenzi (ITAF)	28 May 52
Lt. Col. Paul Strande (NO Army)	15 Jul 52
Secretary	
Lt. Col. Fernand Francois (FR Army)	1 May 52
Assistant Secretary	
Capt. Dennis L. Glass (UK Army)	23 May 52
Personal Assistant to Liaison Officer	
Lt. Rex L. Baseden (UK Navy)	27 May 52

The Non-SG member nations providing a liaison officer staff member were expected also to furnish one enlisted man or civilian for clerical (and if possible stenographic) and typing duties (DSGM-52-52, 22.4.52). The non-host SG nations were to furnish one clerical and two shorthand typists. France, as the "host country" was to provide a number of additional support positions (designated in SGM-910-52, 25.4.52). Admiral Dick requested and received one more English-speaking clerk for the Library part of the Office (in addition to the clerical library position provided by France, DSGM-107-52, 16.7.52 and DSGM-109-52, 18.7.52, amendments to enclosure to SGM-910-52).

By 29th October 1952 the Secretariat for the SGLO consisted of 2 officers, 6 clerks, 2 messengers, several security guards and 2 typists (with a third one expected to arrive soon). The Secretariat later appealed for authorization for an additional officer and 3 clerks from the French MOD and one chief clerk to run the COSMIC Sub-Registry-a position which Admiral Dick would obtain from London (Memo from Secretary SGLO to Secretary SG, 29.10.52).

The growth and development of the SGLO in Paris sufficiently concerned the SG that it ordered the Director of the Standing Group, Brigadier R. H. Barry, to visit Paris to examine the situation and to make recommendations concerning the organization of the SGLO. His report was submitted on 19th January 1953 (DSGM-221-52 and DSGM-5-53).

General Barry made several assumptions in preparing his report.

1. The necessity for temporary reinforcements of the liaison staff by officers from Washington must be reduced to the minimum.
2. Any increase in staff should be kept to the minimum and should not lead to any danger of converting the SGLO into a shadow SG
3. The liaison staff must remain the instrument of the SG and no more.
4. The integrated international character of the liaison staff, representing all NATO nations, must be maintained.

He made several organizational recommendations: That the SGLO present holder should be promoted to three-star rank; that there should be an Executive to the SGLO: that it should be filled by the present U. S. Deputy Liaison Officer; and that there should be an Operational Section and a Logistics Section. To fill the first of these positions, he recommended the Belgian Deputy Liaison Officer should head the Operational Section with the Netherlands and Norwegian Assistant Liaison Officers and one additional officer from Washington assigned to it. He recommended that the French Deputy Liaison Officer should head the Logistics Section to be staffed with a replacement from Washington for the Italian Deputy Liaison Officer and one additional officer from Washington.

General Barry concluded that this staff could handle all the work required with, at peak periods of the annual review, reinforcements from Washington which should not exceed two officers, one from the International Planning Team and the other from the Logistics and Materials Planners.

The Director also called for changes in the Secretariat of the SGLO's office in line with his proposals for reorganization so as to provide one senior secretary and two assistant secretaries dealing with operational and logistical sections respectively. He recommended that all of these changes should be made as soon as possible and the organization outlines should be put into full effect immediately after the next Council meeting. Finally he asked the SG to agree in principle that arrangements should be made so that any future officers appointed to the staff of the SGLO should have previously served on the staff of the Military Representatives Committee or of the Standing Group in Washington.

When Admiral Dick, the SGLO, was asked to comment on the proposals sent to him for comment (SGM-196-53), he submitted a plan closely paralleling that in Brigadier Barry's proposal. It too called for two Deputy Liaison Officers responsible each for operations and for logistics. The third Deputy was to head an Executive Organization which would be responsible for coordinating of the work and ensuring the efficient administration of the office. This Deputy would act as the Executive Officer (but without that title) and should speak the same language as the SGLO. The Secretariat--under a Secretary--would work directly under the Executive Deputy and would be structured with an Assistant Secretary for each of the two sections. Admiral Dick particularly insisted that the division of duties should be expressed in broad terms with the details left to the SGLO to decide as circumstances dictated. He felt that during annual review there

would be a need for only one IPT and one LMP officer be sent from Washington to augment his staff (SGM-232-53, 12.2.53).

The Director's report and recommendations and Admiral Dick's comments were accepted by the SG. The SGLO promptly requested the filling of the additional positions (LOSTAN 394, 21 February 1953). The request was considered (in SGM-245-53, 27.2.53) and all but two positions were authorized. On the 2nd of March 1953, the Military Representatives to the SG received a memoranda (MRM-12-53) on "Modification of the SGLO to the North Atlantic Council to accommodate the requirements of the Annual Review."

On 20th March a memo was sent to the Portuguese Military Representative asking him to provide an army officer of the rank of colonel or lieutenant colonel to serve in the Logistics Liaison Section of the SGLO staff and a clerk to fill the assignment of Registry Clerk (MRM-19-53). The same day a memoranda was addressed to the Military Representatives of Belgium, Italy, Netherlands and Norway to provide for the assignment of the additional clerks agreed for the SGLO staff. The tours of the clericals assigned were to be scheduled to terminate with the assignment of the SGLO staff officer from that country (MRM-20-53).

STANDING GROUP LIAISON OFFICE DEVELOPMENTS, 1954-1957

Staffing and coordinating the annual review exercise on behalf of the SG through the SGLO at NATO Headquarters was a continuing problem. It was exhausting and very demanding work which severely stressed the officers assigned. When Admiral Dick discussed informally with the Standing Group on 24th November 1954, the question of the reorganization and augmentation of the Annual Review Staff in the SGLO, the Chairman asked that his proposal be put in writing for discussion during the SG's visit to Paris in December. Admiral Dick's proposed reorganization was submitted on 13th December 1954 (LOM 94/54).

The proposal called for an additional Deputy to the Standing Group Liaison Officer (in grade of Brigadier), taken from an SG Country, who would handle the Annual Review questions, and the provision of one extra officer to support him. Under this plan the SGLO would continue to be served by a Deputy acting as Executive Deputy as before, one Deputy for Logistics and one Deputy for General Liaison. Inasmuch as Admiral Dick was soon to be replaced by Lieutenant General Georges de Buretel de Chasse (French Air Force), he suggested that the proposal be circulated for consideration, through not for decision, when the SG was in Paris so that it could be discussed before his departure if the SG so desired.

General de Chasse's comments on the proposal were enclosed with Admiral Dick's proposal (Annex 2 to LOM 94/54). After only three month's experience in the SGLO, he endorsed several of Admiral Dick's plans.

Nearly a year later General de Chassey described to the SG a very different organization than that proposed by Admiral Dick in 1954 for the SGLO's Annual Review effort for 1956 (LOM 73/55, 13.10.55). His approach was to set up a working team of three officers on the same basis as the IPTs in the Standing Group. In principle this team would ensure representation of the three Standing Group countries and of the three Armed Services (Air, Ground and Navy). At the same time one of its members would be specialized in problems concerning SACLANT, another for SACEUR's problems and a third in matters pertaining to the Standing Group.

General de Chassey proposed that the three team members have approximately the same rank and should be able to understand the whole procedure of the Annual Review.

Each member was to act as the chairman for the review of five countries and would at the same time follow the work of the other members of the team. The overall direction and coordination between the different tasks would be the responsibility of the SGLO's Executive Deputy. He suggested that this organization would have the advantage of providing good representation of the three Services and of the three Standing Group countries; better insurance in case an officer was unavailable; and would fortuitously parallel the organization of the work being done in the Standing Group in Washington.

General de Chassey put his approved proposal in a staff memoranda on 8th March 1956 (SGLO AR Memo No. 14/56, Terms of Reference of the Annual Review Team), which established an "Annual Review Team" which would be responsible for the 1956 Annual Review effort. In 1956 the Annual Review Team was composed of:

Col. Glain	French Army
Wing Commander O'Neill	UKAF
Commander Johnson	US Navy

The team was responsible to the Executive Deputy for initiating, monitoring and coordinating all activities in respect to the annual review for which the SGLO was responsible. In carrying out this task the team was required to maintain close liaison with the SGLO and with all appropriate NATO and national agencies, both civilian and military, concerned with the annual review.

The Annual Review Team was directed to function on a joint basis and to appoint a spokesman for briefings and meetings on specific subjects. All work presented to the Executive Deputy by the designated spokesman for approval was to be the result of the joint effort by the team.

General responsibilities for action by each member of the team were to be on a dual basis:

- (a) Functional -- for all matters concerned with his own service as affecting all NATO countries; and
- (b) Geographical -- for all matters concerning the respective military efforts of a group of countries assigned to him.

General de Chassey was unhappy with the result of his reorganization and in April 1957 directed a further reorganization. The Annual Review Team ceased to exist as such and the duties of "monitoring officers" were spread evenly between all of the Assistant Officers, thus reverting to the system in force in 1954 and 1955 (LOM 2/58, paragraph 3).

The normal tour of the Standing Group Liaison Officer was two years. In 1956, however, Secretary General Lord Ismay in a letter to the Chairman of the Standing Group, proposed to ask the French Government to allow General de Chassey to remain on active duty as SGLO for a further year.⁵ All the SG members approved, but stipulated his tour was not to exceed a total of three years (STAND 1468 [described in a Note for the Record, 22.3.56, "Decisions taken by the Standing Group on 20 March 1956 on Relief of the Standing Group Liaison Officer"]).

The title of the Standing Group Liaison Officer changed in 1956. The SG Steering Committee first discussed the question of the desirability of changing the title of the SGLO at its 281st Meeting on 7th August 1956 (Record-SC-281st Meeting, Item 5). The Standing Group also discussed the topic at its meeting on 8th August 1956 (Record-SG-289th Meeting, Item 4). In a study by the SG Secretariat on 17th August 1956, a recommendation was made to the SG to take no action at that time to change the title of the SGLO but to refer the question to the IPC then studying the reorganization of the higher military structure of NATO. They were tasked to include this problem as part of their overall study. The SG Secretariat also suggested that the SGLO be informed that the problem was under active study by the SG.

In making their recommendation the Secretariat noted (para 11,c of SECY/9/56),
 Changing the title of the SGLO to "Standing Group Representative" might enhance his prestige and facilitate his relationships vis-a-vis the civilian authorities with whom he is working constantly.

The Director SG approved the report by the Secretariat and included the report in the Steering Committee agenda for consideration at their next meeting (DSGM-14-56, 17.8.56). When the Secretariat paper was discussed by the SG Steering Committee at its meeting on 23rd August (Record-SC-283rd Meeting, Item 2), the Committee decided to request General de Chassey to submit his views on the matter (STAND 1629). After receiving his views the report should be forwarded to the SG for consideration. General de Chassey responded in LOSTAN 1797 on 29th August 1956.

The Standing Group informed General de Chassey that effective 25th December 1956 the title of SGLO was to be changed to "Standing Group Representative" with the short title "SGREP" (STASEC 3994, 20.12.56).

STANDING GROUP REPRESENTATIVE (SGREP) BRIEFING PAPER, MAY 1957

⁵ No copy of the letter from the Secretary General seems to have survived in either the IS or IMS Registry.

The Standing Group Representative, General de Chassey, furnished to the new Secretary General, M. Spaak, on 20th May 1957, a set of briefing papers. An English translation of those papers was provided to the SG for comment and to afford them an opportunity to "set him right if he has mistaken Standing Group thinking on any particular point" (LOM 38/57, 23.5.57).

The first set of briefs covered twelve topics:

1. Political Principles
2. The Strategic Implementation
3. SACEUR's Study
4. Annual Review 1957
6. NATO Military Structure
7. Allied Exercises and Manoeuvres
8. Military Relationships between NATO and WEU
9. Infrastructure
10. Communications
11. NATO Defence College
12. Military Budget.

A few weeks later the SGREP provided Secretary General Spaak with two additional briefs. The first concerned "Alert Measures" and the second, "National Military Service" (LOM 43/57, 26.6.57).

1. Political Principles. When presenting the brief on political principles, General de Chassey summarized the basic principles of the North Atlantic Treaty on which the military functions of the Alliance are based as:

- an armed attack against one of the members is an attack against all,
- the members are going to resist such an attack, separately and jointly,
- the members are going to develop their collective capacity to resist attack,
- the Treaty defined the specific area which the members will defend.

He then proceeded to outline certain applications of these principles, particularly stressing the strategic direction of NATO and the military structure of the Alliance.

2. The Strategic Implication. General de Chassey reminded the Secretary General that in December 1956 the Council issued a new Political Directive to the NATO military authorities (C-M(56)138 (Final)). The Standing Group had already begun conducting its periodic reviews of NATO military planning in mid-1956 and was revising the overall strategic guidance to the Major NATO Commanders. Further work on this document was deferred, however, pending receipt of the new Political Directive. Early in 1957 the military authorities (Military Committee) completed the revision of two basic documents, "Overall Strategic Concept for the Defence of the NATO Area" (MC 14/2(Revised) 21.2.57) and "Measures to Implement the Strategic Concept" (MC 48/2, 15.3.57). The NATO Permanent Council approved these documents on 9th May 1957. These two papers formed the basis for further military planning.

The SGREP recorded that when the Permanent Council approved these two papers it did so with certain reservations. Some members were reluctant to endorse fully the strategic concept until they had had an opportunity to study SACEUR's report. But, he noted, SACEUR's report would be based on the strategic concept and that changes in this strategic concept result only from the changes in the Political Directive provided by the Council. The SGREP also noted that one of the most controversial issues raised in these papers was that of the estimated length of the war. Much depended on this both in the civil and military defence field; for example, the pattern of forces and the relative importance between retaliatory and shield forces.

The third basic document, an MC report to the Council on military planning factors had been expected to be issued in June 1957, but it was delayed and (in May 1957) was expected to be issued in the autumn of 1957 (MC 55/1 was not issued until April 1958).

The fourth basic document was the paper on the "Minimum Essential Force Requirements, 1958-1963" (MC 70) which in May 1957 was still being reviewed. (The reasons for delay are described in the following section. It was not ready for MC consideration until late January 1958, approved by the MC in March 1958, and a final decision on it by the MC was made on 9th May 1958.)

3. SACEUR's Study. By way of introducing the topic of SACEUR's Study, General de Chassey provided a short background note. He explained that when the Western European Union Council met on 18th March 1957 to discuss the proposed reduction in the United Kingdom forces stationed on the mainland of Europe, they concluded by recommending to the NATO Council that it should study urgently the proposals made by the German Chancellor for a new overall review of the resources of the Alliance (C-M(57)41). An extension of the matters to be considered was amplified by the inclusion of questions raised by Professor Hallstein in a statement made to the Council (C-M(57)46).

The Council agreed to undertake the study and referred the political and financial questions to the Committee of Economic Advisers. It wished General Norstad, SACEUR, to deal personally with the military questions. The Standing Group endorsed this decision but noted the need for necessary coordination with the other senior Commanders. The Council invited member nations to submit additional questions for SACEUR's consideration and France and Germany did so.

SACEUR's report was to be submitted simultaneously to the Standing Group and to the Permanent Council. The Standing Group was committed to furnish its comments to the Council at the earliest possible moment.

In commenting on this issue, the SGREP noted that SACEUR's study would in effect be stating his military requirement for the future. Before the Council's request for this study, General Norstad was already committed to submitting to the Standing Group an estimate of his force requirements. That report on force requirements had been due in May, but because of the complexity of the current study it was delayed until the autumn.

The consolidated report on force requirements for all of NATO, MC 70, could not proceed until the SACEUR study was completed. (Presentations by the three Supreme Commanders on their minimum essential force requirements were made to the MC in Chiefs of Staff Session at its 19th Meeting, 13-14.3.58. These presentations were circulated in MCM-39-58).

4. Annual Review 1957. The implications of the new Political Directive, strategic planning and new thinking on force requirements were having particularly strong impact on the 1957 Annual Review. In his brief on this topic, General de Chassesey provided a brief background statement in order to make clear the changes which were occurring.

Responsibility for the Annual Review was vested in the Council with the Annual Review Committee responsible for its execution. The 1957 Annual Review was to be the sixth since its inception in 1952.

From the military point of view, up to this time the review had consisted of a comparison of national force contributions, current and planned as revealed in country replies to detailed questionnaires, together with military guidance issued in fairly general terms by the NATO military authorities. The NATO military authorities then framed comments and recommendations on each national program and on the defence situation of the Alliance as a whole designed to identify weaknesses and to remedy them. At the end of the exercise firm force commitments were given to the major NATO Commanders for planning purposes, and continuity in the defence planning of the Alliance was maintained.

These developments in 1956-57 had a considerable impact on the Annual Review for 1957. The proper balance between "new" weapons and "classical" weapons in the shield forces, and the means to be adopted to introduce these new weapons into NATO forces were important aspects of the Annual Review in 1957. The solution to these problems was a key concern of the studies which were (in May 1957) still underway and were outside the normal Annual Review process.

In his comment on the current situation the SGREP noted that the situation had resulted in a general feeling of uncertainty about future military guidance. It also had given rise to doubts about the practicability of an Annual Review being conducted in 1957. However, the NATO military authorities had stressed at all times the principle that changes in size and nature of forces must take place gradually, in an evolutionary manner and that no radical short-term revision could be expected. On their recommendation the Council agreed to a classic type of review for 1957 inasmuch as (a) it was the only source of firm commitments by nations concerning force contributions and basic planning data; and (b) it provided for the essential continuity required for the defence planning of the Alliance.

When the SGREP wrote his statement on the current status of the 1957 Annual Review that spring, he noted that the major commanders had already issued detailed military guidance to each country. This guidance was in general conformity with their

recommendations on "Minimum Force Requirements"--the final decisions on which would not be forthcoming for many more months. This would produce the most accurate and up to date basis for national authorities to prepare their military parts of the 1957 Annual Review. Visiting teams were being sent by the Supreme Commanders in June and July to each capital to discuss and to explain the guidance to the national military authorities.

The delays being experienced and the additional process of visits from Supreme Commanders would result in the review running about six weeks later than usual, but the military authorities hoped to make up for the lost time and have a final report ready for consideration at the Ministerial Meeting of the Council in December. This would be accomplished in part by simplifying the reports and by posting reinforcements from the Standing Group in Washington to Paris beginning in September.

General de Chassey concluded this brief by alerting the Secretary General to the strong likelihood that several countries would probably fail to provide the full range of information requested in the Annual Review Questionnaire. While some delays are common each year, the concern voiced in some countries to planning beyond 1958 meant that a number of countries would likely find it difficult to define the forces required in the following years. The military authorities of NATO remained convinced that the 1957 Annual Review should be as comprehensive as possible despite the likelihood that there would be some limitations in its scope. He reported that the majority of delegations had agreed to this approach and discussion in this matter was continuing. The SGREP referred the Secretary General to the Report on the Annual Review - General Chapter (C-M(56)132, Part I) and parts of two reports by the Secretary General of Progress during the period 1952-1957 (C-M(57)60, pp. 43-48 and C-M(57)61, pp. 24-30) for further information on this topic.

5. NATO Military Structure. The SGREP opened this brief by noting that the NATO military structure had undergone no fundamental changes since June 1951 when SHAPE was established. However, the Military Representatives Committee and the Standing Group were together studying possible changes in the structure, based on two principles:

- a) equitable sharing of the responsibilities of coordination and direction in the military field for all partners;
- b) closer cooperation among the military, political and economic agencies of the Alliance.

General de Chassey identified some of the most frequently voiced criticisms of the present higher military structure as the lack of a single supreme allied direction, the insufficiency of the contacts between the Standing Group and the Council, the national character of the Standing Group, and the multiplicity of command organizations. He then proceeded to describe, to chart and to list the current incumbents of all of the elements making up NATO's higher military direction, commands and subordinate elements and agencies (Appendix and Annexes 1-11 to LOM 38/57).

The SGREP concluded the appended note on the NATO Military Structure, with a short discourse on the "Reorganization of the Higher Military Structure" (Section IV of Appendix). By way of background, he noted that for years there had been dissatisfaction expressed in both military and political circles of NATO over the organization of the higher military structure. The criticism was based on two factors: the separation of the political and the military organs between Paris and Washington; and the existence of a military body, the Standing Group, which gave a special position to three of the fifteen NATO nations in the military field.

At the 15th Meeting of the MC in Chiefs of Staff Session in December 1956 the MC agreed that it was opportune to make certain improvements and changes in the organization. The majority held that changes should be progressive and evolutionary in nature, rather than revolutionary, in order to avoid any major crisis during the period of changeover. The MC made decisions that further study should be based on two principles: (a) responsibility and share of coordination and direction in the military field was to be on an equitable basis for all partners; and (b) achievement of a closer cooperation among the military and political and economic agencies of the Alliance was desirable. They directed the Standing Group, in conjunction with the Military Representatives Committee, to begin initiating implementing changes (Record 15th MC/CS, Item 9).

By March 1957 the SG and MRC had prepared a report on four recommended improvements on higher NATO military structure (MC 71). The SGREP characterized these proposals as "relatively minor" and dealing with closer SG-MRC relations in Washington, more frequent visits of the SG and its staff to Paris and International Staff visits to Washington ("Current Status," paragraph 13 of Appendix to NATO Military Structure portion of Briefs for the Secretary General, LOM 38/57). Other outstanding proposals concerned the further internationalization of the SG staff and the increase in the number of SG agency positions available to be filled by individuals of any NATO nationality (such as Commandant of the NATO Defence College). A study of further proposals was submitted by the SG in early May 1957 (MC 71/1).

General de Chassey also reported to the Secretary General that at CPX 7 in May 1957, Field Marshal Montgomery (Deputy Supreme Commander Europe) expressed his personal views of the inadequacy of the current higher military structure and his personal views on how it should be altered (DSAC 1705/7). The SG was present on that occasion but there was no opportunity for general discussion. (General Montgomery's proposals were studied in a further report by the SG to the MC, published as MC 71/2 in June 1957).

The remaining briefs submitted by the SGREP to the Secretary General in May and June 1957 consisted of one to three page summaries of the problems and current status of these topics. The most relevant documents concerning the topics were referenced.

ANNUAL HISTORY OF THE OFFICE OF THE STANDING GROUP REPRESENTATIVE, 1957

The annual history of the Office of the Standing Group Representative covering 1957 was submitted (in compliance with the requirement imposed by SGM-405-56, 5.6.56) on 17th January 1958 as LOM 2/58⁶. This four-page report was divided into the two prescribed parts: "Organization" and "Functions." Three annexed charts showed the organization and principle officers assigned as of 1st January 1957 and the changes brought about by two reorganizations (effective on 5th April and 1st October).

General de Chassey, who had served as Standing Group Representative from 1st January 1955, retired from active military service on 30th September 1957. He was succeeded by Major General Theodore W. Parker, U. S. Army, who had been acting as Deputy for General Liaison in the Office of the SG Representative from July 1956.

The April 1957 reorganization resulted in the retitling of the position of Deputy for General Liaison to that of Deputy for Policy; and, as noted above, the Annual Review Team ceased to exist. The reorganization on 1st October 1957 coincided with the succession of General Parker. General de Brigade Georges Glain (after promotion) became Deputy for Policy, replacing Maj. Gen. Parker. There was an interchange of certain duties between the Policy and Logistics Sections; the officers of Policy and Logistics Sections began to work generally in teams of two to achieve greater flexibility; and there was a wider delegation of responsibilities within the Secretariat in order to lighten the administrative duties of the officers.

Under the "Functions" heading the report briefly outlined the Office's general responsibilities as including continuing to meet the requirements set out in SG 112/11 to effect a smooth relationship between the North Atlantic Council and the Standing Group. The SG Representative maintained close contact with the Council, the Secretary General, and his Deputies and Assistants. He attended or was represented by one or more Deputies at all types of Council Meetings held during the year. Officers of his staff worked closely with members of the International Staff and of the National Delegations and attended numerous committee meetings to present the approved military viewpoint and to report on a wide variety of subjects.

The major highlight of the year was the December meeting of the Heads of Government of all the NATO nations and their staffs in a four-day session at the NATO Headquarters in the Palais de Chaillot. The Heads of Government meeting was preceded by a

⁶ The first SGLO Annual Report covering 1956, is filed in the IMS Registry Subject/Decimal 314.7. There was no covering memoranda attached and it bears no serial reference number, but has been annotated by hand, "SGLO MISC 14." In 1956 the SG directed the establishment of records management programs within each agency under its supervision. In order to facilitate the functioning of this program by removing excess public information and general historical material from the central records of each agency and at the same time provide for an adequate and rounded record and history of each agency for permanent retention, each agency was instructed to prepare an annual history of that agency (SGM-405-56 (Revised), 2.7.56).

Military Committee meeting. Thus the national Chiefs of Staff, the Standing Group and the Major NATO Commanders were all in Paris and in a position to attend parts of the meeting of the Heads of Government.

The Annual History provided a litany of items of major concern to the Political Section in 1957:

- Annual Review
- Disarmament Commission discussions
- Reduction of British Forces in Germany
- Promulgation of military documents needed for the implementation of the Political Directive (C-M(56)138 (Final))
- Organization of the Higher Military Structure of NATO
- Communication of information and military opinion to the W.E.U.

(LOM 2/58, paragraph 10)

This was followed by a litany of main items concerning the Logistics Section:

- Status of infrastructure program ceiling and subjects directly relating to:
 - Excess of cost estimates
 - Suspension lists
 - Funding of future infrastructure
 - Overheads and taxes
- Ninth Slice infrastructure
- Progress on the implementation of common infrastructure
- Financing of urgent rehabilitation of airfields pavements
- Maintenance and operation
- Air weapons training installation
- Forward Scatter and Early Warning Systems
- Budget ceilings

(LOM 2/58, paragraph 11)

Other items of concern to the Logistics Sections were:

- Petroleum planning--increased activity in the field of stockpiling in the first six months of 1957 following the Suez crisis.
- Provision of communications in peacetime--budgetary difficulties arising out of the need for vital wartime circuits to be available to SACEUR in peacetime.
- Maritime patrol aircraft--the formation of a Special Group to study coordinated production.
- AGARD--informal discussions to increase cooperation with NATO civil agencies culminating in the formation of a Joint Working Group to make proposals.
- Turkish-Greek communications--the preparation of a report for the Council following the inability to meet national communications commitments.
- Scientific and technical cooperation--study and comparison of the several proposals made by various bodies and nations.

(LOM 2/58, paragraph 12)

The Secretariat was especially concerned during 1957 with administrative arrangements for visiting groups, including those persons attending meetings of the Heads of Governments, the Annual Review IPT, the Standing Group/Military Committee, SACLANT, the Meteorological Committee, and those attending the NATO fall exercises. These arrangements included transport, office accommodation, hotel accommodations, and dissemination of information (LOM 2/58, paragraph 13).

ANNUAL HISTORY OF THE OFFICE OF THE STANDING GROUP REPRESENTATIVE, 1958

The Secretary of the Office of the Standing Group Representative forwarded four copies of the 1958 Annual Report to the Secretary of the Standing Group on 19th February 1959 (LOM 13/59).

The "Organization" portion of the Annual History for 1958 noted that the Standing Group Representative, Major General T. W. Parker, had continued in that position throughout the year (he assumed the post on 1st October 1957). All three Deputy Standing Group Representatives were replaced during the year (with the Italian Air Force Deputy being replaced by a Netherland Army Deputy), and the five Assistant Standing Group Representatives were replaced by just four officers. Enclosed with the history was an organization table identifying the principle officers as of 31st December 1958.

In describing the Offices' activities under the "Functioning" heading, the report noted that the year 1958 was marked by an appreciable increase in the activity of most of the bodies subordinate to the Council and particularly in the Scientific and Research, Development and Production fields. At peak times it had become difficult to provide officers to represent the Standing Group at all of the meetings in progress. As a consequence the Standing Group Representative had taken steps to request the filling of the vacancy of an Assistant which he had earlier decided not to fill in an effort to economise in personnel.

The 1958 history then described the activities in three areas which occupied more of the time of the staff than others, and/or in which significant problems and difficulties were encountered.

Annual Review. As a direct consequence of MC 70 and of the general desire to make the 1958 Annual Review of greater importance than those of previous years, all stages of the procedure occupied much of the time of the Office during the year. Greater responsibility had been delegated to the Standing Group Representative for the Examining Sessions. The staff needed to be augmented by representatives of the Supreme Commanders during the Autumn and the Standing Group Representative himself became preoccupied with this subject, often to the exclusion of other matters.

Infrastructure. The programmed introduction of new weapons into NATO defence and the consequent need for more money, resulted in experiencing considerable difficulties in most aspects of infrastructure. The Council and the Infrastructure Committee

embarked on a long and inconclusive (as of the end of 1958) series of discussions on: (a) which of the facilities for these new weapons was eligible for NATO common financing; (b) what, if any, financial savings could be made from past uncompleted projects; and (c) how to meet the financial requirements of the future. The Office had experienced an ever increasing demand by the NATO civilian authorities for more military information and advice on these matters. Infrastructure was a major preoccupation of the Standing Group Representative and parts of his staff throughout the year, but particularly in the second half of the year.

Research, Development and Production. The establishment by the Council of the Joint Working Group on Cooperation in the Field of Armaments, and the formation of a number of working groups and other bodies to study individual problems in the production field, gave added responsibilities to the Office staff. It absorbed an appreciable amount of its time, both in formal meetings and in informal discussions with the International Staff, particularly since the views of the Standing Group on the organizational questions involved were in direct conflict with those of the International Staff and some delegations.

MEMORANDA AND MESSAGES SENT BY THE LONDON BRANCH STANDING GROUP (LBSG and LONSEC), 1951-1952

The London Branch of the Standing Group Secretariat sent just over 100 memoranda to the Standing Group in Washington, to various Regional Planning Groups, and to various offices and officials in London between the time of its establishment in July 1951 and its closure and removal to Paris in March 1952. These memoranda, bearing the serial indicator "LBSG", primarily concerned administrative, facilitative, personnel and organizational matters. They are of historical interest for the evidence they provide of the day-to-day development of the various functions of the SG's liaison representative's office; its working-level relations with the Council Deputies and other NATO agencies; its assumption of secretariat, messenger, registry and library responsibilities from the Western Europe Regional Planning Group Secretariat; and its services to the SG agencies located in London.

Copies of the LBSG memoranda addressed to the SG Secretariat were not indexed upon receipt in Washington. None seem to have survived the weeding of the MC/SG subject decimal file in the custody of the IMS Registry.

Copies of all of the LBSG memoranda retained in serial order in the records of the SGLO in Paris and transferred to the NATO International Staff Central Archives were microfilmed in 1989 on NISCA Roll 11. They are listed in this report in Annex XI, 4/1.

Cable messages sent by the LBSG Secretariat to the SG Secretariat in Washington were despatched in a series bearing the reference indicator, "LONSEC". Index cards of these messages were prepared in Washington. There were over 200 such messages sent between 16th July 1951 and 10th April 1952. Most of these also have

been destroyed. They have not been listed at this time. They relate to many of the same topics as the memoranda described above and listed in Annex XI, 4/1.

MEMORANDA SENT BY THE STANDING GROUP LIAISON OFFICE IN PARIS (SGLP), 1952-1955.

Following its removal to Paris in May 1952, the Standing Group Liaison Office Secretariat continued to produce numerous memoranda addressed to national authorities of France (largely concerning its facilities and staff in Paris), to the SG Agencies in Paris and London, to SHAPE, and to the NATO civil authorities. These memoranda, bearing the serial indicator "SGLP," continued to concern administrative, facilitative and organizational matters.

With the establishment of a permanent Council with a Secretary General and International Staff supporting a growing number of Council created committees the mission of the Standing Group's Liaison Officer grew in importance. Consequently the purport of a great many of the SGLP memoranda was to convey to the various civil and military authorities the views and decisions of the Standing Group and of the higher NATO Military Authorities on every issue of concern to them. Many were in response to questions posed to the military authorities. Others sought clarification of issues on behalf of the military authorities in order to obtain a fuller understanding of the requirements of the Council and of the various NATO civil structures.

The Consultants have entered into the IMS database format the titles or descriptions of the contents of several thousand SGLP produced in the Standing Group Liaison Office between 1952 and 1955. This information is taken from the nearly complete serial set of SGLP which was transferred to the custody of the International Staff Central Registry and microfilmed in 1991 on NISCA Rolls 5 and 6. Every substantive memoranda was included in this listing in Annex XI, 4/2. Deliberately omitted were the most routine unclassified and RESTRICTED memoranda concerning security passes, employment, service acknowledgements and honors, billing and accounts, parking and canteen privileges, and document destruction certificates. Time was not available to permit the Consultants to complete the lists through 1958 as planned.

Memoranda in the SGLP series were not addressed to the Standing Group in Washington (such memoranda, LOM, are described in the immediately following subsection). Copies can sometimes be found in the IMS Registry as they were occasionally enclosed as annexes to LOM.

Many SGLP were addressed to the Secretary General, to the Executive Secretary, to the Council and to its committees. A small number of these were entered onto index cards by the International Staff Subregistry personnel where they were originally filed (with a specific file indicator). Many of these are scattered throughout the NATO International Staff Central Archives. Other SGLP were addressed to SHAPE and to Standing Group Agencies in Paris and London (notably to the NATO Defense College,

AGARD, the Electronics-Communications agencies, and the Military Agency for Standardization). Some SGLP were addressed directly to national delegations.

The titles/descriptions of the SGLP in Annex XI, 4/2 make the subject covered clear in most instances. The Consultants have also indicated documents referenced and the reference number of documents enclosed. Such enclosed documents are only infrequently on the NISCA microfilm.

MEMORANDA SENT TO THE STANDING GROUP (LOM), 1951-1965

The SGLO (after 25th December 1956, the SGREP) was the eyes and ears in Paris for the military authorities in Washington-the Standing Group, the Military Representatives Committee and the Military Committee in Permanent Session. His major responsibility was to keep the Standing Group informed of every issue which might concern them. At the same time the SGLO/SGREP was the spokesman for the Standing Group (and through them, all of the NATO Military Authorities) before the Council and its Committees. In both of these roles it was essential that he have a full understanding of the SG position on issues as they arose or as he anticipated them. He did this by making frequent trips to Washington, by participating in meetings of the Military Committee in Chiefs of Staff Session, by attending meetings of the SG in Paris and at SHAPE; by memoranda (SGM, described in the section on SG records, and LOM, described here), and by radio/cable messages (STAND, described in the section on SG records, and LOSTAN, described below; and other message series described in Annex XI, 4/5 to this part).

The Standing Group's Liaison Office in London (1951-1952) and Paris (1952-1965) sent about 100 memoranda each year between 1952 and 1958, in a series addressed to the Standing Group in Washington. This series of memoranda, bearing the serial reference, "LOM," dealt primarily with policy issues and other matters which were of interest to the NATO military authorities raised in the Council, by the Council's Boards and Committees, and by the International Staff.

These Liaison Officer Memoranda (LOM) were sometimes personal communications from the SG Liaison Officer/SG Representative directly to the Standing Group Principals (signified by the use of the personal pronoun), sometimes directed to the Director SG, and sometimes staff-originated memoranda addressed to the Secretariat for appropriate assignment and any required action. Copies of memoranda sent by the SGLO to a NATO organization might be summarized or enclosed with a LOM. More frequently a LOM would enclose a copy of a document received in the SGLO along with a note or commentary on the issues of concern.

Much routine Liaison Office business was also transmitted to Washington in a LOM. If the matter was not especially urgent (warranting a message) it would be handled via memoranda. If the matter required a multi-page communication it would be sent as a LOM (sometimes as a follow-up to a message).

The Consultants have entered into the IMS database format about 600 LOM and Informal LOM issued between September 1951 and December 1958. Every LOM which was in the SGLO's file series transferred to the International Staff Central Registry and microfilmed on NISCA Roll 19, is listed in Annex XI, 4/3 to this report.

The copies of the LOM which were microfilmed (and which form the basis for the 1951-1958 LOM listed in Annex XI, 4/3) usually were second or third carbon copies of the typed memoranda. A small number of these are especially difficult to read. About 10% of the memoranda are missing from this file. Documents identified as enclosed with the LOM are only infrequently included in the series which was microfilmed.

The copy of the Liaison Office Memoranda received in Washington was not indexed. Most were forwarded to the action office or to the IPT or LMP as appropriate. Some became part of reports or memoranda issued as SGM, DSGM or MRM. A number of the original memoranda were filed into the MC/SG subject decimal file now in the custody of IMS Registry. A number of those sent by the SGLO to Washington have been pulled out of their place in that file and are now maintained separately in binders. The Consultants have included in the listing all of the 1951-1958 LOM which have survived in the IMS and are in those binders. A small number of LOM may still be scattered in the decimal file. Most of them, however, appear to have been destroyed in the course of the several weeding of the decimal file.

The IMS Indexers have entered into their database about 70 LOM for the period 1959 through 1965. They have been included at the end of the listing in Annex XI, 4/3.

MESSAGES SENT TO THE STANDING GROUP (LOSTAN), 1951-1965

Annex XI, 4/4 A to this report is a listing of LOSTAN messages entered by the IMS Registry's Index Unit and the Consultant into the IMS database through 1958. Included in this listing are all of the messages sent to the SG in this series by the SG Liaison Officer in London and Paris between 1951 and 1958. These messages provide a day-by-day picture of the business and concerns of the NATO Council and Civil Authorities which the SG liaison representative felt was important for the top military authorities of the Organization to know about and to understand during this period. Together with the SGLO's Memoranda (LOMs) they provide a very full accounting of the interplay between the military and civil sides of the Alliance. (Other message series which will provide further details on particular matters affecting the day-to-day operations of the military liaison representation at NATO headquarters are outlined in Annex XI, 4/5.)

Included among the LOSTAN messages are accounts of meetings attended (including private meetings of the Council), conversations with the Secretary General and other civil and military officials of the Organization, action taken by the Council and civil committees, accounts of efforts to interpret the military viewpoint to the civil officials, transmittals of formal and informal communications between the two parties, arrangements for visits and meetings, staffing and space requirements of the Liaison

Office, and constant attention to details in order to ensure that the correct interpretation of positions taken by the military authority were conveyed to the civil authorities.

The IMS Registry Index Section entered an additional 170 LOSTAN messages dated between 1959 and 1965 into the database. Those entries are listed in Annex XI, 4/4 B.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Consultants recommend that all of the memoranda originated by the London Branch Standing Group between July 1951 and March 1952 be downgraded to NATO UNCLASSIFIED and disclosed to the public. These memoranda, "LBSG," are listed in Annex XI, 4/1.
2. The Consultants recommend that all of the memoranda originated by the Standing Group Liaison Office in Paris between 1952 and 1955 be downgraded to NATO UNCLASSIFIED and disclosed to the public. All of the substantively important memoranda in the series, "SGLP," are listed in Annex XI, 4/2.
3. The Consultants recommend that all of the memoranda, including numerous informal memoranda, originated between 1951 and 1965 in the Standing Group Liaison Office in London and Paris and addressed to the Standing Group be reviewed for reclassification to NATO UNCLASSIFIED and disclosure to the public. These memoranda, "LOM," are listed in Annex XI, 4/3.
4. The Consultants recommend that all of the messages in the serial "LOSTAN" sent by the Standing Group Liaison Office in London and Paris between 1951 and 1958, be reviewed for downgrading to NATO UNCLASSIFIED and disclosure to the public. These "LOSTAN" messages, are listed in Annex XI, 4/4 A. The Consultants also recommend that the selected additional "LOSTAN" messages entered by the IMS Registry Index Section for the years 1959 through 1965 be reviewed for downgrading to NATO UNCLASSIFIED and disclosure to the public. These additional "LOSTAN" are listed in Annex XI, 4/4 B.
5. The Consultants recommend that the messages sent by the London Branch Standing Group Secretariat to the Standing Group Secretariat in Washington between July 1951 and April 1952 be downgraded to NATO UNCLASSIFIED and disclosed to the public. These messages (ca. 200) issued in the series "LONSEC," are not listed. Index cards describing each message are in the custody of the IMS Registry.
6. When downgrading and disclosure determinations have been made, this narrative description of the records created by the Standing Group Liaison Office in London and Paris (1951-1957) and successor, the Standing Group Representative in Paris (1958-1965) (i.e., Subpart C of Part XI), and all of the associated listings annexed to this subpart should be disclosed for use by researchers.

7. All of the index cards in the custody of the IMS Registry which describe the record items included in this subpart which have been agreed for declassification and disclosure should be preserved and transferred to the NATO Archives for use by researchers.