

DECLASSIFIED/DECLASSIFIEE - PUBLIC DISCLOSED/MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE



ORGANISATION DU TRAITÉ DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD  
NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

144

Place du Maréchal  
de Lattre de Tassigny  
(Porte Dauphine)  
PARIS-XVI

Tél. : KLEber 50-20

Adresse télégraphique :  
OTAN PARIS ou  
NATO PARIS

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH  
10th July, 1967

NATO CONFIDENTIAL  
PO/67/475

To: Permanent Representatives: Belgium  
Canada  
Denmark  
Germany  
Greece  
Iceland  
Italy  
Luxembourg  
Netherlands  
Norway  
Portugal  
Turkey  
United Kingdom  
United States

From: Secretary General

SELECTION OF TROL CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT

Delegations will be aware that it is urgently necessary to carry out a selection of the TROL point-to-point cryptographic equipment to be used by the Alliance for communications purposes. These purposes embrace the Major NATO Military Commands and the new NATO-wide communications system for emergency use, as well as being basic to the improved system of satellite communications which has been foreshadowed. I do not need to emphasise the crucial importance of a decision in this matter.

2. In February 1966 the Council set up a High Level Working Group to decide on a method of selecting both point-to-point and tactical cryptographic equipment. Since then the ASG for PL&I, who was Chairman of the Group, has actively pursued a solution, first through a series of official meetings of his Group and later through continuing informal contacts with the delegations concerned, interspersed by presentations to the Defence Planning Committee. A very important point in these continuing processes of negotiation was reached on 14th April of this year (1) when the German, Dutch and British Delegations (the only ones with competing equipment in this category) agreed upon the performance ratings

(1) DPC/R(67)7

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

to be applied to prices when choosing between the three equipments by the method laid down by the High Level Working Group of 1966 in its report to the Council.

3. Unfortunately, any immediate action to secure prices and proceed to a final selection was ruled out by the fact that the United States Delegation then insisted that the actual requirements of NATO in this field, originally programmed in 1965, should be re-evaluated by the NATO Military Authorities and the National Communications Experts and that both these bodies should be free to consider whether, on grounds of both economy and efficiency, more use could not be made of the so-called tactical equipment. The American KW7 had already been selected for use in the tactical category, the equipment for which is by definition more easily installed in small places and transportable, but does not offer certain special security features such as traffic flow security.

4. It was in any case necessary that the programme of requirements for the Major NATO Military Commands and for the new NATO-wide communications system should receive a final up-to-date screening by the Commands and by the National Communications Experts. This was duly carried out in May. The results are fully accepted by all governments except the German and Netherlands Governments, which asked for higher figures for point-to-point equipment. However, the latter two Governments have agreed to the use of the approximate figures of 800 point-to-point sets in the duplex mode and 750 in the simplex mode for the purpose of issuing a final request for quotations and carrying out selection. It is understood that these approximate figures, which lie between the actual requirements screened by the Group of National Communications Experts and the higher requirements, for which the Germans and the Dutch have argued, will not bind NATO to buy that exact number of sets. But it is accepted by the competing delegations that the figures represent a fair approximation and that the actual purchases will of course depend on the usual Infrastructure processes.

5. Subject therefore to one final difficulty I can recommend to the Defence Planning Committee a process of selection based on the following elements:

- (i) selection by the methods worked out by the High Level Working Group and submitted to the Council in their report(1), i.e. the securing of prices by a request for quotations as worked out by SHAPE and the Working Group and the selection of a winning equipment by the application of an agreed series of ratings to those prices. This was the general conclusion emerging from the Defence Planning Committee meeting of 14th April;

---

(1) C-M(66)90 of 18th October, 1966

- (ii) that the ratings to be applied to prices should be as finally agreed at the Defence Planning Committee meeting of 14th April, viz.
- |                   |     |
|-------------------|-----|
| Elcrotel (German) | 100 |
| Alvis (British)   | 65  |
| Ecolex (Dutch)    | 50  |
- (iii) that the numbers of point-to-point equipments for which countries should be asked to quote prices (see paragraph 4 above) should be 800 duplex and 750 simplex;
- (iv) that the Defence Planning Committee should authorise SHAPE to send out a final request for quotations based on the above figures as soon as possible to expedite selection.

6. The German and Netherlands Governments have now said that they have grave doubts about the use of Alvis equipment without Vendor for the simplex mode, should that equipment be selected. They questioned whether the Alvis equipment for use in the simplex mode was in fact evaluated by the Military Committee in the first place. In order to dispose of these doubts the ASG for PL&I addressed a message to the Assistant Chief of Staff for Communications and Electronics at SHAPE in the following terms:

"In order to enable us to submit a final procedure for the selection of point-to-point TROL equipment to the Defence Planning Committee I should be grateful to have your confirmation that the United Kingdom Alvis equipment has been duly evaluated by the NATO Military Authorities and found acceptable in the following configuration:

ALVIS (with Vendor) for duplex use

ALVIS (without Vendor) for simplex use."

7. The SHAPE reply is attached at Annex. It will be seen that the German Ministry of Defence propose to circulate a paper to the Defence Planning Committee critical of the performance of Alvis.

8. The reply from SHAPE gives us two assurances which are necessary for progress. The first is that the Alvis equipment was duly evaluated by the NATO Military Authorities in the configuration described in the NATO message. We know that it was also accepted as a competitor by the NATO Military Authorities. Secondly, the SHAPE message says that "experience with Alvis has given no indication of unacceptable deficiencies".

9. Owing to the serious delays which these negotiations have encountered I am circulating this PO as a matter of urgency so that delegations may be immediately informed of the state of affairs and with the hope and expectation that the subject may be taken and decided by the Defence Planning Committee before the end of this month. Although SHAPE have answered satisfactorily the question asked of them by the International Staff, they have said they wish to send their final views after considering the paper promised by the German Ministry of Defence, which is also apparently to be circulated to the Defence Planning Committee. I take it that we may expect this German paper soon and it is not for me to prejudge its contents. But, whatever it may say, I cannot myself understand how it could claim to alter the findings of the Evaluation Group of the Military Committee and the subsequent negotiations in the High Level Working Group designed to select one type of equipment on grounds of cost efficiency. During both these procedures it was always recognised that Alvis was second best by a fair margin, but a fully acceptable second best.

10. I am therefore planning to take this subject at a meeting of the Defence Planning Committee on Thursday, 20th July.

(Signed) Manlio BROSIO

SH 21732

Reference: NAC 878, 17th June

Subject: TROL

MCREP pass to Assistant Secretary General, PLI

1. In reply to reference SHAPE confirms that United Kingdom Alvis Equipment has been evaluated by Evaluation Group with participation of MNCS for following configurations:

- A. Alvis with Vendor for duplex
- B. Alvis without Vendor for simplex

2. Meanwhile SHAPE has received information from MOD Germany alleging serious deficiencies of Alvis without Vendor. The seriousness of these allegations cannot be assessed until more details are known.

3. MOD Germany has indicated that within the next few days they will submit a special report on this to Defence Planning Committee. SHAPE experience with Alvis has given no indication of unacceptable deficiencies; however, due to the imminence of the German submission SHAPE prefers to postpone its final reply.