

CONSEIL DE L'ATLANTIQUE NORD
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

380

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
23rd September, 1952

NATO CONFIDENTIAL
DOCUMENT
AC/19-D/13(Final)

COMMITTEE ON THE ANNUAL REVIEW

REVISED OUTLINE OF FURTHER PROCEDURE FOR THE
ANNUAL REVIEW

Note by the Secretary

The attached paper, with amendments made in the course of discussion, was adopted by the Committee at its meeting on 12th September, subject to approval by the Canadian Representative on receipt of instructions from his Government (AC/19-D/10, Item I). The Canadian Representative indicated his concurrence in the meeting on 19th September (AC/19-D/11, Item III)

(Signed) R.G. RAMES

Palais de Chaillot
Paris, XVIe.

REVISED OUTLINE OF FURTHER PROCEDURE FOR THE ANNUAL REVIEW

The Report resulting from the Annual Review should, it is suggested, consist of three parts.

(a) The first part should be a summary of conclusions and recommendations. This should be drafted in a form suitable for perusal by Ministers, that is to say it should cover all important aspects of the report as concisely as possible and should contain references to the fuller exposition of each question given elsewhere in the Report.

(b) The second part should contain a series of chapters dealing with the subjects covered by the Annual Review, e.g., Military considerations, required and planned expenditures, etc. The chapters would no doubt correspond generally to the sections of the Questionnaire. Each of the chapters would deal with the position of reporting countries as a whole in the subject which it covered. It seems appropriate, as suggested in AC/19-D/10, that this synthesis should be prepared by the Secretariat, organized in specialised teams, in liaison with representatives of the Working Groups described below, and then submitted to the Annual Review Committee. The Secretariat would, however, welcome the views of Delegations on the division and arrangement of the contents of this part of the Report.

(c) The third part of the Report should deal with the position of each individual country as it emerges both from the country's reply to the Questionnaire and from the subsequent discussions.

2. In the view of the Secretariat this third part of the Report involves preparations, which can be broken down into three types of operations, described as (a), (b) and (c) in C-M(52)60, paragraph 1.

- (a) A statistical examination by the staff.
- (b) The development of a brief, including questions to be addressed to the reporting country.
- (c) Discussions with country representatives.

3. It had been envisaged that this preparatory work would be conducted in three successive stages: in order to reduce the amount of time involved, it now seems possible, and in some respects advantageous, to proceed simultaneously with all three operations. As soon as a reply to the questionnaire has been received from any country, the staff would start to apply statistical checks, making available the results of their work as it is completed; at the same time Working Groups, including representatives of delegations and of the staff, would start preparing briefs and questions. These Working Groups would be provided in advance with references to the relevant records of the formal country reviews conducted by the TCC last year, and also a note of any relevant problems outstanding from the TCC Report.

4. To study the detailed replies and conduct the examinations of the fourteen countries in a short period will involve great pressure of work. The Secretariat therefore suggests that the Working Groups should consist of a Chairman from the Secretariat and representatives of Delegations, four of which would be "obligatory" members. The obligatory membership would vary as between Working Groups so as to give each Delegation the opportunity to serve. The only distinction between the obligatory members of a Working Group and other delegations would be that the former would be expected to familiarise themselves with all relevant details of the country to be examined, to attend all the meetings of the Group and to participate in its work. All meetings would, of course, be open to any other delegations who cared to attend. The distinction between the designated members of the Group and others would thus be one of obligation and not of privilege.

5. A provisional plan of the composition of these Working Groups prepared by the Secretariat is at Appendix I; it is open to variation by arrangement between delegations. This plan assumes that the Belgian and Luxembourg replies will be examined by the same Working Group, since their economic data to CEEC will, it is understood, be presented jointly. The plan does not cover the arrangements which will be required for the examination of the German reply; these will need to be considered separately.

6. In view of the limited time available for the conduct of the Annual Review, the procedure of the Working Groups will have to conform to a strict time-table if the work is to be completed expeditiously. It is suggested that three days should be allowed for the study of a country's reply, after its distribution, and that a Working Group should be prepared to hold its first meeting on the fourth day, even though a translation of the memoranda included in the reply may not by then have been distributed.

7. The subsequent procedure of each Group would be as follows. Technical questions would be put to the country as they arise; policy questions while being notified unofficially to the country concerned would be collected and submitted to all delegations for comment. These questions together with any supplementary ones suggested by delegations would then be put formally to the country the answers being elicited by the Group in the course of the ensuing oral discussions.

8. The findings of each Group will constitute a country chapter in the third part of the Report (see para. 1(c) above). The first part of the Report (summary of conclusions and recommendations) should include a summary of these findings to be prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with the Working Groups.

9. The preparation of the draft Report as described above would, of course, be supervised by the Annual Review Committee and it is hoped that this body could adopt it quickly for transmission to the Council and consideration by the Military Committee. The chiefs of delegations would no doubt wish to

consult their Governments; in the light of comments from the delegations, and of the appreciation of military risks, a revised Report would be prepared, for final consideration by the Council.

10. The above proposals could, it is thought, be carried out, down to the stage of submission of the revised Report to the Council, by 15th December, provided that replies to the Questionnaire are received between 15th September and 11th October. It is hoped that in the course of ten weeks running from 15th September to 22nd November, the first draft of the Report may be completed. This time-table gives four to eight days for each country study, assuming that two teams can work simultaneously. These four to eight days would not, of course, be consecutive. During the latter part of the exercise, i.e. 23rd November to 15th December, a full two weeks would be available to delegations for the study of the draft Report. A detailed time-table, assuming that the last country reply is received not later than 11th October, is attached at Appendix II.

PROVISIONAL CONSTITUTION OF EXAMINING GROUPS

A. Classification by Examining Countries

<u>Examiners</u>	<u>No. of Countries Examined</u>	<u>Countries Examined</u>
Belgium	4	France, Italy, Netherlands, U.K.
Canada	3	Denmark, Portugal, U.S.A.
Denmark	3	France, Netherlands, Portugal
France	7	Belgium, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, Turkey, U.K., U.S.A.
Greece	1	Denmark
Iceland	1	Norway
Italy	5	Canada, France, Greece, Turkey, U.S.A.
Luxembourg	1	Portugal
Netherlands	4	Belgium, Iceland, Norway, Turkey
Norway	3	Iceland, Netherlands, U.K.
Portugal	3	Denmark, Greece, Iceland
Turkey	3	Greece, Italy, Portugal
U.K.	6	Belgium, Canada, France, Italy, Norway, U.S.A.
U.S.A.	9	Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Norway, Turkey, U.K.

B. Classification by Countries Examined

<u>Countries Examined</u>	<u>Examiners</u>
Belgium/Luxembourg	France, Netherlands, U.K., U.S.A.
Canada	France, Italy, U.K., U.S.A.
Denmark	Canada, Greece, Portugal, U.S.A.
France	Belgium, Denmark, Italy, U.K., U.S.A.
Greece	Italy, Portugal, Turkey, U.S.A.
Iceland	Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, U.S.A.
Italy	Belgium, France, Turkey, U.K.
Netherlands	Belgium, Denmark, France, Norway
Norway	Iceland, Netherlands, U.K., U.S.A.
Portugal	Canada, Denmark, Luxembourg, Turkey
Turkey	France, Italy, Netherlands, U.S.A.
U.K.	Belgium, France, Norway, U.S.A.
U.S.A.	Canada, France, Italy, U.K.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

TIME-TABLE FOR ANNUAL REVIEW

(from receipt of last country reply, assumed to arrive on 11th October)

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLIC DISCLOSURE / DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

	Number of weeks needed for operations by:				Dates of completion of operations
	Staff	Working Groups	Annual Review Committee	Council	
1 (a) Statistical examination, preparation of summary tables for the country concerned..... .. concurrently with:	2				25th Oct.
(b) Preparation of country summary and draft questions distributed to all delegations.....		2			25th Oct.
2. Comments by delegations, revision and distribution of summary and questions, completion of discussion with country delegates..		1			1st Nov.
3 (a) Completion of part of the report and annex relating to country..... .. concurrently with:	1				8th Nov.
(b) Completion of subject chapters, in the light of country examinations.....	1				8th Nov.
4. Completion and adoption of draft Report.....			2		22nd Nov.
5. Review by Permanent Representatives and Military Committee.....				2	6th Dec.
6. Revision of draft report and re-submission to Council.....			1		12th Dec.