

3 w/leg encl

NATO - CONFIDENTIAL

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

E

PLACE DU MARÉCHAL DE LATTRE DE TASSIGNY - PARIS (XVI^e) - TÉL. KLE. 90-20

NATO CONFIDENTIAL

BUREAU DU REPRÉSENTANT
DU GROUPE PERMANENT

OFFICE OF THE STANDING GROUP
REPRESENTATIVE

LOM 43/64

30th January, 1964.

MEMORANDUM FOR : Secretary, Standing Group.

SUBJECT : NAMFI

Reference : PARWA 1372 .

Attached for your information is a copy of the U.S. statement on NAMFI range safety referred to in PARWA 1372.

FOR THE STANDING GROUP REPRESENTATIVE

G. H. Shorland
G. H. SHORLAND ^{col.}
Colonel, UKA

084/1

[Handwritten signature]

Enclosure : 1 copy of Note by the U.S. Delegation (INFRA/5027/64, dated January 30, 1964).

THIS MEMORANDUM MAY BE DOWNGRADED
TO NATO UNCLASSIFIED
WHEN DETACHED FROM ENCLOSURE

IMS Control N° 0.112

INDEXED SCAN
[Signature]
Index Section IMS

NATO - CONFIDENTIAL

R 1139

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2015)0004 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

UNITED STATES DELEGATION
TO THE
NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

In Reply Refer:
INFRA/5027/64

January 30, 1964

NOTE TO ALL NATO DELEGATIONS

SUBJECT: NAMFI Instrumentation

The following data is a resume of information submitted to the US Delegation by Washington re NAMFI Instrumentation. This information is being made available to you in accordance with desires expressed by several Delegations during the meeting of the Infrastructure Payments & Progress Committee on 16 January 1964.

a. Problem

Can NAMFI Range, in fact, be used to extent required by SHAPE under recognized rules of International Law in light of heavy air and sea traffic.

b. Consideration and opinions

1) Basic disagreement between CEAC and SHAPE over usable firing time and allowable restrictions on sea and air traffic appears to us as yet unsettled. Therefore it seems reasonable to us that until this dispute is resolved and until SHAPE clearly states that NAMFI can be used in effective manner, despite limitations imposed by International Law and the heavy air and sea traffic, that expenditures of many millions of dollars for range facilities and equipment may not be justified. (Washington recognizes possibility that there may be other factual information available in Paris of which it is unaware and which might satisfactorily resolve this issue. However, Washington is most anxious to have such information examined by Infrastructure Committees if it exists).

2) AC/92-R/24 suggests that SHAPE and CEAC are now closer to agreement concerning operation of the Range as a controlled firing area rather than declaring it a restricted (Prohibited) area. Does fact that SHAPE was represented at November 20-21 meeting of CEAC and that meeting approved free movement of air and sea traffic mean that SHAPE acquiesces in this procedure so that Infrastructure Committees and governments concerned can accept this as firm basis for authorizing further expenditures on Range?

3) Even if issue of controlled firing is already resolved, question remains re practical problem of effective and feasible utilization of Range. Concern re safety factors and reasonable utilization of Range has been expressed by others (AC/92-R/24). Major difficulty in coming to grips with problem is that no clear picture has been given of how actual firings might mesh with time required by non-participating aircraft traversing Range. Documents here contain at best only general preferences to 50% assurances of a 20 or 30 minute interval of free air space at any given time but no detailed analysis of problem. In view known magnitude of air traffic in Range area, appears doubtful whether limitations on availability of free time for safe firing have been adequately considered by SHAPE and by all Committees concerned (see para 2.3.3. in AC/92-D/260). Additionally, we have seen only barest reference to sea traffic in impact area and no evidence that NATO authorities have determined what future effect this might have on effective use of range.

4) Re air traffic information available from Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) shows three, not two, international airways crossing NAMFI Range. Some 238 weekly flights by nearly 30 airlines involved including: Air Ceylon; Air France; Air India; International: ALITALIA; BOAC; BEA; British United Airlines; East African Airways; Ghana Airways; Japan Airways; Yugoslavia Air Transport; KLM; HUFTHANSA; Polish Airlines; Middle East Airlines; UAR Airlines; Olympic Airways; Czech Airways; Quantas Airlines; Sudan Airways; Aeroflot; SAS; Sabena; Swissair; TWA and Skyways-Silver Fleet. There are probably additional flights by non-scheduled airlines.

5) Information supplied by Maritime Administration indicates that some 86,000 vessels of all types use Eastern Mediterranean yearly in areas surrounding NAMFI Range. Approximately 55,000 of these are large passenger and cargo vessels. Granting that all this traffic does not traverse exact impact area, even a small percent added to coastal, pleasure and fishing craft could pose significant operational problems. Our data shows average of 240 vessels per day arriving at only Turkish and Greek ports in Range vicinity. Figure increases if departures from these ports are included. Some 4,963 vessels per year use Cretan Ports and some 7,427 vessels have used Istanbul in journeys involving Range area. Also appears that on a particular day, average of 30 vessels might be found in or near Range area in upper northern part of Range and some 40 vessels in eastern part. Preponderance of vessels involved in this overall traffic reportedly fly USSR flag and emanate from Black Sea and Istanbul area. Ships of all NATO countries and of more than 20 non-NATO countries, including most of Communist Bloc, also involved.

6) We believe that SHAPE, CEAC, and East Mediterranean Working Group Representatives should be invited to appear before the Infrastructure Committee to assist in presenting full factual data demonstrating how NANFI firings would be meshed with flow of air and sea traffic through the Range area, and to convince the Committee that SHAPE requirements can be met satisfactorily under these conditions. Our objective is to assure that the Committee responsible for NANFI decisions arrives at sound judgments based on all existing facts and legal considerations, and that the evidence that this has in fact taken place is duly recorded.