

FILE

1. AS-70 AS-80 5 May 48  
 AS-90  
 AS-62  
 AS-20  
 IN TUNE

**Proposed Directive Concerning Destruction of  
 Crypto-Equipment**

1. It is necessary to provide procedures concerning destruction of crypto-equipments that result from non-standard practices common to this Agency which have not been considered in AR 384-5; therefore, the inclosed directive has been prepared.

2. Concurrence or comments are requested on the proposed inclosure.

1 Incl  
 Proposed directive con-  
 cerning destruction of  
 crypto-equipment

a. SINKOV  
 Chief, Security Division  
 Extension 241

3

1

F-101  
↓

1. AS-70 AS-80 11 May 48  
AS-90  
AS-62  
AS-39  
IN TURN

**Proposed Directive Concerning Destruction of  
Crypto-Equipment**

1. The enclosed directive has been prepared in order to establish procedures which will govern the destruction of crypto-equipment under certain non-standard practices which are common within the ISA but which have not been considered in AR 380-5.

2. Concurrence or comments are requested on the proposed inclosure.

1 Incl  
Proposed directive concerning destruction of crypto-equipment

A. SINKOV  
Chief, Security Division  
Extension 241

36.00

G

2. AS-90 AS-70 21 May 48 1. The proposed directive is not satisfactory in  
AS-62 so far as the Electronic and Electromechanical Branch of  
AS-20 this Division is concerned.  
IN TURN

2 Frequently, for testing purposes, equipment is modified and remains in this condition for only a few weeks before again being modified. It is considered impractical to assign a new nomenclature to the equipment each time such a revision takes place. Furthermore, it seems unnecessary to register skeletons of old machines when models of new machines, such as the MX 507, are not registered

3. It is agreed that register cryptographic devices, which are modified for semi-permanent use, (such as cryptanalytic aids) should be assigned a new nomenclature. The registration and naming of such devices can be covered by the new nomenclature plan.

4. It is recommended that equipment which is to be dismantled for experimental purposes continue to be removed from accountability

1 Incl  
n/c

/s/ S KULLBACK  
S. KULLBACK  
Chief, Research and  
Development Division  
Ext 321

- 3 AS-62  
AS-20 AS-90 8 June 48

This Division concurs with the remarks of CSGAS-70.

1 Incl  
n/c

/s/ Frank B. Rowlett  
FRANK B. ROWLETT  
Chief, Operations Division  
Ext 315

4. AS-20 AS-62 4 June 48 1. This Branch concurs in paragraph 5 and 6 of the proposed directive.

2. In the event classified equipment is to be stored by Supply Branch adequate storage facilities, i.e. barred windows and combination locked doors, would have to be constructed. AS-62 has no data as to the storage space requirements for this type of equipment.

1 Incl  
n/c

WASHINGTON 22 D C  
ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

/s/ J. E. Wood  
J. E. WOOD  
Major, QMC  
Chief, Supply Branch

НЕУДОКУМЕНТОВАНО  
2600

**GOPY**

~~SECRET~~  
CONFIDENTIAL

**Proposed Directive Concerning Destruction of  
Crypto-Equipment**

5. AS-80 AS-23 11 Jun 48

Returned for consideration of Comments 2, 3, and 4

1 Incl  
n/c

/s/ Paul E. Neff  
PAUL E NEFF  
Lt Colonel, Signal Corps  
Acting Deputy Chief, ASA  
Ext 498

~~RESTRICTED~~

FUG 114

6. AS-70  
 AS-90 AS-80 6 Jul 48 Proposed Directive Concerning Destruction of  
 AS-62 Crypto-Equipment  
 AS-20 Mr. Brann Ext 388

## IN TURN

1. In accordance with Comment 2, paragraph 2 of the inclosure has been re-written to include statements pertaining to modification for research and development purposes. A new paragraph 5 has been added to care for dismantling.

2. It is believed that these changes will remove the causes for objection expressed by AS-70

3. With reference to Comment 4, space required for storage of classified equipment by AS-62 should not exceed a room 12'x12'x8'.

1 Incl  
 Revised proposed directive  
 concerning destruction of  
 cr,pto-equipment

A. SINKOV  
 Chief, Security Division

**PRATT****SUBJECT: Destruction of Crypto-Equipment****TO:**

1. In the past, individual copies of registered crypto-equipments have been removed from accountability by preparing a report of destruction when the crypto-equipment has not been destroyed. In some instances, the device has been returned to the cryptographic custodian with the attendant confusion caused by the actual existence of a registered equipment and the existence of corresponding reports of destruction.

2. Reports of destruction will not be completed unless the crypto-equipment is actually destroyed. If the device is to be modified, it will be assigned new nomenclature and a new name plate affixed. If the device is to be modified only to the extent that the modification does not affect its use for its original cryptographic purpose, the nomenclature will indicate that this is a modification of an existent device. For example, SIGABA has been assigned the nomenclature "ASAM 1" and if this device were to be modified either to improve its mechanical or operational characteristics or a modification of its cryptoprinciples and still allow it to be used for its originally designated purpose, the new nomenclature would be ASAM 1-1, with a new series of registry numbers. However, if this device were to be modified so it would be used for an entirely different purpose, or embodied a change of cryptoprinciples, the nomenclature would be changed in accordance with the Nomenclature Plan approved 9 March 1948. For example, if the SIGABA

*Incl 1*

were to be modified in order that it could be used as key production equipment, it would receive the title ASAP I. The classification of the modified device will depend upon its inherent characteristics. A decision as to registration will have to be made at the time of modification and will depend upon the proposed use and the cryptoprinciples inherent in the device. Recon-  
elature assignments may be secured from AS-62 by written request.

3. When a machine is modified, a DA AGO Form 223, should be completed with the following notation in the "Remarks" column:

**MODIFIED AND CONVERTED TO (NEW NOMENCLATURE)**

An additional Form 223 is then required for the new device and should have the following notation in the "Remarks" column:

**CONVERTED FROM (OLD NOMENCLATURE)**

4. Equipment may be kept for historical purposes and in such cases a report of destruction should not be prepared. The equipment should be listed on a Form 223 with the following notation in the "Remarks" column:

**HISTORICAL COPY, ANNUAL INVENTORY ONLY NECESSARY**

5. A crypto-equipment that has been declared obsolete may have some copies that are not destroyed and that are intended for experimental, developmental, or other use. In these cases, the equipments being retained will be removed from registration and if the cryptoprinciples require protection the equipments will be classified. These equipments will then be turned over to AS-62 on a Property Turn-in Slip.

6. The provisions of paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 are retroactive.