

Military Medals Review

Sir John Holmes

July 2012

MILITARY MEDALS REVIEW

“The object of giving medals, stars and ribbons is to give pride and pleasure to those who have deserved them. At the same time a distinction is something which everybody does not possess. If all have it, it is of less value. There must, therefore, be heart-burnings and disappointments on the borderline. A medal glitters, but it also casts a shadow. The task of drawing up regulations for such awards is one which does not admit of a perfect solution. It is not possible to satisfy everybody without running the risk of satisfying nobody. All that is possible is to give the greatest satisfaction to the greatest number and to hurt the feelings of the fewest.”

Winston Churchill – 22nd March 1944

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. THE CONTEXT
2. SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
3. THE CURRENT PRINCIPLES AND RULES
4. THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS
5. MAJOR CAMPAIGNS FOR MEDALLIC RECOGNITION

ANNEXES

A TERMS OF REFERENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT

B LIST OF MEETINGS

C HD COMMITTEE: COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

D RULES GOVERNING THE ACCEPTANCE AND WEARING OF FOREIGN ORDERS, DECORATIONS AND MEDALS BY CITIZENS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND HER OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

E TABLES OF CAMPAIGN AND OTHER OPERATIONAL AWARDS AUTHORISED FOR WEAR BY THE ARMED FORCES SINCE 1939

1. World War 2 Medals and Campaign Stars 1939 – 1945
2. Medals for Individual Campaigns or Operations (since 1945):
3. General Service Medal 1914 and 62:
4. Operational Service Medal (Instituted 1 January 2000).
5. Miscellaneous

F TABLES OF FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL AWARDS APPROVED FOR WEAR BY UK CITIZENS

1. Foreign and Commonwealth
2. United Nations Medals:
3. United Nations Special Service Medal:
4. NATO:
5. European and International Organisations:

G LIST OF CAMPAIGNS FOR MEDALLIC RECOGNITION

H COST ISSUES

I MEMBERS OF THE REVIEW TEAM

INTRODUCTION

1. The United Kingdom takes a distinctive approach to the award of military campaign medals, reflecting a strong view that medals must be awarded sparingly to maintain a highly prized currency. Medals attract strong emotions in any event. It is not therefore surprising that they can become the subject of controversy, and can attract the attention of press and politicians.
2. A number of veterans groups and individuals have been lobbying the Ministry of Defence and the Government about perceived injustices in medallic recognition, in some cases for many years. Some are in relation to specific actions or campaigns that have not been recognised. Other groups feel unfairly excluded by qualifying criteria for campaigns that were recognised. There are also campaigns to recognise military service more generally, notably for a National Defence Medal (NDM).
3. The authorities have looked at many of these concerns in the past, and the MOD carried out a further internal review in 2011, in response to a Coalition Government commitment to review the rules for awarding campaign medals. However this review was criticised by campaign groups and others for its lack of independence. They believed that they had not been properly consulted or given a fair chance to present their cases.
4. The Government therefore decided that a further rapid, independent review to scrutinise the guiding rules, principles and processes for medallic recognition of military campaigns should be conducted, involving full consultation with all concerned. The Review was announced by the Prime Minister on 30 April. His statement and the Terms of Reference for the Review are at Annex A.
5. The Review was conducted between 1 May and 29 June. The team took a wide range of evidence from individuals and campaign groups. It received over 200 submissions and spoke to more than 50 people (see Annex B for full list).
6. The Review was not asked to rule on the merits of particular campaign groups' claims, and did not in any case have the time or resources to undertake the necessary historical investigations to do that. Nor would it have been right simply to bypass the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals in this way. But it did take full account of the issues raised by these campaigns in respect of medallic recognition principles and process.
7. This report describes the Review's findings and key recommendations. It looks first at the overall context, then at the current rules and principles, and finally at the process used to make recommendations to The Sovereign,

drawing conclusions and proposing improvements. It also summarises some of the main campaigns. Annexes contain reference material.

8. I would like to record my and the Review Team's thanks to all those who have contributed to the report: veterans, officials, Parliamentarians and members of the Government.
9. We are not so naive as to imagine that our recommendations, if followed, will end all controversies, but believe they offer a way forward to draw a line under some of the campaigns, reduce some of the emotions, and result in a more transparent and credible system for the future.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Horne". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

July 2012

Section 1: the context

1. Medals are an emotive subject among veterans and current members of the armed forces precisely because they are valued by so many and signify so much. No medals policy will ever keep everyone happy. However, before going into the details of current policy and practice and making recommendations about how they might change, it is useful to look at some of the background and underlying considerations.
2. This Review was set up not so much because there is major dissatisfaction with current decisions on when and how military campaign medals are awarded, but because the official response to long-running attempts to persuade the system to look again at particular past decisions had seemed to many to be unduly dismissive. However, we found evidence that current service personnel also have issues about medals policy, including lack of transparency about the process and the reasons for particular decisions, and about the fairness and consistency of the criteria and qualifying conditions in certain instances. They may well articulate these concerns more strongly when they in turn become veterans.
3. The British system of awarding campaign medals over the last century or so has been characterised by a deliberately parsimonious approach: a British military campaign medal should be something which has been hard-earned, recognising service where life is at risk and conditions are tough; and it should be seen to be so by all concerned, so that it can be worn with special pride.
4. Other approaches are possible and have their advocates. Some countries award medals much more freely. Commonwealth countries close to our own military traditions have come to more flexible conclusions in recent years about campaign medals. Nevertheless we came across few among those we met who wanted to change the British ethos in any fundamental way, whether among the veterans or those currently serving in the armed forces. There is a degree of disdain among the military in this country for other countries which have gone down different routes and awarded medals less sparingly.
5. One consequence of the parsimonious British approach is that some servicemen and veterans can feel left out altogether, even when they have served with distinction for many years, because there were few active campaigns when they were serving or because they did not happen to take part in particular campaigns.
6. Those who served in the Second World War received a small number of medals, depending on where they served, since only broad geographical theatres of war were recognised for individual medallic recognition. In the

1950s campaigns linked to the end of empire provided opportunities for winning medals. Those who did their service largely in the 1960s and 1970s could easily do many years of loyal and good service, including on the front lines of the Cold War, but finish up with no medals at all, because there were few active campaigns in which they could serve. By contrast, those who have served more recently, with the conflicts in the Balkans, two Gulf Wars, Afghanistan and elsewhere, can easily have a significant number of medals, even at a relatively young age.

7. No-one, least of all the veterans of generations, begrudges the younger generation their medals for campaigns which have undoubtedly been difficult and deadly. However it does leave some of those who served without medallic reward feeling aggrieved that their service was not recognised, not least at Remembrance Day Parades where medals signify so much
8. This sentiment of service ignored, particularly for those in the forces when there were less hot wars around, helps drive a campaign of a different kind in favour of a National Defence Medal for which anyone who has served in the armed forces since 1945 could qualify, including National Servicemen. Most other countries have something along these lines, including countries to which we are particularly close in historical military terms like Australia, Canada and New Zealand.
9. It is widely understood by veterans and serving personnel that the awarding of any campaign medal is bound to leave some disappointed, because of the need to draw clear boundaries, in terms of the geographical limits of the area of operations, the time period of the campaign, and the amount of time in the area required to qualify. However much care is taken in doing this, there will always be some people who fall just the wrong side of the qualifying lines and who will therefore feel aggrieved.
10. At the same time, fairness and consistency are constant and crucial issues. The medallic campaigns mostly reflect cases where individuals or groups are convinced that the wrong decisions have been taken, and that substantial injustices have been done. These people are not to be dismissed as 'gong-chasers', in our experience of meeting them and discussing their cases in some depth. Often those campaigning already have medals themselves or do not stand to benefit personally even if the decisions are changed. Many of those we met had cases which seemed to have some merit. Some had been looked at by the authorities several times in the past, without result, but the campaigners were determined not to give up and convinced that their cases had not been properly considered by the right people.
11. The fact that campaigners feel strongly about a specific issue does not mean they are right. Nor does the existence of significant public, press and political

support for any particular campaign. However they do suggest that cases of this kind need to be considered particularly carefully, with some degree of transparency. Otherwise the feeling of injustice will be reinforced by frustration at an apparent brick wall of bureaucratic obstruction, however unfair this may be to those trying to implement a sensible and balanced policy.

12. The campaigns also raise a more philosophical issue. How far is it right and reasonable to reopen past decisions years after they were taken? Many we spoke to who were not campaigners took the view that we should not try to substitute our contemporary judgment for the judgment of those in charge at the time. We bring a different set of attitudes and sensitivities to those prevalent when the decisions were taken, cannot know or understand the context in which they were operating at the time, or all the considerations and knowledge they had in their minds. We should not therefore second-guess them, armed with hindsight.
13. This view is reinforced by another strong objection to reviewing past decisions, and the one most often invoked – the fear of opening Pandora’s Box, and being faced with an endless stream of claims which have to be looked at, irrespective of their real merits and of how much time will have to be spent on them. Fear of setting undesirable precedents has been a very powerful driver of MOD policy in this area.
14. These are understandable and indeed powerful arguments. However it is also legitimate to ask whether a little more past flexibility would not have avoided some genuine grievances without opening the gates to a flood of vexatious correspondents. In other areas of life, including decisions of the courts, we are from time to time ready to revisit decisions which seem to have been badly made and if appropriate to try to right wrongs. It is not necessarily the case that agreeing to one ‘concession’ will inevitably lead to many more. Fear of precedent is not always a good guide to policy, however bureaucratically convenient.
15. Moreover, over past years, a number of decisions have been taken which have gone against the system’s own rules. Previous medal decisions have been overturned years later, wearing of ‘double medals’ has been permitted in some cases, and medals which have nothing to do with ‘risk and rigour’ have been instituted, for example for successive Jubilee celebrations. These have undermined the credibility of the principles and rules, and reinforced a feeling on the part of the campaigners that double standards are at work.
16. Another strong concern of those responsible for medals policy is that decisions about campaign medals should not be ‘politicised’. In other words serving politicians, whether ministers or MPs, should not be directly involved because they will always be too vulnerable to campaigns and public,

particularly those where the press becomes involved. It would certainly be undesirable for campaign medals to become political footballs, subject to party politics or passing political whims.

17. However the current system of decision-making is vulnerable to the charge of being a 'black box' operation, where those outside have no knowledge of what is being decided or why, and have no access to it; and where the rules and principles underlying the decisions, while frequently referred to, have never been properly codified or promulgated.
18. Medals are not the only way in which particular campaigns can be recognised. Memorials are one method which has often been used. They offer lasting public reminders and places of pilgrimage for veterans and families. The latest example is the striking Memorial to Bomber Command opened on 28 June 2012 by The Queen, opposite Hyde Park Corner. London has many other memorials, including to civilians who made sacrifices during the Second World War. The National Memorial Arboretum near Tamworth contains many memorial gardens. Other possibilities are badges or pins, for example special pins which have been introduced to mark service in nuclear strike submarines.
19. These are all important forms of recognition which should continue to be used imaginatively. However for many veterans there is something special and especially personal about a medal, for which a memorial or badge is no substitute. The reaction of rejection of many Arctic Convoy veterans to the 2005 institution of the Arctic Emblem was illustrative in this respect.
20. One thing we have sought to understand is how far those campaigning for particular issues to be reopened represent wider veteran opinion or have wider veteran support; and how far they have the support of those currently serving. In some cases those campaigning can cite numbers of those who belong to particular supporting associations, but even here it is hard to gauge the degree of real support. Our concern has been to avoid being too seduced by the views of those who shout loudest, ignoring the possible silent majority.
21. We have not been able to conduct scientific opinion surveys, but we have consulted a number of service charities in touch with large numbers of veterans, and talked to a number of serving personnel. Our impression is that, for most veterans, medals issues are not at the top of their priority lists. Many are not interested in reopening such issues. However, both among veterans and serving members of the forces, we did detect a widespread feeling that there have often been mistakes and anomalies over medals, and a degree of particular sympathy for those campaigning for changes to decisions affecting Second World War veterans. Their sacrifices through a long and deadly war

are fully recognised, and there is recognition too that the last remaining veterans will inevitably not be with us much longer.

22. The question of cost is an uncomfortable issue behind all this. No-one would suggest that decisions about medallic recognition should depend on money, but the MOD does have to be concerned about how much it would cost if some previous decisions about medals were reopened or new kinds of medals instituted. In times of austerity, decisions about whether to spend money on current men or equipment or on medals become particularly sensitive. This is an area where imagination to bring in other sources of funds, without devaluing or cheapening the medals themselves, may be needed.
23. A rather different issue which we have not had time to look at in detail but which certainly needs to be considered more seriously by the MOD in the future is the changing nature of warfare, for example the question of recognition for those engaged in remote operations, firing cruise missiles or weapons carried by drones. They are not themselves at physical risk but are in highly stressful situations and potentially contributing to major military successes. Similar issues have arisen in the past for those who have made huge contributions to military campaigns but only in supporting or enabling roles, for example in the areas of aerial supply and maritime support, with limited physical presence in the area of operations. Numbers on the front lines in future campaigns may be limited, posing the issue of how to deal with support personnel ever more acutely. Serving personnel are very mindful of these changes to the nature of operations and what it may mean for the opportunities for medals in future.
24. A final reflection is on the oddity of the existence of a thriving commercial military medal industry, turning out medals to commemorate many campaigns and battles not recognised by issuance of an official medal. These commercial medals have no official status and can be freely purchased. They should not of course be worn at official parades, and in any case not on the left breast where official medals go. But these rules are not always respected. In some cases a percentage of the proceeds of a particular medal goes to a services charity, giving the impression that they are in some way officially sanctioned. It may be too difficult to do anything about this commercial business in a free country, but many veterans and serving personnel rightly feel uncomfortable about it.

Section 2: summary of principal conclusions and recommendations

1. The Review's overall conclusion is that there is no appetite or good reason to change the basic approach underlying British military campaign medals policy, ie that they should be awarded sparingly, on the basis of genuine risk and rigour. However there is room for greater transparency and flexibility in how some of the current rules are framed and applied and for a broader-based decision-making and review process for the future.
2. The Review, while not able to take a definitive view in any particular case and anxious to avoid raising public expectations by naming names, was sufficiently impressed by the arguments of some of the campaigners about past decisions to recommend that there should now be a rapid but in-depth independent look at the main controversies, to try to draw a line under them.
3. The case for some form of National Defence Medal, to recognise all military service, is a larger issue which needs further study and should then be considered by the government as a whole, in consultation with other political parties and concerned organisations.
4. The arguments underlying these conclusions and specific recommendations, set out in the sections below, are not repeated here for the sake of brevity. But they need to be read, against the background of the broader context considerations in Section 1, to understand why we have reached the views we have.

Our specific recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation 1

The risk and rigour principle should remain the basis of decisions about campaign medals. Particular care needs to continue to be taken about consistency in setting the qualifying criteria for individual medals, to ensure both fairness for that medal, and fairness compared to other comparable medals. There is also a strong case for a separate medal for campaign support, particularly as the nature of warfare changes.

Recommendation 2

Campaign awards should continue to be determined in a timely fashion, with a strong presumption that they should not be revisited later. Five years after the conclusion of the operations concerned is a reasonable cut off and review point for this. However this should not be elevated into a blanket refusal to reconsider cases where the criteria set out in paragraphs 30-33 of Section 3 are met, leading to a prima facie case that the original decisions may have been unsound or unfair in

some way. The existence of a strong campaign in favour of a review of a particular past decision should not be a deciding factor in favour of a review itself or a change of mind but can strengthen the presumption of the need for such a review.

Recommendation 3

Avoiding double medalling for the same operational service should continue to be an absolute rule for British medallic recognition. It should also remain an important aim in cases where a combination of a British medal and a medal or medals from another country or international organisation is offered. However the current muddle about how the latter policy is applied, and how international medals are dealt with overall, should be reviewed by the MOD, FCO and Cabinet Office as a matter of urgency, on the basis of a fresh study of international comparisons, with a view to new, simpler and more consistent rules about when international medals can be accepted and worn.

Recommendation 4

The membership of the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals (HD Committee) should be broadened to reflect outside views, expertise and interests, and a new sub-committee should be created to look specifically at military issues. As well as appropriate officials, up to five outside members should be appointed to this sub-committee, which could be broken down as follows: three experienced and credible figures not active in front line politics, and representing a broad spectrum of views; an independent military expert; and a representative of the Armed Forces Covenant Reference Group. The Committee itself should meet in person more regularly, particularly when there are controversial issues to discuss, and the sub-committee as often as necessary.

Recommendation 5

The reconstituted HD Committee, on advice from the new military sub-committee, should be asked to look again rapidly at the main long-standing controversies to try to draw a line under them, on the basis of the criteria set out in paragraphs 30-33 of Section 3. It should start with the longest-standing issues, notably that surrounding the Arctic Convoys from the Second World War. An independent expert should be commissioned on a temporary basis to advise the sub-committee on these controversies rapidly but fully, starting from the material provided to the Review.

Recommendation 6

The reconstituted HD committee, having taking advice from the new subcommittee, should recommend to The Queen texts codifying the basic principles and rules underlying campaign medal decisions, based on the conclusions of this Review. These texts should then be promulgated publicly, in order to provide greater transparency and a fully agreed basis for future decision-making.

Recommendation 7

The idea of a National Defence Medal as a recognition of military service of whatever form is worthy of consideration but is in a separate category from military campaign medals and should be treated accordingly. Its merits, and examples from other countries, should be looked at by a Cabinet Office-led working group in the first place, before consideration by the reconstituted HD Committee and its sub-committee. Any recommendations should be made initially to the government, rather than The Queen, and would then need to be the subject of wider political and other consultation, since this is a decision of broad national significance which would require a broad political and public consensus.

Recommendation 8

In the event of changes to past medalling decisions with significant cost implications, veterans should not be asked to pay for their medals, but the direct cost to the MOD budget should be minimised where possible through recourse to different kinds of volunteer funding, in particular to cover extra administration costs.

Section 3: the current principles and rules

Background

1. Military campaign medals can be awarded for operations ranging from global conflict, as in the two World Wars, through large scale military engagements, to relatively minor deployments or actions.
2. For the Second World War, the War Medal was awarded to all who took part, whatever their role; the 1939-45 Star was given to all who did qualifying service in operations; and a number of geographically based campaign stars were awarded to all who did the necessary qualifying periods in different theatres – for example the France and Germany Star, the Pacific Star, the Atlantic Star and the Air Crew Europe Star.
3. Since then specific medals have been struck for significant wars or campaigns, for example most recently for the South Atlantic in 1982, the Gulf War in 1991, and Iraq in 2003. Clasps can be added to mark particular battles or actions. The award of a clasp is denoted by a silver rosette on the ribbon when only the ribbon is worn. For other military actions, until recently a General Service Medal was usually awarded, with clasps marking the particular action. Rosettes are not worn on this medal. Since 2000, Operational Service Medals (OSM) have been awarded, with a unique ribbon to mark particular campaigns, for example for Sierra Leone and Afghanistan. The introduction of the OSM has increased the numbers of ‘medals on chests’, presumably deliberately.
4. In addition, medals are awarded by relevant international organisations for military or peacekeeping operations under their control. In each case where British troops have served under international command, usually either NATO or the United Nations, a decision is needed as to whether there should be a British medal, as currently in Afghanistan, or the international medal should be the one accepted and authorised for wear.
5. There are also medals for Accumulated Campaign Service, where a General Service Medal or Operational Service Medal has already been awarded, to recognise repeat service in the same theatre or other theatres.
6. Tables of British and international medals awarded since 1945 are at Annexes E and F, and show the complexity of medal structures.
7. The introduction of a new campaign medal is not automatic, even if casualties are sustained. In the case of campaign service or an emergency situation, the process starts if the Chief of Joint Operations at the Permanent Joint Headquarters on the advice of the Theatre Commander-in-Chief at the time considers that a medal for service in the particular theatre is justified. Timing

is important. The decision should be taken by those involved at the time while memories are fresh, but a proposal for a new medal should not be initiated and decided before the real nature of the campaign/operational service has become apparent.

8. The main factors considered in looking at the case for a medal for an operation include:
 - a. The risk and danger to life.
 - b. The style and force of the enemy.
 - c. The physical and mental stress and rigours experienced by individuals;
 - d. The numbers of individuals and/or units committed to the operation.
 - e. The restrictions, limitations and difficulty in implementing the operation, including climate, weather and terrain.
 - f. The time in theatre (stated in number of days) or for example the number of air sorties (which may have a limit on how many on any one day) that should count towards eligibility.
 - g. The geographical boundaries within which eligibility will count (this does not have to accord with the officially defined operational area).
9. On receipt of the proposal the Defence Commitments Staff seeks advice from the Front Line Commands (and other departments as appropriate), to ensure all who might be eligible have been included and advise the single-Service Chiefs of Staff whether it appears that in principle:
 - a. An award is operationally justified
 - b. An award is not operationally justified;
 - c. It is not possible to reach a decision on an operational justification for the present but the matter should be kept under review.
10. Once endorsed the paper is staffed to the Chief of the Defence Staff and Service Chiefs Committee (COS(I)) for consideration. If the Service Chiefs support an award, the initiating commander prepares a fully staffed proposal, including the detailed criteria for eligibility. This proposal has to be endorsed by the Chiefs of Staff, and finally by the Secretary of State for Defence. If endorsed it is forwarded to the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals (the HD Committee) for consideration. Finally, if agreed, it is put to the Sovereign for approval.

11. The key consideration for the award of UK medals for military service has been the presence of both risk and rigour. In addition two so-called rules have been applied, a five year limit on consideration of medal cases, and no double medalling, although these rules have never formally been codified. The following sections describe the rationale of each principle or rule, and examine how far they are justified and/or open to revision.

Risk and Rigour.

12. The idea is that campaign medals should only be awarded where deployed personnel have been exposed to a significant degree of risk to life and limb, and to arduous conditions, in excess of what might be expected as part of normal service duties, whether deployed or in the home base. It is this which underpins the ethos that British medals are hard earned.

13. Determining what constitutes appropriate risk and rigour in particular circumstances can follow set criteria, such as those set out in paragraph 8 above. However there will always be a subjective element of judgment involved, on a case by case basis. For example should eligibility be only for those on the real front line of a particular operation, who are at the most risk, or for all those physically deployed in a particular area of operations, even where they are carrying out support roles in relatively safe areas. The former approach can help to maintain the currency of the medal but can also be divisive. The latter can produce a perception that risk and rigour is not really being applied across the board. In practice some kind of compromise is usually sought. This issue is a live one in Afghanistan currently, as we heard from several interlocutors.

14. It has also been an area of difficulty in the past too. We heard for example that, in some previous campaigns for which medals had been awarded, there had been a feeling that awarding medals to those in forward supply bases, such as those in Cyprus or Ascension Island, had been unfair, both in relation to those actually doing the fighting, and to others who had played vital support roles in UK-based headquarters and had undergone at least as much rigour, if not risk. There are also tricky questions about eligibility criteria for those not on the ground but operating from the air or at sea, and some feeling that these make it harder to earn medals for those in the Navy or Air Force than in the Army.

15. The question of time periods is also difficult where wars or operations, particularly guerrilla campaigns, have no clear opening date, and particularly no clear-cut end point. At what moment have the risks subsided or disappeared sufficiently to say that the requirements of risk and rigour are no longer met? Such decisions are always likely to leave some disappointed. Most veterans and servicemen accept this reality.

16. Perfect consistency and absolute fairness for all are certainly unattainable. But maximum consistency and fairness are equally clearly crucial. Many of the veteran campaigns for reopening past medal decisions/criteria are based on a view that the rules were not applied fairly or consistently as between different groups, different time periods and different medals, going beyond the necessity of drawing lines somewhere, with the inevitable risk of some people falling on the wrong side of them. We detected concerns that similar issues may arise currently. There is a risk that future controversies will develop on similar lines to past ones.
17. There is therefore a case for an HD Committee procedure to review the decisions on qualifying criteria for individual medals, in the light of experience, while memories are relatively fresh and shortly before the normal limit of five years after the events concerned expires. That would enable any obvious anomalies or widespread complaints which have emerged to be addressed, and would go a long way to prevent future long-running campaigns. It would also be an opportunity for a lessons learned exercise to help future decisions. We do not think it would be right to bind the hands of the HD Committee in advance by making this a formal recommendation, but propose that the sub-committee consider this possibility once established.
18. We likewise believe that there is a case for the arguments behind the institution of particular medals, including how and why the particular criteria of time and space were drawn, to be available, at least to service personnel, in the interests of transparency and consistency. We recognise that this may create extra opportunities for questioning decisions but believe that this would be outweighed by reductions in grumbling. It would also help to drive greater consistency. Again, we do not recommend this formally but suggest it should be considered by the MOD and the new sub-committee.
19. We also believe that the issue of how far to reward support and enabling roles needs to be kept under close review, particularly when the nature of warfare is changing and remote operations are increasingly frequent, as noted in Section 1 above on the overall context. We understand that the MOD are looking at the introduction of a Campaign Support Medal. We would support such a proposal, and suggest that consideration be given to including non-deployed personnel for such medallic recognition in exceptional cases.
20. Overall, and subject to these comments, we do not believe that the basic principle of risk and rigour needs to be revised, although its definition should be more clearly expressed and published. However its application and the eligibility criteria derived from it do need to continue to be monitored with especial care and attention, in order to prevent inconsistencies, anomalies and injustices, to the maximum extent possible. The separate recommendations we are making on process may help here.

The Five Year Rule.

21. The basis of this so-called rule is that decisions about the institution of a medal or clasp or about the criteria to be applied for qualification of an award should not be revisited once five years have passed since conclusion of the operation in question, provided due consideration was given to the issue at the time. The underlying view is that second-guessing decisions made in the past, with the benefit of hindsight, and applying contemporary views and sensitivities, is inappropriate - we cannot know or understand all the circumstances taken into consideration at the time
22. The five year rule has never been formally codified but rather represents the custom of successive Governments since the Second World War. Its origin is believed to date from June 1946 when His Majesty King George VI approved the advice of the HD Committee to institute a number of Campaign Stars and Medals for service in the War. Having instituted these awards, it was agreed that no further WW2 Medals or Stars would be considered. A particular decision was taken that no further recommendations for gallantry awards arising from service during the War would be considered after 1950 (i.e. after five years).
23. Since then the five year rule or some variant of it has been the main argument used by the MOD against reopening particular decisions about military campaign medals. Many of those we spoke to, particularly in the MOD itself, considered the rule sound and reasonable. The overriding fear was that relaxing the rule in any way would open Pandora's Box and leave the MOD exposed to an unending stream of campaigns for reviews of past medal decisions. There was significant support for the view that those in office at the time were best placed to make judgements and that the alteration of perceptions with the passage of time is not a valid basis on which to take different decisions.
24. HD Committee has looked at the five year rule on a number of occasions, most recently in 2005. On each occasion it has concluded that the rule is sound and should not be changed.
25. One notable exception to the rule came in 2002/3. Following a long-running and strong campaign by veterans, with some political support, it was agreed to look again at the case for a Suez Canal Zone medal, as there was no evidence that the proposal for a medal had ever been properly considered at the time. The Canal Zone Clasp for the General Service Medal, for service between 1951 and 1954, was subsequently approved by The Queen in September 2003, on the recommendation of the HD Committee. At the time the HD Committee indicated that the retrospective institution of the 'Canal Zone' Clasp was not to be regarded as a precedent. However it has inevitably

been seen as such by many of those campaigning for reviews of other past decisions.

26. Most of the veteran campaigners for particular medal causes whom we interviewed rejected the five year rule as arbitrary and illogical. They believed that the requirements of justice and due recognition for those who had made sacrifices for their country should override any such limit. They saw the rule as essentially a highly convenient bureaucratic road block behind which the MOD chose to shelter, and questioned the absolute reliance on the sound judgement and application of correct procedures of those making the judgments at the time. A number of campaigners made clear their suspicions that their cases were not properly considered at the time because of the prevailing political sensibilities of the government of the day, for diplomatic or other reasons.
27. This is a difficult area. On the one hand the Pandora's Box argument clearly has validity. The attempt to argue that the Canal Clasp decision of 2003 did not set a precedent clearly failed. Any further reversals of past decisions or announcement of readiness to do so may well encourage others who feel aggrieved to come forward and start campaigning in their turn. There are limits to the extent to which the MOD should be expected to devote resources to investigating claims over events long past, particularly when defence spending is so restrained in general. Five years may be an arbitrary time period but it is not an inherently unreasonable one.
28. On the other hand, governments often revisit past decisions when there is a strong case that an injustice was done, without the sky falling in. The British government did so over the cases of First World War soldiers summarily shot for cowardice, who were finally pardoned in 2006. Moreover it is not inevitable that reopening a small number of particularly contested cases, and possibly changing the decisions in some of them, will lead to endless, irresistible claims from others if the successful challenges can be clearly shown to be *sui generis* in some way, and meet criteria set in advance, such as those described in paragraphs 30 – 33 below.
29. The Review's conclusion is that there should remain a strong presumption that decisions should not be reopened more than five years after the events in question concluded, but that where circumstances can be shown to be exceptional, there should be greater readiness to review previous decisions than has been evident in the past. Some of the cases set out by the campaigners from whom we heard, set out in Section 5 below, seemed to reflect a *prima facie* case for a fresh and independent look at their claims. With the time and resources available to us, we have not been able to gather all of the facts in any of the cases to take definitive views. We also do not wish to raise or dash expectations unnecessarily by 'ranking' the cases publicly in

this report. But we certainly see a requirement to take a proper, independent look at some of them.

30. The exceptional circumstances referred to above should include the following:

- a. evidence that the issue was never properly considered at the time;
- b. significant new information becoming available that had not been considered previously;
- c. facts relied upon during the original decision-making process being shown to be unsound;
- d. the original decision appearing to be manifestly inconsistent with those for other similar campaigns;
- e. the decision appearing to have been taken for reasons which have nothing to do with risk and rigour;

31. The existence of a long standing campaign for a review cannot be a reason for reopening a decision by itself, but the degree of public, press, political or other support is a factor which should be taken into account, since it tends to suggest there is a prima facie case for another look.

32. The decision about whether another look should be taken at a particular case should not rest with the MOD, though their views will always be very important, but with HD Committee, reconstituted as recommended below, and in particular with the new military sub-committee, also recommended below, helped by an independent adviser where appropriate, basing themselves on the criteria set out above.

33. It is impossible to lay down hard and fast rules in advance about what would justify recommending a change to a past decision, but there would need to be at a minimum evidence of a significant injustice or inconsistency affecting a substantial group of individuals, a sufficient degree of assurance that the requirements of risk and rigour were genuinely met, and satisfaction that new inconsistencies were not being created.

34. There is legitimate concern in the MOD that the administration of potential claims is likely to be complex, lengthy and costly. If decisions are taken to review particular cases independently, there will be extra work involved for MOD too, for example in providing archive and other material, but there is no reason to suppose that this will be excessively onerous or costly, or would need to be provided for separately. However, if past decisions were changed in some cases, and new medals were needed, or more had to be produced of existing ones, there would be significant extra costs both for production of the medals themselves, and more importantly for the administration of claims to

check eligibility and qualification, particularly where old and possibly incomplete records are concerned.

35. The Review believes that, if decisions are eventually changed in some cases, the medals concerned should be awarded posthumously where appropriate, in accordance with usual practice. This adds to the administrative complication owing to the difficulty in some cases of establishing the next of kin. It also adds to the cost.
36. The true extent of extra costs is disputed, with the MOD quoting figures at the top of the range and veterans groups strongly contesting these figures as exaggerated and producing estimates of their own. The Review does not have access to information which would enable it to judge in any particular case who is nearer the truth.
37. The Review does not in any case believe that it would be right to ask veterans themselves to pay for their medals, if some decisions are changed, since that would devalue the principle that they represent an award from a grateful state. However, it should be possible, where the extra costs of changing decisions may be considerable, to devise arrangements where these are shared, so that for example the state pays for the production and despatch of the medals themselves, but the extra administrative costs are met at least in part by a combination of interested outsiders. The veterans involved in some campaigns have themselves proposed solutions on these lines.
38. Annex H looks at these cost issues in more detail.

Award of foreign medals - Five Year Rule

39. The FCO, which leads on the implementation of decisions to award and wear foreign medals, applies a variation of the five year rule about the award of foreign medals to British citizens, which states that:

“Requests made in respect of services rendered more than five years previously, or in connection with events in the distant past, will not be entertained.”

40. This is presumably derived from the MOD five year rule, but is somewhat different in its impact. It is designed not so much to prevent issues or past decisions from being reopened, as to discourage foreign governments from believing that they can institute medals for services in the past which will be acceptable to the UK. Again it is a very convenient roadblock to hide behind from a bureaucratic point of view. But the logic is not entirely clear, except in relation to the wider policy of discouraging foreign governments from offering medals to British citizens altogether, discussed below.

Double medalling

41. The double medalling rule is based on the idea that an individual should not be awarded more than one medal in recognition of the same period of military service. This is relatively straightforward in the British national context, since it is easy to control the issue of medals and to ensure that no individual receives two or more medals for the same service. However its main importance, and difficulty, comes in the international context. As a general principle, the UK does not believe it is appropriate for another country to offer medals to UK personnel, and does not give its own military campaign medals to others, though exceptions have been made.
42. There seem to be two main reasons behind this. First is the fear that foreign states giving awards to those serving the British crown could somehow lead to the possibility of influence over them, or reflect special favours given to the state in question. Second is a desire to avoid reciprocal exchanges of medals which would risk devaluing British honours.
43. The issue of double medalling has a long history. It was for example addressed at the end of the First World War, resulting in the 'Inter-Allied Victory Medal' and an agreement for no reciprocal exchange of national campaign medals. There was no similar medal at the close of the Second World War but the UK took steps to prevent the award of Stars and Medals to Allied personnel who were to receive their own country's equivalents and did not permit acceptance of Allied campaign medals other than by Supreme Commanders.
44. Permission to accept and wear a medal from another country or international organisation has to come from The Queen, on recommendation of the HD Committee. But the rules here are complicated. In the case of medals from Commonwealth countries of which The Queen is head of state, some may be worn without specific permission. In the case of medals from other countries or international organisations, The Queen's permission is always required. Permission to wear may be unrestricted, ie it applies at all times, or restricted, ie it applies only on special occasions such as a State or official visit by the head of state concerned.
45. In principle any country or international organisation which wants to give a medal to a UK citizen is supposed to ascertain, through its representation in London, whether permission to accept such an award is likely to be given. It is in this context that the five year rule mentioned above applies, ie requests concerning awards for services more than five years old will not be entertained. (The detailed rules are set out in Annex D.)
46. In reality some foreign states have awarded medals to UK citizens without asking first, and this practice has been on the increase.

47. An exception to the double medalling rule came after the Korean War (1950-53) when both the UK and United Nations issued medals that were permitted for acceptance and unrestricted wear by UK personnel. This overlap is understood to have been largely due to the UK and UN failing to consult on their intentions to strike a medal but may also have been a mark of courtesy by the Government to the still relatively new United Nations organisation.
48. Since then the policy has been to avoid situations where two medals are accepted for wear, even where two or more may be issued. If an international medal is to be issued by the UN or NATO, it has sometimes been the case that no separate British medal will be issued. Only UN, EU and NATO medals were awarded for the Balkans campaigns of the 1990s. They were allowed to be accepted but not authorised for wear. In the first Gulf War, British medals were awarded but British servicemen were also allowed to accept, though not wear, other medals awarded by Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Most recently, in Afghanistan, an Operational Service Medal has been approved, with a unique ribbon. A NATO medal, with Afghanistan clasp, is also available, but not authorised for acceptance or wear by British service personnel.
49. A further exception to the rule nevertheless came over the Pingat Jasa Malaysia (PJM) medal. In 2005, the Malaysian Government asked for permission to award the PJM to British military and civilian personnel who had served in the Malaya Emergency in the late 1950s and 1960s. This breached the five year rule and also involved double medalling for many British service veterans who had already received a General Service Medal with Malaya clasp. Nevertheless, for diplomatic reasons, a decision was taken to agree to the request in order to allow qualifying British personnel to accept but not wear the PJM. The decision not to allow wear was then heavily contested by many of the veterans concerned, particularly since recipients from other Commonwealth countries were allowed to wear it. The British government resisted this campaign until November 2011, when particular political and parliamentary circumstances led to a late change of heart in time for the PJM to be worn on Remembrance Day a few days later.
50. It will be apparent from even this relatively brief description that the so-called rule about double medalling is in a muddle where international medals are concerned, with exceptions proliferating, a good deal of dissatisfaction about how it operates, and no consistency with how other countries treat these issues, including those with military traditions close to ours, such as Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Moreover from a diplomatic point of view the current policy is not helpful to our relations with other countries and international organisations, since we are frequently at risk of causing offence without fully convincing arguments to back up our positions. There was also a lack of clarity between the FCO and MOD about which department was

actually responsible for the substance of the rules and whose interests they were serving.

51. The Review therefore believes there is a strong case for the current rules to be reconsidered and brought more into line with current reality, but has not had the time or resources to elaborate new rules itself. There is every reason to maintain the principle that it should not be possible to receive two British awards for the same piece of military service. But continuing to insist on the current rules in the case of medals from other countries or international organisations certainly needs a fresh look. In particular the distinction between accepting and wearing international medals in now lacks credibility in its current form. Much of the original concern about double medalling was driven by a desire to avoid wide exchanges of medals in the case of large-scale conflicts. The likelihood of such proposals in today's world, and therefore of British medals being devalued by such large scale exchanges, looks low. Fear of undue influence on British personnel from the receipt of foreign medals also does not seem applicable in any significant way to military medals from international organisations.
52. The Review's recommendation is therefore that the FCO, MOD and Cabinet Office should work together as a matter of some urgency to elaborate a new, effective, simple and fully defensible policy about medals from other countries and international organisations, reflecting the observations above. This should include a study of how other comparable countries deal with these issues. We recommend in particular the appointment of an independent expert or group of experts to conduct a review, including such a study, as the basis for a genuinely fresh look. The new policy should be agreed by HD Committee and The Queen, and then published.

Section 4: the decision-making process

1. As explained at the beginning of Section 3, the introduction of new medals, and decisions on changes to existing medal regimes, require individual cases to be submitted from MOD through the Committee on the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals (the HD Committee) to the Sovereign for approval. The HD Committee, which has been in existence since before WW2, is the principal body for provision of advice to the government and the Sovereign on these issues, including individual gallantry and meritorious service awards (outside the scope of this review). It also has a wider remit related to the honours and appointments system in general.
2. The Committee is currently chaired by the Head of the Home Civil Service. The other members are the Principal Private Secretary to The Queen; the Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister; Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Defence; Defence Services Secretary, Ministry of Defence; Permanent Secretary, Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Permanent Secretary, Home Office; Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood; and the Head of the Honours and Appointments Secretariat, who acts as Secretary.
3. Although the Committee is composed of civil servants, by definition answerable to ministers, it operates essentially as a non-political body, not consulting or going through ministers, but providing advice direct to the Sovereign, as the fount of all honours. Ministers have in effect adhered to a self-denying ordinance in not attempting to direct its recommendations, and not intervening directly with the Palace. This is a convention rather than a rule. If the Prime Minister wished to make a direct recommendation to the Sovereign on a particular medal issue, either through HD Committee or directly, that would be within his constitutional right. Meanwhile the presence of his Principal Private Secretary on the Committee enables him to make his views known.
4. HD Committee has a small secretariat based in the Cabinet Office which prepares papers for the Committee's consideration, records meetings and decisions, and acts as a channel of communication between the relevant government departments and the Palace.
5. By and large this very British system seems to have worked reasonably well over time, avoiding politicisation of medal decisions. However, the Review also found a degree of dissatisfaction with its operation. This is partly about process. The Committee rarely meets in practice (it has not physically met for the last two years, for example) and conducts its business largely by correspondence/ email. Since most of its members are extremely busy people with many other issues on their plate, this increases the risk that

recommendations to it about military medals issues from the MOD or FCO, via the Secretariat, go through without substantial discussion or the airing of other views.

6. The process is also largely invisible and inaccessible to those outside the system, which has substantially added to the frustration of veterans and other campaigners, unable to penetrate beyond bland official statements that a particular decision has been taken.
7. The Committee's narrow membership, essentially of civil servants only, also means that there is little or no scope for wider views or considerations to be introduced. This looks increasingly anomalous as committees dealing with other individual aspects of the Honours system have been opened up to outside membership. For example the compositions of the committees which make recommendations about the main civilian honours are dominated by independent members, with relatively few officials.
8. The Review believes that opening up membership of the HD Committee to a number of outsiders and ensuring that it does meet physically on a reasonably regular basis would improve both its decision-making and its credibility more widely, including with veterans' representatives and other campaigners. Since its remit covers a number of areas besides those which are the subject of this review, it is not feasible for this Review to say exactly how its composition should be changed, but the Review believes that any change should include a number of outsiders who have wider political and military expertise and experience relevant to the military side of its activities.
9. The Review also recommends the establishment of a standing sub-committee charged with looking more deeply at the military issues and making recommendations to the full committee. The members should be a balance of relevant officials and credible outside figures with some relevant experience of the security and international affairs worlds, and of government business. Some could be members of the full committee but others could be co-opted as necessary. The Review would recommend that the sub-committee have up to five outside members which could be broken down as follows: three senior figures not active in front-line politics but representing a broad spectrum of opinion; one military historian or other outside military academic expert; and one representative of the Armed Forces Covenant Reference Group, to ensure that decisions are compatible with broader concerns about proper treatment of veterans and service personnel.
10. A sub-committee with a wider membership of this kind would be particularly helpful in looking at controversies over previous decisions and trying to draw a line under them, either by investigating them afresh or by deciding that the

prima facie case for such a fresh investigation does not exist. The eventual recommendations and decisions might not be very different in many cases from those which the HD Committee has come to in the past. No doubt not everyone would be satisfied. But the process would be more open and broadly based, which would also help to counter the idea of an inflexible system unwilling to admit mistakes.

11. To enable rapid and proper consideration of these long-standing cases, and reassure the veterans that a genuinely fresh look is being taken, we recommend that an independent expert in military history be tasked to report on them rapidly, but also in some depth, using particularly the criteria set out above in Section 3, paragraphs 30-33, and provide advice to the subcommittee accordingly. The Royal United Services Institute might for example be asked to provide a suitable expert and supervise the process. Top priority should be given to looking at those involving veterans from the Second World War, such as the campaign over the Arctic Convoys, for obvious reasons of the age of those concerned. The material made available to the Review and any preliminary reflections on the cases we heard about will of course be made available, so that the work does not start again from scratch, but the official records will also need to be scrutinised. Once the backlog of such cases has been dealt with, the subcommittee should be able to deal with business without the need for such extra help, using the normal MOD and HD Committee resources.
12. The broader participation in the sub-committee should also be helpful in consideration of new awards by ensuring that they are as soundly and consistently based as possible, thus reducing the risk of future controversies and campaigns.
13. There need to be limits to transparency, to protect the requirement for frank discussion and the necessary discretion around the role of The Sovereign. However there should be openness about the membership of the committee and sub-committee, the fact of its having looked at particular issues, and the eventual decisions, without the details of discussions or recommendations being revealed.
14. There would also be great advantage in setting out clearly and explicitly for all to see the principles and rules which underlie future decisions, including the broad definition of risk and rigour, the five year rule, and double medalling. The Review therefore believes that an early task of the sub-committee should be to advise the reconstituted HD Committee on agreed recommendations about the exact formulation of these for approval by The Queen, on the basis of the analysis, conclusions and recommendations set out in this report. Once approved these should be published.

15. Many of the veteran and other campaigners we met expressed frustration at the lack of opportunity to challenge decisions formally. It is worth noting that the Australian Government recently set up a Tribunal to consider appeals against decisions in this area, including on individual gallantry medals. However, the Review does not believe, on the evidence it has heard, that such an appeals mechanism is necessary or appropriate. The cost and risk of encouraging litigation argue against such a heavy procedure. The combination of a new more broadly-based sub-committee and a reconstituted HD Committee, with an interest in addressing grievances about particular decisions, where there are specific grounds for doing so, and codification and promulgation of the rules, seem to us to be sufficient.
16. The Review also notes that considerations about reviewing past campaign medal decisions should not be seen as setting a precedent for individual gallantry award decisions, which are not only outside the scope of this review but also raise other issues.

Section 5: Campaigns for Medallic Recognition

1. This section describes the main campaigns for medallic recognition brought to the Review's attention, divided into three categories:
 - a. those asking for recognition of actions which did not originally attract separate military medals;
 - b. those asking for changes to the number of people given medals for particular operations, on the basis that the criteria appear unreasonable or not correctly applied;
 - c. those asking for broader recognition of service.
2. This section is not exhaustive, but reflects the meetings that we held with those veterans groups who requested a meeting with us and substantive submissions received. We are aware that there have been, and still are, other campaigns and grievances. Annex G provides a further list of those that have been brought to the Review Team's attention.
3. The individual entries in this section are necessarily brief. They reflect the points that those we met raised or covered in the submissions (often very detailed) that were sent to us, rather than independent historical research. We have also noted the MoD's position, where this is known to us, but these are not necessarily fully balanced presentations. We are mindful that many of the claims in relation to these campaigns are the subject of continuing debate, which is why further investigation would be needed before final decisions on the campaigns.

Campaigns for Specific Recognition

Arctic Convoys

4. Veterans of the Arctic Convoys to Russia from 1942-1944 have been campaigning for a separate Star for the Arctic on the basis that this both comprised a distinct theatre of war in its own right and was particularly fundamental to the eventual Allied Victory, by keeping the Soviet Union in the war. They also argue that the Convoys were unique in terms of "risk and rigour", and point to Churchill singling these out as the "most dangerous run of the war". 22 warships and 104 merchant ships were sunk. They query why there were separate Africa and Italy Stars for adjacent campaigns, but not one for the Arctic when the area was so far from the Atlantic itself. They note exceptions already made to the 5 year rule, particularly the creation of the Suez Clasp in 2003. The Veterans appreciate that the criteria for the Atlantic Star specifically included the Arctic Convoys, but note that the qualifying period for the Atlantic Star was six months, which could rarely if ever have been achieved in the Arctic campaign alone because of its dangers and the

intense cold. Some of those who served on the Arctic Convoys, including many who died, did not therefore receive the Atlantic Star

5. Some veterans suspect that an Arctic medal was not awarded after the war for political reasons related to the deepening rift with the Soviet Union, and argue that it therefore only became appropriate to lobby actively for such a medal in the 1990s, once the Cold War had ended. They argue that most histories of the war, including those produced by the MoD, do in fact treat the Arctic as a separate theatre. They also believe that the award of an Arctic Emblem badge in 2005 makes their case, but that they deserve a proper medal not a badge. Arctic Convoy veterans were exceptionally given permission to wear a 40th Anniversary medal awarded by the Russians, but attempts by the Russian government to reward the veterans further continue to pose problems in the light of the five year rule about foreign medals.
6. There is no doubt that the conditions and hardships faced by the convoys were horrendous and that the risk and rigour principle is met. Other major actions from the Second World War such as Dunkirk and D-Day did not attract separate medals, though the Battle of Britain was recognised through a separate clasp. The issue is therefore whether the Arctic Convoys deserve separate recognition because the Arctic was a separate geographic theatre; and in particular whether the decision made at the time to include the Convoys within the criteria for the Atlantic Star was right or should be reopened so long after the events concluded.
7. The Arctic Convoy medal campaign has attracted significant political, press and public support, including from members of the Conservative party while in opposition.
8. The MoD take the view that the service of those on the Arctic Convoys was explicitly considered by HD Committee after the war, and there is no case to revisit the decision to include Arctic service in the criteria for the Atlantic Star.
9. It is estimated that at least 95,000 members of the Royal Navy served in the Arctic campaign, together with a similar number from the merchant navy.
10. The veterans and the MoD dispute the order of costs associated with a retrospective award (including for posthumous claims by next of kin). MoD estimate the cost at £12.3million. The Veterans believe it would be not much more than £1m, and that volunteers could help with the administration and any necessary research.

Bomber Command

11. The Review received no formal submission for a campaign medal for the pilots and aircrews (including a large number from the Commonwealth) who took part in the Second World War Bomber Command campaign, but did

meet a senior member of the Bomber Command Association. The Association itself has not campaigned for medallic recognition for some years, having decided to focus efforts on the Hyde Park Memorial, opened by The Queen on 28 June 2012. However individual members are still pursuing the campaign for a separate medal or clasp.

12. Bomber Command suffered extremely high casualty rates: 55,000 out of 125,000 who served died. Many of those who served were awarded either the Air Crew Europe Star or the France and Germany Star. Although Fighter Command did not receive a separate medal, those eligible were awarded a distinctive Battle of Britain clasp to the 1939-45 Star. Many veterans and others believe that the decision not to award any separate medallic recognition for Bomber Command reflected the controversy surrounding the intense bombing of cities like Dresden.
13. Again, there is no doubt that the risk and rigour principle was met. The issue is primarily whether there should be separate recognition for service in a particular Command, akin to the Battle of Britain clasp; and whether this should be looked at again so long after the events concerned.
14. The Canadian government decided in June 2012 to institute a special bar to accompany one of their medals to honour former members of Bomber Command.
15. The MoD believe that, in accordance with the Five Year Rule, there is no case for reopening this issue.
16. The MoD estimate that the cost of awarding 125,000 medals to the veterans or next of kin of those who served would be some £8.1m.

Nuclear Test Veterans

17. A significant number of British Servicemen, including National Servicemen, served in the immediate area of the British atmospheric nuclear tests held in the Pacific during the late 1950s/early 1960s. The British Nuclear Test Veterans Association (BNTVA) has been campaigning over the last seven years or so for medallic recognition for the dangerous, arduous and unique service they gave in relation to these tests. They note that the New Zealand government has recently awarded a Special Service Medal for their service personnel involved in the tests. They note that there was apparently little or no awareness at the time of the likely damage to health and the potential for long-term harm across future generations. Certainly little attention was given to this: virtually no warnings were given, or precautions taken. They note that several senior scientists and others involved received awards connected to the tests through the Honours system, but ordinary service personnel were not included.

18. There has also been a long running legal case for compensation that we understand may now be at risk of being timed out.
19. The BNTVA support the National Defence Medal campaign but would still seek a clasp to recognise the particular features of their service.
20. The MoD view is that service of a particular specialist nature has never been seen as the sole justification for a medal, even though the circumstances of the nuclear tests are unique. Commanders at the time did not make any case for a medal.
21. Around 22,000 UK service personnel took part in the tests in the Pacific. MoD estimate that costs for a medal could be around £1.6m.

Cold War Veterans

22. Groups of veterans from the Cold War believe that their service deserves medallic recognition, and propose that all who served a qualifying period of 160 days after basic training during the period from 1945 to 1981 should be eligible, whatever they were doing at the time, since all were involved and at more or less constant risk. This might involve 3-4 million servicemen. Their argument is that the Cold War was a real war, and a genuine armed confrontation, not a phony one, which involved constant risk and rigour for many. It has been described as the most dangerous time in recent history, where the stakes were uniquely high.
23. The Campaign argue that even though full-scale confrontation and nuclear war never happened, they were close at many times, notably during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Soviet forces were targeted on the UK and vice versa over many years, and deployments around the world reflected that, particularly but not only in Germany. Those who manned nuclear strike submarines under the ice for months at a time, or nuclear bombers primed for take-off at a moment's notice were only the most obvious cases of personnel in risky and rigorous conditions. Exercises, including wearing of NBC protection, were frequent and occasionally dangerous. Levels of readiness were constantly high for many units. There were also significant casualties from air and sea clashes at intervals during the period.
24. Other countries are beginning to recognise the service of Cold War veterans, including the Netherlands and New Zealand (with a Special Service Medal). Although the campaigners believe that their service deserves a separate medal, there is a degree of acceptance that their case to some extent coincides with that for a National Defence Medal.
25. The MoD have not estimated separately the cost of such a medal but given the numbers their estimate would presumably be in the low hundreds of millions of pounds, as for the National Defence Medal.

Korea Post Armistice

26. The Review has received a detailed submission from the Korea Post Armistice Medal Campaign which seeks medallic recognition for the thousands of British troops who served in Korea following the July 1953 Armistice until the final British withdrawal in July 1957. The Campaign argues that the arduous climate and physical conditions, and the continuing real risk of a sudden resumption of hostilities, represented service that was significantly more difficult and dangerous than could usually be expected. They illustrate with a range of examples continuing tensions in the demilitarized zone and emphasise the political instability. They note that other Commonwealth countries and the US have all established medallic recognition for personnel who served in Korea after the war.
27. In particular they point to the findings of a 2005 Australian working party established to review the level of recognition after the Armistice, and query why the UK has not adopted a similar approach for British service personnel.
28. MoD has not evaluated the potential coverage, or estimated the potential cost of such an award.

Armilla Patrols (The Gulf)

29. The Navy has continued to patrol the Persian Gulf to protect British shipping and other interests since the Iran and Iraq war broke out in 1980. At least one Royal Navy vessel has remained there ever since. Typically patrol deployments last for six months or so, with the supporting Royal Fleet Auxiliary vessel sometimes spending an aggregate total of over a year in the area.
30. The largest British presence in the Persian Gulf was during the two operations against Iraq, for which various medallic awards are available. The Review has received a number of queries from naval personnel who assert that the patrols from 1980 onwards should qualify for some recognition as these were also challenging operational deployments.
31. MoD has not evaluated the potential coverage, or estimated the cost of such an award.

Campaigns which dispute qualifying criteria for existing medals, or their application in practice

Yangtze – HMS Concord

32. The ‘Yangtze 1949’ clasp to the Naval General Service Medal (1915) (NGSM) was announced in November 1949, in recognition of actions fought between Royal Navy ships and Chinese communist land forces in the Yangtze River on

20 and 21 April 1949, and HMS AMETHYST's subsequent incarceration in the Yangtze from 20 April until breaking out in July. HMS CONCORD was not involved in April 1949, but on the night of the break-out in July the ship was dispatched into the river to be on hand to assist AMETHYST if required. Veterans, including some who would not benefit themselves, have been campaigning for the clasp for the 180 crew members of the CONCORD.

33. They argue that CONCORD's entry a number of miles into the Yangtze river, ie Chinese territorial waters, to help AMETHYST and readiness for expected military action, as opposed to waiting at the mouth of the river for AMETHYST to emerge, was concealed at the time for political and diplomatic reasons. They believe that documents now available and contemporary accounts prove conclusively that CONCORD did meet the AMETHYST well up river, and that this means her crew qualified for the clasp, even though the feared attack from Chinese forts along the banks, which CONCORD was there to counter, did not in the event materialise. They argue that the qualifying criteria for the clasp cover not only involvement in the actions in April but were later extended to cover those involved in the July break-out too, because of the need to cover individuals who helped AMETHYST after the action, including the acting captain of AMETHYST during the break-out.
34. The MoD argue that the contention that HMS CONCORD was deliberately excluded is not supported by the records, and that the Yangtze clasp was instituted in recognition of the actions of April, in which HMS Concord was not involved.
35. MoD estimate that the cost of issuing a clasp to veterans of the CONCORD or surviving family members would be in the region of £1K.

Suez Veterans

36. A Canal Zone Clasp to the General Service Medal was introduced in 2003 following a long standing campaign by the Suez Veterans Association. However the Association remains concerned that the criteria for the clasp cover the period from October 1951 to 1954, and not from the end of the Second World War to June 1956 when troops were finally withdrawn. The Veterans note that there were significant casualties from December 1945 to October 1951, and again from 1954 to 1956, even if the fighting was at its height between 1951 and 1954.
37. They argue that the dates for the clasp reflect particular political landmarks (Egypt rejecting the Suez Canal agreement and later reaching a final settlement) rather than the events on the ground themselves, and that levels of risk and rigour were not significantly different before or after these dates. The Veterans association is unsure how many more people would qualify for the clasp if the criteria was extended, but note that of the 1,000 or so

individuals thought to have been killed, only around 400 are covered by the current criteria time period.

38. MoD has not evaluated the potential coverage, or estimated the cost of widening the criteria.

Aden Veterans

39. Three medals were instituted in respect of the military campaigns in Aden between 1957 and 1967, although they do not cover the entire period of operations there. The Aden Veterans Association has campaigned for the Government to extend the qualifying period of either the “Arabian Peninsula” General Service Medal(GSM)/Naval General Service Medal(NGSM) or the “South Arabia” GSM to cover operational service between July 1960 and 1964 which is not currently recognised by any of the clasps to the GSM. The Association assert that the levels of risk and rigour for this period were not significantly less than at other points before or after, and are unaware of any events (e.g. any kind of cease fire) that would suggest otherwise.
40. The MoD argue that those concerned at the time were looking at these issues on a regular basis and clearly decided that the risks from raids and terrorist actions did not justify including this period in the qualifying criteria.
41. The MoD do not know how many served in Aden in the period 1960 to 1964 but estimate that the extension of the GSM clasp to cover this period would cost several thousand pounds.

South Atlantic Medal (without rosette)

42. A number of Falklands Veterans made a submission to the Review regarding the qualifying criteria for the South Atlantic Medal, which they believe should be extended from 12 July 1982 to December of that year. They believe that the current qualifying dates, which end 30 days after the Argentine surrender, ignore continuing hardships, risk and rigour associated with the immediate aftermath of the conflict, and note that there was no definitive end date for “Operation Corporate” itself. The date they suggest of December 1982 reflects the point at which the Falklands became defensible from the Islands themselves, because of the repairs and modifications to Port Stanley airport, rather than by the Naval Taskforce.
43. The veterans recognise that it is appropriate that those who did the fighting itself be awarded the medal with rosette but argue that those who sailed in full expectation of taking part in the campaign and, while arriving too late for the actual fighting, remained on a war footing and high alert for months afterwards, including high risks from mines on land and at sea, should receive the medal without the rosette. What they did and had to endure should not be regarded as in any sense reflecting normal duties or service.

44. They also argue that the decisions about the qualifying criteria for the South Atlantic Medal were rushed in order to ensure that they were available for issue and wear before the 'victory parade' in London on October 1982; that there are many anomalies about who received the South Atlantic Medal, including some who never got beyond Ascension Island; and that if decisions then had been taken on an analogous basis to decisions more recently over Iraq and Afghanistan, more medals would definitely have been awarded.
45. MoD has not evaluated the potential coverage, or estimated the cost of widening the criteria.

Jubilee Medals

46. Although strictly outside the terms of reference of this enquiry, we received a number of comments regarding the criteria for the Queen's Silver Jubilee Medals (QSJM) issued in 1977, Golden Jubilee Medals (QGJM) in 2002, and Diamond Jubilee Medals this year, and include these to illustrate the wider issues. These are not campaign medals as such but clearly have great prestige. Only 35,000 QSJM were minted and complicated instructions were issued to each unit about how the few medals allocated to them were to be awarded. This resulted in a great deal of disappointment and resentment. Some smaller units only received one or two medals, if any.
47. Mindful of the problems that had occurred in 1977 the allocation of the QGJM was very different. An individual had to have completed five years reckonable service to receive either medal, but there was no limit on the number of QGJMs minted. Anyone in the Armed Forces in adult full-time service who had completed the necessary five years service and was serving on 6 February 2002, the 50th anniversary of The Queen's Accession, qualified for the medal. Many thousands of medals were distributed. They are still available for issue if it can be proven that an applicant meets the qualifying criteria.
48. The Diamond Jubilee Medal was issued this year on similar principles to the QGJM, ie all who had done at least five years qualifying service on the day of the anniversary of the Accession were awarded the medal.
49. Many people serving at the time of The Queen's Silver Jubilee who did not receive the medal were very disappointed. There are a smaller number who were similarly disappointed because they fell outside the criteria for the Golden Jubilee, for example those who retired after many years service shortly before 6 February 2002. The same is likely to be true of the Diamond Jubilee Medal. We also heard comments about the unfairness of soldiers currently on the front lines eg in Afghanistan not receiving the Diamond Jubilee Medal, while others in office roles did, just because they had done the requisite five years.

50. The MoD see no strong case for revisiting the criteria agreed at the time.
51. They estimate that the cost of extending the QSJM to all who had served 5 years, or their surviving relatives, at the time of the 25th anniversary could require a further 170,000 medals to be struck at a cost of around £12.8M. The number of additional QGJMs required would depend on what basis the criteria were extended.

Broader Recognition Sought

National Service

52. The National Service Veterans Association (NSVA) is campaigning for a medal to recognise the varied service of those whose lives were interrupted by compulsory National Service: two million people were conscripted from the end of the Second World War until 1960. In 1992 a commemorative medal was struck by the medals industry, but the association seeks more official recognition either via a distinct medal or a broader National Defence Medal (NDM).
53. The NSVA feel that the significant contribution made by National Service personnel has not been recognised. They note the variety of service and cite particular instances of hardship and rigour. For example, between 1945 and 1955 the army on the Rhine remained on a war footing; many served in Korea; others volunteered for non-conventional weapons testing (including the nuclear weapons in the Pacific).
54. Despite these instances of particular risk and rigour, the claim is not for a military campaign medal in the traditional sense. Many spent their national service alongside regular personnel who also did not receive medals, while others qualified for the same campaign medals as regular colleagues. This makes the campaign akin to the National Defence Medal for broader recognition of service, and it has indeed increasingly been included within it.
55. The MoD believe that it would be divisive to introduce a National Service Medal since those concerned served alongside their regular colleagues and were treated in the same way as regards medallic recognition. No case was put forward for a National Service medal at the time.
56. MoD estimate the cost of an official medal for all who undertook National Service between 1945 and 1960 to be around £150m.

National Defence Medal (NDM)

57. A campaign for the institution of a new universal medal to recognise all service in the Armed Forces since 3 September 1945 (detailed criteria to be determined by a working group) has been gathering strength in recent years,

and has for example attracted support in a Parliamentary Early Day Motion. The Liberal Democrats passed a motion at their 2010 party conference to support the introduction of a National Defence Medal.

58. Supporters of a National Defence Medal (NDM) seek recognition for all who have served irrespective of where they have been called upon to do that service. They argue that this would help to address the issues of inconsistency and injustice which have characterised medallic recognition over past decades, and ask why a country which sets great store by its armed forces would not want to recognise its veterans. They believe that many have served through events which are as demanding as those marked by issue of a campaign medal but have never been recognised. Past examples would include the Berlin Airlift and the Cold War in general when those concerned may not have been directly involved in armed conflict but did face significant risks and were often at a moment's readiness to deploy. They also point to the specific risks to servicemen from Northern Irish terrorism even for those not serving in Northern Ireland.
59. The argument is strengthened in their view by the fact that most countries have their own equivalents of a National Defence Medal, including close allies. Australia and, most recently, New Zealand have introduced Defence Medals for four years and three years Service respectively. The Prime Minister of New Zealand announced the introduction of the New Zealand Defence Service Medal on 11 October 2010. The intent of the Medal is to recognise the unique requirements of military service. These requirements are stated as including: commitment to service of the Crown, liability for operational service subject to military discipline and lifestyle, and imposed constraints on employment conditions and personal freedoms.
60. Against the argument that there is no tradition in the UK for medals being awarded just for being members of the Armed Forces, advocates of the National Defence Medal believe there is a strong case for a medal to acknowledge and record military service of the Crown. They note that there is already a long service and good conduct medal for other ranks, and for officers in the reserves, though not for the regular forces, which is an anomaly which will become more glaring as regulars and reservists become more integrated. The NDM Campaign also notes similarities with the Coronation and Jubilee medals, where the qualifying criteria have nothing to do with risk and rigour. They also believe that the lack of an NDM has favoured the unofficial medals industry, which in turn threatens to devalue official medals by association.
61. They argue that institution of an NDM would mean that every veteran would have at least one medal, which would therefore help to deal with the problem noted elsewhere in this report of veterans from certain periods having little or

no medallic recognition. Those in favour of such a medal also argue that this would be an opportunity to address, at least partially, grievances of other more specific veteran campaigners such as the National Servicemen, Cold War Veterans, British Army on the Rhine Veterans, and Nuclear Test Veterans.

62. The Review found little or no enthusiasm for a universal medal of this kind amongst current or past military chiefs or the limited number of serving personnel we met.
63. The MOD instituted the Armed Forces Veterans lapel badge in 2004, as a way of identifying all those who had done past military service. Some 800,000 veterans have claimed a badge and one is now issued to all personnel leaving the Armed Forces. However the NDM Campaign believes that the badge is insufficient recognition for having served. Many veterans we spoke to noted the big psychological difference between an identifying badge and a 'proper' medal.
64. Some campaigners note that the medals similar to the NDM, introduced by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand, have been approved by The Queen. There cannot therefore be a fundamental objection to an NDM for the UK. However the governments of these countries make their own recommendations to The Queen, in line with their own customs and military ethos. Since Australia and New Zealand withdrew from the Imperial Honours System, advice from their ministers to The Queen does not have to be consistent with that from the British Government.
65. The MoD argue that there is no British tradition of medals just for being members of the Armed Forces, no desire for such a medal among serving personnel, and a great potential cost. They therefore do not support its introduction. However it is not clear how far the arguments have been looked at in detail – hence the recommendation in Section 2 that a Cabinet Office-led working group be set up to look at the arguments, and at examples from other countries, to enable a considered view to be taken and recommendations made to the government accordingly.
66. Cost is bound to be a particular issue if such a medal is considered for institution retrospectively as those in favour argue it should be, for the reasons set out above of recognising those who have not otherwise been recognised. It is estimated that up to 6 million people could apply either for themselves or on behalf of a deceased relative (2 million alone completed post-war National Service). The MoD therefore estimate that the cost could exceed £300 million.
67. Some campaigners for the medal have suggested that it could be paid for by the individuals concerned. However official medals are the gift of The Queen,

who is the fount of all Honour in the UK, and are traditionally awarded free of charge to individuals who meet the qualifying criteria. If a charge was placed upon such a medal it would devalue the status of the award, and by extension the UK Honours and Awards system more generally.

68. The NDM campaign argue that the MoD are greatly exaggerating the costs, and that these would in any case be spread over several years, as take-up would be gradual. They also believe that it would be possible to distinguish between the production costs of the medal, which are relatively small, and the administrative costs, and mitigate or eliminate the latter as a direct charge to the MOD through use of volunteers looking at the records, packaging and posting etc, and possibly through sensitive commercial sponsorship of some kind, without undermining the principle that medals are a gift from the state and The Queen.

Medal for those killed or wounded in action

69. The Review has also received a submission proposing a medal for service personnel killed in action or seriously wounded. This would build upon the Elizabeth Cross award, instituted in July 2009, and presented to the next of kin of those service personnel who have been killed in action on a medal earning operation.

70. This submission proposes a medal akin to the US Purple Heart and Canadian Sacrifice Medal, and points to the wounded stripes and discharge badges adopted for British servicemen in World War I and II. The submission argues that the reality of modern warfare, together with improvements in battle field first aid and medical advances in general, is leading to increasing numbers surviving horrific injuries. A medal, the submission suggests, would offer appropriate recognition, and contribute to their psychological rehabilitation and readjustment. It advances similar arguments to the NDM Campaign about the status of medals compared to badges or emblems, although the Review notes that the Elizabeth Cross seems to have been very well received by service personnel and families.

71. Our sense is that the MoD and serving personnel may view the proposal with similar scepticism to the NDM Campaign.

72. There are no estimates available of the potential coverage or cost.

ANNEXES

A TERMS OF REFERENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT

B LIST OF MEETINGS

C HD COMMITTEE: COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

D RULES GOVERNING THE ACCEPTANCE AND WEARING OF FOREIGN ORDERS, DECORATIONS AND MEDALS BY CITIZENS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND HER OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

E TABLES OF CAMPAIGN AND OTHER OPERATIONAL AWARDS AUTHORISED FOR WEAR BY THE ARMED FORCES SINCE 1939

1. World War 2 Medals and Campaign Stars 1939 – 1945
2. Medals for Individual Campaigns or Operations (since 1945):
3. General Service Medal 1914 and 62:
4. Operational Service Medal (Instituted 1 January 2000).
5. Miscellaneous

F TABLES OF FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL AWARDS APPROVED FOR WEAR BY UK CITIZENS

1. Foreign and Commonwealth
2. United Nations Medals:
3. United Nations Special Service Medal:
4. NATO:
5. European and International Organisations:

G LIST OF CAMPAIGNS FOR MEDALLIC RECOGNITION

H COST ISSUES

I MEMBERS OF THE REVIEW TEAM

ANNEX A

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENT

MILITARY MEDALS REVIEW – TERMS OF REFERENCE

The review will:

- Consider the current medallic situation and examine the rationale for existing guiding principles, including the 5 year rule; double medalling; risk and rigour and the HD Committee process. The review will examine the background to the current arrangements, the pros and cons of them and make recommendations where appropriate for any changes, and;
- Make recommendations on how retrospective claims for medals for earlier campaign service should be assessed in light of the guiding principles recommended by the Review.

Consultation

The review should consult widely and those consulted should include: CDS and the Chiefs of Staff; Buckingham Palace; personnel from all three Services (from a range of ranks); representatives from veterans groups who have campaigned for further recognition; representatives from veterans organisations such as the Royal British Legion, officials involved in medal policy matters in the Cabinet Office, Ministry of Defence and the Foreign Office.

Assumptions

The review will consider the arrangements relating to military medals only and is not to review state honours and awards (including national gallantry awards) or Long Service and Good Conduct Medals.

The review should draw on, but not necessarily be guided by, the work already undertaken as a part of the initial Ministry of Defence medal review. This should include consideration of the responses to that review by the veterans groups consulted.

Any changes recommended should consider the cost to the taxpayer of any such changes.

PRIME MINISTER

Written Ministerial Statement

30 April 2012

Military Medals Review

This Government is fully committed to recognising all that our Armed Forces do to keep us safe. That's why this Government has enshrined the Military Covenant in law.

Today, I am pleased to update the House on the fresh review of the rules governing the award of military campaign medals that Lord Astor announced in the House last October.

I have appointed Sir John Holmes to carry out this review of the rules and principles governing the award of military campaign medals to ensure that it is fully independent. Sir John is currently Director at The Ditchley Foundation, and formerly served as the UN's Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator and as Her Majesty's Ambassador in Paris and Lisbon.

The review will consider the current medallic recognition situation and examine the guiding principles and current processes. It will make recommendations where appropriate for any change. I have asked Sir John Holmes to report on his review by the summer.

A copy of the terms of reference has been placed in the Libraries of the House.

ANNEX B

LIST OF MEETINGS

The following is a list of individuals or organisations whom the Review Team met. The review also received over 200 written contributions.

Government

Rt Hon Philip Hammond MP	Secretary of State for Defence
Nick Harvey MP	Minister for Armed Forces
Andrew Robathan MP	Parliamentary Under Secretary, for Defence Personnel, Welfare and Veterans
Lord Astor of Hever	Parliamentary Under Secretary, Ministry of Defence

Parliamentarians

Rt Hon James Arbuthnot MP	Defence Select Committee, Chair
Rt Hon Jim Murphy MP	Shadow Secretary of State for Defence
Gemma Doyle MP	Shadow Minister for Defence Personnel, Welfare and Veterans
Marshal of the RAF the Lord Craig of Radley GCB OBE	Former Chief of the Defence Staff (1988-91)
Lord Touhig	Former Minister for Veterans (2005 -06)
Caroline Dineage MP	Gosport Constituency
Penny Mordaunt MP	Portsmouth North Constituency

Officials

Sir Jeremy Heywood	Cabinet Office, Permanent Secretary
Ursula Brennan	Ministry of Defence, Permanent Under Secretary
Sir Christopher Geidt KCVO OBE	Principal Private Secretary to The Queen
Ian Keith, Colonel V Woyka	Ministry of Defence, Honours and Awards
Simon Martin, Judith Usher	Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Protocol Directorate
Steve Spear	Naval Secretary, Honours and Awards
Richard Tilbrook	Cabinet Office, Head of HD Secretariat

Military

General Sir David Richards	Chief of the Defence Staff
Air Chief Marshal Sir Stephen Dalton	Chief of the Air Staff
Admiral Sir Mark Stanhope	Chief of the Naval Staff
General Sir Peter Wall	Chief of the General Staff
Air Vice Marshal David Murray	Assistant Chief of the Defence Staff (Personnel)

Veterans' Representatives

Commander R Agar, Bryan Dickson, Derek Hodgson, William Leitch, Ray Shenston	Yangtze River Incident
Andrew Davies, Paul Tofi	Cold War Veterans Association
Lieutenant Commander R F Dykes, Commander William Grenfell	Arctic Convoy Veterans
Judith Holland	Aden Veterans Association
Nigel Heaps, Jeff Liddiatt	British Nuclear Test Veterans
Charles Lovelace	National Service Veterans and National Defence Medal
Ian McVitie, Nigel Morris, Mark Willoughby	South Atlantic Medal
Tony Morland, Terry Scriven. Arnold Schwartzman OBE	National Defence Medal, Co Chairs. Patron of the National Defence Medal campaign
Douglas Radcliffe	Bomber Command Association, Secretary

Other organisations

Donald Anderson	New Zealand Defence Force, Medals Policy
Major Carl Gauthier	Department of National Defence, Directorate of Honours and Recognition, Canada
Sir Dusty Miller	RAF Association
Robert Robson	The Royal Navy and Royal Marines Charity, Chief Executive
Chris Simpkins	British Legion, Director General
Air Vice Marshal Tony Stables	Confederation of British Service and Ex Service

Organisations, Chairman

Focus Groups on Medals with serving military personnel Army, Royal Air Force, Royal Navy

Brigadier Robin Bacon Soldiers' Charity, Vice-Chair

ANNEX C

HD COMMITTEE: COMPOSITION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

Composition:

The Committee is chaired by the Head of the Home Civil Service. Other members are: the Principal Private Secretary to The Queen; the Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister; Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Defence; Defence Services Secretary, Ministry of Defence; Permanent Secretary Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Permanent Secretary, Home Office; Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood; Head of Honours and Appointments Secretariat (Secretary).

Current members:

Sir Bob Kerslake – Head of Home Civil Service (Chair)

Sir Christopher Geidt – Principal Private Secretary to The Queen

Alexander Matheson of Matheson, yr – Secretary of the Central Chancery of the Orders of Knighthood

Dame Helen Ghosh – Home Office Permanent Secretary

Simon Fraser – Foreign and Commonwealth Office Permanent Secretary

Air Vice-Marshal David Murray – Defence Services Secretary, MOD

Chris Martin – Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Terms of reference:

The HD Committee is the permanent standing Committee which provides advice to The Sovereign on policy concerning honours, decorations and medals. The terms of reference of the Committee are:

‘To consider general questions relative to the Grant of Honours, Decorations and Medals; to review the scales of award, both civil and military, from time to time, to consider questions of new awards, and changes in the conditions governing existing awards.’

ANNEX D

RULES GOVERNING THE ACCEPTANCE AND WEARING OF FOREIGN ORDERS, DECORATIONS AND MEDALS BY CITIZENS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AND HER OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

These rules set out the circumstances under which a citizen of the United Kingdom or her Overseas Territories (“UK citizen”) may be granted The Sovereign’s permission to accept and wear an Order, Decoration or Medal (“foreign award”) conferred by a Head of State or Government of a foreign country, Head of Government of a Commonwealth country of which The Sovereign is not Head of State and certain international organisations (collectively referred to as “foreign state”).

Principles

1. No UK citizen¹ may accept and wear a foreign award without The Sovereign’s permission. Such permission must be sought as soon as there is an indication that an award may be offered.
2. The granting of permission for a UK citizen to accept an award offered by a foreign state will only be considered if the award recognises specified services rendered to the interests of that foreign state.
3. Permission will not be given for UK citizens to accept a foreign award if they have received, or are expected to receive, a UK award for the same services.
4. Acceptance of a foreign award does not mean that the UK will make a reciprocal offer directly or indirectly associated with the UK recipient.

Permission

5. Permission to wear a foreign award, if granted, will be either:
 - **unrestricted** – allowing the award to be worn on any occasion; or
 - **restricted** – allowing the award to be worn only on particular occasions associated with the foreign state that conferred it.
6. The grant of permission, whether unrestricted or restricted, will be conveyed by letter to the UK citizen concerned from the The Sovereign’s Private Secretary.

Application

7. A foreign state wishing to confer an award on a UK citizen is expected to ascertain – through its Diplomatic Representative at The Court of St James’s – whether permission to accept an award would be likely to be given. Such

¹ This includes British subjects and British-protected persons (BPPs). BPPs may accept awards conferred by their Rulers.

requests for clearance will only be entertained in respect of awards given by Heads of State or Governments recognised as such by The Sovereign.

8. Requests made by certain international organisations (e.g., the United Nations and NATO) in respect of service in operations under their auspices should be made to the Defence Services Secretary in the Ministry of Defence.
9. Requests made in respect of services rendered more than five years previously, or in connection with events in the distant past (e.g., commemorative awards), will not be entertained.
10. Requests for clearance meeting the requirement of these regulations will be submitted to The Sovereign for consideration by the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs – who will be under no obligation to make such a submission if the application has not been made as indicated in paragraphs 7 and 8 above.
11. Requests for clearance in the case of foreign awards conferred by private societies or institutions will not be granted.

Guidelines

12. Each request will be treated on a case by case basis. The fact that a similar application has been approved in the past should not be taken as implying that permission will be granted.
13. The grant of unrestricted permission will be considered in the case of foreign awards conferred for services:
 - related to the saving or attempting to save life²;
 - by any member of the UK Armed Forces or other UK official on exchange, attachment or loan to a foreign state who is involved in a military operation or an emergency³ on behalf of that country, state or organisation;
 - by any member of the UK Armed Forces serving in a UK Unit within a bi-lateral force under the command of the other country who renders especial service to the country's forces in a military operation or emergency; or
 - in military operations under the auspices of an international organisation (e.g., the United Nations).
14. The grant of restricted permission will be considered in the case of foreign awards conferred:
 - on the occasion of and in connection with a State or official visit by a Head of State or Government of a foreign or Commonwealth country;
 - in connection with a State visit by The Sovereign; or

² Including medals issued by life saving societies and institutions (but these must be worn on the right breast).

³ It will be for the UK to decide if the operations or emergency is of the standard to fall within this criterion.

- to members of Special Missions when The Sovereign is represented at a coronation, wedding or funeral or other similar occasion; or on any Diplomatic Representative⁴ when specially accredited to represent The Sovereign on such occasions.
15. Other than in circumstances described in paragraphs 13 and 14 above, permission, unrestricted or restricted, will not be granted to⁵:
- Crown, civil and most categories of public servants generally;
 - in particular, to Heads or other members of HM Diplomatic or Consular establishments abroad when leaving their posts – whether on transfer or on final retirement;
 - senior officials, military and civilian, visiting foreign states; and
 - British citizens working as officials in international organisations.
16. No permission is needed for the acceptance of any foreign award if it is designed not to be worn.

⁴ This does not apply to his or her staff.

⁵ This guidance normally applies equally to the spouses or partners of Crown servants.

ANNEX E

CAMPAIGN AND OTHER OPERATIONAL AWARDS AUTHORISED FOR WEAR BY THE ARMED FORCES SINCE 1939

1. *World War 2 Medals and Campaign Stars 1939 – 1945:*

SER	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS/ EMBLEMS	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	1939-45 Star	3 Sep 1939 to 8 May 1945 (2 Sep 1945 in Far East)	Battle of Britain	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 180 days operational service between 3 Sep 1939 and 2 Sep 1945.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Ground Crew – 6 months (180 days) operational service overseas between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945</p> <p>- Aircrew – 60 days operational service between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945 (2 Sep 1945 in the Far East)</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- 6 months (180 days) service afloat in operational areas between dates above.</p>	Battle of Britain Clasp only awarded to flying personnel who flew fighter aircraft engaged in the Battle of Britain between 10 July 1940 and 31 October 1940.
2	Atlantic Star	3 Sep 1939 to 8 May 1945	Air Crew Europe, France & Germany	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 12 months (360 days) operational service, any six months afloat, between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Ground Crew – 6</p>	Persons who entered operational service during the last 6 months up to 8 May 1945, will if they did not serve subsequently in another operational area, qualify for the award and the prior time qualification will not apply.

				<p>months (180 days) operational service overseas between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945 after qualifying for the 39/45 Star.</p> <p>- Aircrew – 60 days operational service between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945 (2 Sep 1945 in the Far East) after qualifying for the 39/45 Star</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- 6 months (180 days) at sea in an operational area provided the 39/45 Star has first been earned.</p>	
3	Air Crew Europe Star	3 Sep 1939 to 5 Jun 1944	Atlantic, France & Germany	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 120 days operational flying between 3 Sep 1939 and 5 June 1944 (inclusive). The 39/45 Star must have been earned first.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- 120 days operational flying (first 60 days being 39/45 Star) between 3 Sep 1939 and 5 June 1944.</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- As above</p>	
4	Africa Star	10 Jun 1940 to 12 May 1943	8 th Army, 1 st Army, North Africa 1942-43	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 1 day operational service between 10 June 1940 and 12 May 1943.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Non flying personnel</p>	

				<p>as above.</p> <p>- Aircrew – 1 operational sortie between above dates.</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- Naval and Merchant Navy service anywhere in the Mediterranean between the above dates.</p>	
5	Pacific Star	8 Dec 1941 to 2 Sep 1945	Burma	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 1 day operational service between 8 Dec 1941 and 2 Sep 1945.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Non flying personnel as above.</p> <p>- Aircrew – 1 operational sortie between above dates.</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- Must qualify for the 39/45 Star first (6 months) then as above.</p>	Persons who entered operational service during the last 6 months up to 2 September 1945, will if they did not serve subsequently in another operational area, qualify for the award and the prior time qualification will not apply
6	Burma Star	11 Dec 1941 to 2 Sep 1945	Pacific	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 1 day operational service 11 Dec 1941 to 2 Sep 1945.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Non flying personnel as above.</p> <p>- Aircrew – 1 operational sortie between above dates</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- Must qualify for the</p>	

				39/45 Star first (6 months) then as above.	
7	Italy Star	11 Jun 1943 8 May 1945		<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 1 day operational service between 11 Jun 1943 and 8 May 1945.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Non flying personnel as above.</p> <p>- Aircrew – 1 operational sortie between above dates</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- Must qualify for the 39/45 Star first (6 months) then as above</p>	
8	France & Germany Star	6 Jun 1944 to 8 May 1945	Atlantic	<p><u>Army</u></p> <p>- 1 day operational service between 6 Jun 1944 and 8 May 1945.</p> <p><u>RAF</u></p> <p>- Non flying personnel as above.</p> <p>- Aircrew – 1 operational sortie between above dates</p> <p><u>Navy</u></p> <p>- Naval and Merchant Navy service afloat in the North Sea (specified areas) qualify provided such service was directly in support of land operations.</p>	
9	Defence Medal	3 Sep 1939 to 2		<u>All Services</u>	

		Sep 1945		<p>- 3 years' (1080 days) service in the UK between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945</p> <p>- One year's service (360 days) non operational service overseas between 3 Sep 1939 and 2 Sep 1945</p> <p>- 6 months' (180 days) non operational service in an area deemed to be closely threatened or subject to air attack between 3 Sep 1939 and 8 May 1945</p>	
10	War Medal 1939-45	3 Sep 1939 – 2 Sep 1945	Oak Leaf	All Services – minimum of 28 days embodied service in the Armed Forces between 3 Sep 1939 and 2 Sep 1945	

Notes:

1. A total of 8 Campaign Stars with 3 Clasps and 2 Medals were agreed in recognition of War Service of which a maximum of 5 Stars with associated Clasps and 2 Medals could be worn as follows:
 - a) There were three unique Campaign Stars (1939 – 45 Star, Africa and Italy Star) all of which could be worn as appropriate.
 - b) Thereafter, only one of the following Stars could be worn in date order of award with Clasps to denote subsequent campaign service within the region, Pacific and Burma Stars; Atlantic, Air Crew Europe and France and Germany Stars.

2. Medals for Individual Campaigns or Operations (since 1945):

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Korea Medal	2 July 1950 to 27 July 1953	None	1 Day (Ashore) 28 (Afloat)	
2	South Atlantic Medal	2 Apr to 12 Jul 82 - 30 days 2 Apr to 14 Jun 82 - 1 day	Rosette worn on the medal and brooch bar to signify service south of the 35 th Parallel	1 day 30 days (Ascension Island)	
3	Gulf Medal	2 Aug 90 to 7 Mar 91	Clasp: Aug 90	1 day 30 days	Clasp awarded to those Kuwait Liaison Team

			Clasp: 6 Jan to 28 Feb 91	7 days continuous	personnel who were taken hostage Clasp to signify war fighting period and awarded to those in Zone I only.
4	Iraq Medal	20 Jan 03 to a date to be decided	19 Mar - 28 Apr 03	30 days RN 30 days continuous or 45 days aggregated	

3. *General Service Medal 1962*

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	GSM 1962	24 Dec 62 to 11 Aug 66	Borneo	30 days OR 1 operational sortie (aircrew)	
2	GSM 1962	25 Apr to 31 Jul 64	Radfan	14 days	
3	GSM 1962	1 Aug 64 to 30 Nov 67	South Arabia	30 days	
4	GSM 1962	17 Aug 64 to 12 Jun 65 for Ground Forces 17 Aug 64 to 11 Aug 66 for Air Crew	Malay Peninsula	30 days or 30 sorties (max 1 per day)	
5	GSM 1962	14 Aug 69 to 31 Jul 07	Northern Ireland	30 days	
6	GSM 1962	1 Oct 69 to 3 Sep 76	Dhofar	30 days	
7	GSM 1962	7 Feb 83 to 9 Mar 84	Lebanon	30 days Ground Forces OR 3 sorties Aircrew	
8	GSM 1962	15 Aug to 15 Oct 84	Mine Clearance	30 days accumulated	Gulf of Suez
9	GSM 1962	17 Nov 86 to 28 Feb 89	Gulf	30 days	
10	GSM 1962	8 Mar to 30 Sep 91	Kuwait	30 days	

11	GSM 1962	6 Apr to 17 Jul 91	Northern Iraq/Southern Turkey	30 days or 3 operational sorties	
12	GSM 1962	16 Jul 91 to 18 Mar 03 16 Jul 91 to 30 Apr 03	Air Operations Iraq	60 days continuous or 90 days accumulated service on qualifying operations OR 6 operational sorties	Op RESINATE SOUTH Op RESINATE NORTH (Incirlik, Solopi or Zakhu 16 Sep 91 to 13 Sep 91, 30 days continuous or 60 days aggregated service)

4. Operational Service Medal (Instituted 1 January 2000).

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Sierra Leone	5 May 00 to 31 Jul 02	Rosette awarded for service on Op BARRAS or Op MAIDENLY	1 day 14 days 30 days continuous	1 day Op BARRAS – 10 Sep 00 (Rosette) 1 day Op MAIDENLY – 15 Jul 00 (Rosette) 14 days (Op PALLISER) 30 days (Op BASILICA or SILKMAN)
2	Afghanistan (Op VERITAS)	11 Sep 01 to a date to be decided	Zone 1: Clasp Afghanistan Zone 2: No clasp	1 day 20 days 30 days Aircrew – 30 sectors aggregated	Rosette worn on brooch bar to signify award of clasp. Aircrew awarded clasp for 30 landings and takeoffs. Flying 30 sectors without Landings, awarded medal only.
3	Democratic Republic of Congo	14 Jun to 10 Sep 03	Clasp: DROC	25 days OR 5 operational sorties	Awarded to those who served in Bunia in the Ituri Province on qualifying operation

5. Miscellaneous

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Iraq Reconstruction Medal	19 Mar 2003 to a date to be agreed		40 days	Issued to MOD personnel serving with FCO.
2	Queen's Golden Jubilee Medal	6 Feb 02		Serving on 6 Feb 02 with minimum aggregated service of 5 years	
3	The Civilian Service Medal	19 Nov 2001 to a date to be agreed		30 days or 40 days aggregated within one calendar year.	Issued to MOD personnel serving with FCO.
4	Queen's Diamond	6 Feb 12		Serving on 6 Feb	

	Jubilee Medal			12 with minimum aggregated service of 5 years	
--	----------------------	--	--	---	--

ANNEX F

FOREIGN AND INTERNATIONAL AWARDS APPROVED FOR WEAR BY UK CITIZENS

1. *Foreign and Commonwealth*

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Pingat Jasa Malaysia Medal	31 Aug 1957 to 31 Dec 1966 or Singapore 31 Aug 1957 to 9 Aug 1965		90 days or more within Malaysia and Singapore. 180 outside the area but in support of operations.	
2	Brunei General Service Medal	12 Aug 66 to a date to be decided		1 year	Loan personnel service only.
3	Kenya Campaign Medal	12 Dec 63 to 30 Nov 67		30 days (not continuous)	Loan personnel service only.
4	Malaya Active Service Medal	31 Aug 57 to 15 Sep 63		DCI does not provide eligibility criteria	Loan personnel service only.
5	Malaysia General Service Medal	11 Aug 66 to 31 Dec 89		DCI does not provide eligibility criteria	Loan personnel service only.
6	Muscat/Oman Dhofar Campaign Medal	23 May 65 to 30 Sep 76		14 days	Loan personnel service only.
7	Republic of South Africa UNITAS	1 Jun 94 to 26 Apr 03		DCI does not provide eligibility criteria	BMATT personnel only
8	Australian INTERFET (East Timor)	16 Sep 99 to 10 Apr 00		30 days	This is worn as a Commonwealth medal instituted by The Sovereign ie after all UK awards.
9	General Service Medal (OMANI)	23 May 65 to 30 Jun 76	Dhofar	DCI does not provide eligibility criteria	Loan personnel service only.
10	The Accession Medal (OMAN)	23 Jul 70 only		1 day	Loan personnel service only. Issued to those in SAF on 23 Jul 70 when the current Sultan superseded his father
11	The Peace Medal (OMAN)	Awarded for 1 years service between 1 Jul 76 and 17 Nov 85 Also for service with		1 year	Loan personnel service only.

12	Muscat Victory Medal (AS SUMOOD)	23 May 65 to 2 Dec 75		30 days	Seconded forces only. Unrestricted wear.
13	Rhodesia Medal	1 Dec 79 to 20 Mar 80		14 days	Not classed as a campaign medal and thus it is worn immediately after any Long Service award
14	Sultan of Oman's 30th Renaissance Medal	National Day 2000		1 day (see Remarks)	Extract from London Gazette dated Tue 24 Jul 01 (number 56284) Her Majesty the Queen has been graciously pleased to approve that Members of Her Armed Forces who were in the service of His Majesty the Sultan of Oman on either loan or contract terms at the date of the celebration of the Sultanate's National day in November 2000 and who are eligible to receive from the Sultan the 30 th renaissance Medal (30 th National Day Medal) in recognition of their services, may accept and wear the medal with unrestricted permission
15	Sultanate of Oman's 35th Renaissance Medal	National Day 2005		1 day	Service personnel who were in the service of HM The Sul;tan of Oman, either on contract or on loan, on the date of the Sultanate's National Day on 18 Nov 05. Accept and wear with unrestricted permission.

2. *United Nations Medals:*

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBLTY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Korea Medal UN	Dec 1950 to 27 July 1954		1 Day	
2	Congo (ONUC)	10 Jul 60 to 30 Jun 64		90 days	Seconded/Loan personnel only
3	Cyprus (UNFICYP)	27 Mar 64 to a date to be decided		30 days 27 Mar 64 – 26 Mar 65 90 days 27 Mar 65 – present	Numerals awarded for subsequent & every accumulated 180 days service
4	Namibia (UNTAG)	1 Apr 89 to 31 Mar 90		90 days	

5	Iraq/Kuwait (UNIKOM)	1 Apr 91 to 6 Oct 03		90 days	
6	Western Sahara (MINURSO)	1 Apr 91 to a date to be decided		90 days	
7	Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR)	1 Mar 92 to 31 Dec 95	No Clasp	90 days	Numerals awarded for subsequent & every accumulated 180 days service. Cannot have the NATO medal for same period
8	Cambodia (UNAMIC)	1 Oct 91 to 31 Mar 92		90 days	
9	Cambodia (UNTAC)	1 Apr 92 to 30 Sep 93		90 days	
10	Rwanda (UNAMIR)	1 Oct 93 to 31 Mar 96		90 days	
11	Angola (UNAVEM 3)	1 Feb 95 to 1 Jun 97		90 days	
12	Georgia (UNOMIG)	23 Aug 93 to a date to be decided		90 days	
13	Transitional Administration for Balkans (UNTAES)	Jan 96 to Jan 98		90 days	Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium [Croatia]
14	Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL)	1 Jun 98 to 30 Sep 99		90 days	
15	Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL)	1 Oct 99 to a date to be decided		90 days	
16	East Timor (UNTAET)	25 Oct 99 to a date to be decided		90 days	
17	East Timor (UNAMET)	7 Jun 99 to 25 Oct 99		90 days	
18	Congo (MONUC)	30 Nov 99 to a date to be decided		90 days	
19	Kosovo (UNMIK)	10 Jun 99 to a date to be decided		90 days	
20	Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE)	15 Sep 00 to a date to be decided		90 days	

Note: UN medals should be applied for whilst serving in the theatre of operations directly from UN HQ in theatre. Those who do not receive their medals in theatre may apply for them through the MOD Medal Office. This service is only available for 12 months after leaving theatre. Replacements are only available 5 years after the operation has ceased.

3. United Nations Special Service Medal:

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Peshawar (UNOCHA)	1989 to 1990		90 days	
2	Sarajevo Airlift	3 Jul 92 to 12 Jan 96	No clasp	100 landings at Sarajevo as part of Op Cheshire OR 90 days with UNHCR detachments	Category 2 and 3 only awards may be worn
3	Iraq (UNSCOM)	Apr 91 to a date to be decided	Clasp 'UNSCOM'	90 days continuous or 180 days cumulative	

4. NATO:

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	Former Yugoslavia	1 Jul 92 to 31 Dec 02	FORMER YUGOSLAVIA – Numerals awarded for subsequent tours	30 days in Former Yugoslavia OR 90 days in support areas on qualifying operations .	Numerals for subsequent tours of 180 days in Yugoslavia or 540 days in support areas on qualifying operations. (UK Ground forces under UN Command until Dec 95)
2	Kosovo	13 Oct 98 to 31 Dec 02	KOSOVO - Numerals awarded for subsequent tours	30 days in Kosovo, FYROM and Albania OR 90 days in support areas on qualifying operations	Numerals for subsequent tours of 180 days in Kosovo or 540 days in support areas on qualifying operations
3	Macedonia	1 Jun 01 to 31 Dec 02	No Clasp – No Numerals	25 or 30 days depending on Operation Name	
4	Balkans (Non Article 5)	1 Jan 03 to 20 Dec 04 for Bosnia 1 Jan 03 to a date to be decided for Kosovo/ 1 Jan to 31 Mar 03 for Macedonia	Clasp 'NON ARTICLE 5' - No numerals issued	30 days	This medal replaced the previous three NATO Balkan medals. Only personnel deploying to the Balkans for the first time are eligible to wear the medal. No numerals and no qualification in support areas
5	Active Endeavour	26 Oct 01 to a date to be decided	Clasp 'ARTICLE 5'	RN Ships only	Medals issued by NATO HQ direct to ships upon application to NATO HQ.

					Permission to accept but NOT wear
6	Eagle Assist	11 Sep 01 to 16 May 02	Clasp 'ARTICLE 5'	RAF only	Medals issued by NATO HQ direct to units upon application to NATO HQ. No longer available. Permission to accept but NOT wear
7	Pakistan Earthquake	8 Oct 05 to 1 Feb 06	Clasp 'PAKISTAN'	14 days	No permission to accept. May NOT be worn. ALL Medals have been issued – No longer available
8	Afghanistan		Clasp 'ISAF'	30 days	Medals issued by NATO HQ in theatre. No permission to accept. May NOT be worn
9	NATO Meritorious Service Medal	Awarded at NATO discretion only	--	--	Permission to accept but NOT wear
10	NATO Training Mission Iraq	18 Aug 04 to a date to be decided	Clasp 'NTM-IRAQ'	30 days	No permission to accept or wear
11	NATO Logistical support to African Union Mission in SUDAN	13 Jul 05 to a date to be decided	Clasp 'AMIS'	30 days	No permission to accept or wear

5. European and International Organisations:

Ser	MEDAL	ELIGIBILITY PERIOD	CLASPS / ROSETTES	CRITERIA	REMARKS
1	WEU Mission (Yugoslavia)	1 Jul 92 to 31 Dec 96		30 Days in Yugoslavia or 90 Days in support elsewhere	
2	European Community Monitoring Mission (Yugoslavia)	25 Jul 91 to 30 Jun 92		Min 21 days	Issued through FCO
3	European Security Forces - Congo	14 Jun to 10 Sep 03	Clasp 'ARTEMIS'	30 days	NOT approved for wear. No longer available.
4	European Security and Defence Policy Service Medal	2 Dec 04 to a date to be decided	Clasp 'ALTHEA',	Minimum 30 days continuous	UK troops withdrawn Jul 07. Received in theatre, special cases only via medal office.

	<p>for Operation ALTHEA Procedure For The Introduction Of A New Medal (Bosnia and Herzegovina)</p>				<p>Numeral for 2nd tour of min 30 days Planning & Support version (central white stripe on ribbon) may NOT be worn.)</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---

ANNEX G

LIST OF FURTHER CAMPAIGNS FOR MEDALLIC RECOGNITION

Below are further medallic grievances that have been brought to the Review Team's attention. These are described in the terms they were presented to us. Although they generally raise similar issues to those raised by the campaigns for medallic recognition summarised in Section 5, we have included these to illustrate further the variety and diversity of medallic recognition issues.

- Concerns about the accept not wear "rule" in respect of NATO (Afghanistan, Africa etc), UN Special Service and other foreign medals (including Kuwait);
- Concerns about inconsistencies in the criteria for the award of General Service and Naval General Service Medals and clasps, including: Borneo, Cyprus, and Aden;
- Concerns about the qualifying criteria for the Accumulated Campaign Service Medals '94 and 2011;
- Concerns about the criteria for the Gulf War Medal '91;
- Suggestions that long service awards (not included in the Review's terms of reference) should cover any service in the emergency services after leaving the military; and should also be extended to officers in the regular forces as well as those in the reserves;
- A variety of Navy patrols beyond the Gulf;
- Specific aspects of the Cold War, including submarine service and the Berlin Air Lift;
- Proposal for a General Service Medal for ongoing Falklands Garrison duty;
- Proposal for a bomb and mine clearance clasp for specific duties in the Falklands;
- Proposal for a Humanitarian Service Medal for deployments alongside the Stabilisation Unit (e.g. Haiti);
- Lobbying for a Libya Medal (still under consideration).

ANNEX H

COST ISSUES

1. The issue of funding was raised by many of those consulted. It was recognised that while the cost associated with creating and awarding medals should not be the determining factor, the resources available are inevitably limited, particularly in current conditions of austerity. However campaigners and MoD have widely varying estimates of the costs and difficulty of the administrative tasks involved, and different views on how they might be met.
2. Costs broadly fall into two areas: the production of the physical medal, and the associated administrative costs to verify the records of those eligible and distribute the medal to them. The scale of costs for any medal is obviously heavily dependent on the number of medals required, but also on the complexity of the task of checking records for eligibility. Historically eligibility for any military medal awarded by the Queen is verified against individual service records from official sources and where the intended recipient is deceased the medal is awarded to next of kin.
3. MoD estimate that the approximate cost of producing and issuing new medals for a past campaign is £65 to £75 each. The production cost is dependent on the metal used ie around £25 for a medal made of cupro-nickel, as used for a number of recent medals, or £15 for nickel-silver medals, eg The Queen's Diamond Jubilee Medal. The major costs are therefore the administration costs involved in the issue of each medal by the MOD Medal Office.
4. The issue of any medal in large quantities (ie tens of thousands) requires a significant number of additional personnel for a limited period of time to enable applications to be processed by the Medal Office in a timely fashion. Eligibility for any official medal approved by The Queen has to be checked against individual Service records and for past cases these records have to be recovered from archives. Archived records are commercially managed and there is a transaction cost of around £5 for each record withdrawal and deposit. With the addition of postage and packing this leads to an estimated administration cost of around £50 for each medal issued.
5. Some of the veterans groups we have consulted argue that these estimates are flawed and offer alternative costings. The campaign for the National Defence Medal for example argue that production cost of a cupro-nickel medal could be in the region of £2.50- £3.50, on the basis of the costs of similar commercially-produced medals. They further argue that costs for administration and distribution of a medal should be no more than approximately £17 per medal.

6. Extra costs are applicable for all changes to past medal decisions but the potentially large number of recipients of a National Defence Medal has led the campaigners to be particularly mindful of the issue. Charging individuals for a medal would potentially devalue its status and that of the system of honours as a whole. They have therefore presented alternative methods for funding.
7. They propose for example that production and administrative costs could be separated. Whilst the former would come from 'central' funds, alternative proposals on funding the administrative costs could be based on the principle of pledges of time and money from outside volunteers.
8. The Review also heard a number of suggestions for alternative funding streams such as private sector sponsorship and national funding campaigns and believes there is scope to explore imaginative and flexible solutions which would help minimise the costs to the government. The basis for these would need to be robust and verified costings for the production and administration of new medals, since the Review has not been able to verify independently who is right about the projected costs of changing decisions about past medals or instituting new ones.

ANNEX J

MEMBERS OF THE REVIEW TEAM

Sir John HOLMES, GCVO, KBE, CMG

Currently: Director, The Ditchley Foundation

Formerly: Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator at the United Nations, New York (2007-2010); Foreign and Commonwealth Office (1973 -2007): HM Ambassador, Paris (2001-2007); HM Ambassador, Lisbon (1999-2001); Principal Private Secretary to Prime Minister Tony Blair (1997-1999); Private Secretary (Overseas Affairs) and diplomatic adviser to Prime Minister John Major (1996-1997); Head, European Union Department (External) (1995); Political, then Economic and Commercial, Counsellor, British High Commission, New Delhi (1991-1995); Secondment to Thomas De La Rue (1989-1991); Assistant Head, Soviet Department (1987-1989); First Secretary (Economic and European issues), Paris (1984-1987); Assistant Private Secretary to Foreign Secretary (Middle East, Africa, Asia and Latin America) (1982-1984). Near East and North Africa Department (1978-1982); Third Secretary, then Second Secretary, Moscow (1976-1978).

Born 1951. Married Penny (née Morris) 1976. 3 daughters: Sarah (b.1981), Lucy (b.1982), Emilie (b.1985).

Education: Preston Grammar School (1962-9); Balliol College, Oxford (1969-73).

Sir John was assisted in carrying out the Review by ***Ian Wood*** and ***Michael Shryane***, both Cabinet Office officials with previous experience across a range of Government Departments.