

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE 5<sup>TH</sup> ETAP/ETAC STEERING BOARD (SB)

Madrid, 21MAR18 at the premises of the  
SpAF Headquarters

**Participants:** See Annex 1 / No representative from Luxembourg nor Czech Republic attended the meeting.

**Chairman:** Col Jose Luis Romero Allegue

**Secretary:** TCol Alex v. Lengriesser

**Annexes:**

1. - Action Items
2. - List of Participants
3. - Agenda
4. - Briefing (provided only as electronic version)
5. - ETAP/ETAC TA Annex A (Peacetime Establishment PE)
6. - ETAP/ETAC TA Annex F (Note of Joining)
7. - MB 2017 execution report (approved)
8. - ETAC Job Descriptions

**Start:** 08:50 MEZ

**End:** 14:30 MEZ

This minutes as a seminar protocol follows the proposed agenda, and thus record the sequence of events and presents at the same time the meeting results (additionally summarised at the end). The agenda was displayed as intro before and repetitively during the sequence of the meeting. No requests to change the agenda have been stated by any representative.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome</b>
	BGEN JOSE M JUANAS, ChOps of the SpAF HQ welcomes all participants and stresses out the Spain's honour to host the ETAC. He foresees a successful future of the Centre. Spain will continue to support the Centre to its maximum. He concludes with wishing all representatives a fruitful meeting.
<b>2.</b>	<b>Chairman: administrative remarks/Chairmanship of the SB</b>
	<p>Col Romero, Cmdr of the ETAC and Chairman of this SB (later referred to as ETACCOM) takes the floor and introduces himself. After the Cmdr's Asst introduces himself and explains his role during the SB, a 'tour de table' is conducted to give each representative the opportunity to introduce himself.</p> <p>The ETACCOM continues explaining briefly the rules for the SB representatives and the role of the EATC during the SB iaw the ETAP/ETAC TA (later referred to as TA). The fact of the existing differences in the three (3) language versions of the TA about "ETAC provides a non-voting chair. ..." (TA Sec. 2, Para 5) requires a clarification in regard of the future SB-chairmanship.</p> <p>(Note: The French version is deviating in this para from the English and Spanish one. IAW the French version 'ETAC owns an observer role without voting right'.)</p> <p>The proposal of the ETACCOM to in future always chair the SB, is not approved.</p>

	<p>The French representative states that a rotating chairmanship might allow a better recognition of the Centre especially by having any commanding general of an Air Transport Command chairing the SB. The SB will be then hosted by the nation, who is chairing the SB. The SB fails to reach an agreement about the future chairmanship during the following discussion even though unanimity prevails about the ETACCOM owns the best knowledge regarding all ETAP\ETAC issues.</p> <p>In consequence, ETAC will start a written query among the nations about the Chairmanship of the ETAC. If unanimity exists, ETAC will start a formal procedure of re-negotiation the TA, which might implicate the creation of a Working Group and might last for several years. If any nation is reluctant to initiate a rotating chairmanship or re-negotiation procedure, then the discussion and decision about the chairmanship will be delayed towards the 6th Steering Board. (AI 05/1)</p>																
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p><b>4th ETAP/ETAC SB actions review</b></p>																
	<p>D-01 Due to minor last minute changes the latest versions of the Job Descriptions (JB) are not presented by ETAC. They will be sent to the representatives together with the final minutes (AI 05/2) with the request to staff and timely approve them. (AI 05/3)</p> <p>D-02 The discussion of the national manning commitment of each TA-nation is delayed to a later stage of the SB.</p> <p>D-03-All actions are explained to the representatives by the ETACCOM.</p> <p>D-09 No further questions arise.</p>																
<p><b>4.</b></p>	<p><b>ETACCOM: Proposal to change Annex A: ETAC Peacetime Establishment (PE)</b></p>																
	<p>EATC is playing a vital role in the preparation and execution of the projects. However, ETACCOM states that the PE displayed in the TA, Annex A does not reflect reality, since - like usual in military units - the two personnel contributed by the EATC are not his subordinates and he does not have any control over them and/or their work. Especially since the duties are not assigned to two (2) certain personnel at EATC but vested on a rotating basis. ETACCOM therefore proposes to change ANNEX A and with that the PE in order to reflect these circumstances (outsourcing the positions of TrngSup and ChOps/ChPlans as project posts without giving up the constant support of the EATC).</p> <p>The new PE is approved by the SB. Annex A will - after its translation into the three languages - be distributed to the TA-nations for exchange. (AI 05/4)</p> <p>Thereafter ETACCOM stresses the high workload of his team and himself due to the lean structure the 'Centre' was given and more important due to the still not completely filled PE.</p> <p>With the missing CIS-Officer (CISO), the INTEL Officer (INTELO) and the Tactical Loadmaster Instructor (TacLM) three (3) positions are still vacant.</p> <p>ETACCOM explains the necessity of having permanent personnel on site in order to continue to deliver a proper work on a stable basis.</p> <p>As a sum up following suggestions and commitments are confirmed:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="276 1664 1342 2143"> <thead> <tr> <th>Nation</th> <th>Commitment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BEL</td> <td>will provide the INTELO, as committed earlier, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> rotation, however, is unable to provide one earlier than 2021/2022.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CZE</td> <td>ETACCOM states that CZE might send a CISO as of summer 2018 instead of summer 2019 as expected. No further notices are received so far. Formally the commitment remains as agreed: summer 2019.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DEU</td> <td>volunteers to send a TacLM as an Interim solution until NLD will fulfil its commitment in summer 2019. After further clarification a provision of an INTELO might be possible, but no earlier than BEL (s. above).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FRA</td> <td>is interested in the continuation of the provision of a ChTacIP/TacIP.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ITA</td> <td>is interested in the continuation of the provision of a TacIP even as a voluntary national contribution (VNE, not counted against the PE).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>NLD</td> <td>will provide a TacLM as of summer 2019.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PRT</td> <td>is going to provide a ChTacIP following the current ITA commitment.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Nation	Commitment	BEL	will provide the INTELO, as committed earlier, in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> rotation, however, is unable to provide one earlier than 2021/2022.	CZE	ETACCOM states that CZE might send a CISO as of summer 2018 instead of summer 2019 as expected. No further notices are received so far. Formally the commitment remains as agreed: summer 2019.	DEU	volunteers to send a TacLM as an Interim solution until NLD will fulfil its commitment in summer 2019. After further clarification a provision of an INTELO might be possible, but no earlier than BEL (s. above).	FRA	is interested in the continuation of the provision of a ChTacIP/TacIP.	ITA	is interested in the continuation of the provision of a TacIP even as a voluntary national contribution (VNE, not counted against the PE).	NLD	will provide a TacLM as of summer 2019.	PRT	is going to provide a ChTacIP following the current ITA commitment.
Nation	Commitment																
BEL	will provide the INTELO, as committed earlier, in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> rotation, however, is unable to provide one earlier than 2021/2022.																
CZE	ETACCOM states that CZE might send a CISO as of summer 2018 instead of summer 2019 as expected. No further notices are received so far. Formally the commitment remains as agreed: summer 2019.																
DEU	volunteers to send a TacLM as an Interim solution until NLD will fulfil its commitment in summer 2019. After further clarification a provision of an INTELO might be possible, but no earlier than BEL (s. above).																
FRA	is interested in the continuation of the provision of a ChTacIP/TacIP.																
ITA	is interested in the continuation of the provision of a TacIP even as a voluntary national contribution (VNE, not counted against the PE).																
NLD	will provide a TacLM as of summer 2019.																
PRT	is going to provide a ChTacIP following the current ITA commitment.																

	<p>However, except for the DEU offer the present national commitment does not help to improve the Centre's manning situation ad hoc. The few ETAC personnel form the backbone of every CPT by guiding, monitoring and giving tasks. Duties like INTEL and CIS are distributed to other personnel, which causes an overload and result a non-perfect outcome.</p> <p>ETACCOM repeatedly calls for investigating further possibilities to commit personnel to the Centre (AI 05/5). Shall a modification of the TA become due, the TA, which is in this particular point too unspecific, should become a matter of being changed accordingly to demand a stronger commitment by the TA-nations.</p>
<b>5.</b>	<p><b>Upcoming improvements to be implemented in the Courses/Trainings, AWACS integration and POLYGON participation</b></p>
	<p>The status of the ETAC's intention to implement AWACS and POLYGON in the flying projects of the ETAP is presented by ETACCOM.</p> <p>While AWACS participated in the recent ETAP-C 18-1 with observers, Polygon participated with a GBAD (SA8/ZSU) simulator.</p> <p>Concerning the AWACS implementation ETACCOM prefers a 'slow approach' beginning with a participation in ETAP-C and succeeding in a later stage in a more challenging ETAP-T.</p> <p>Unanimity exists that possible additional costs to each single project caused by the presence of the AWACS or POLYGON will be shared by the project participants. At this stage the Italian representative offers to host ETAP-T in 2020 and to implement the Gulfstream G550 conformal airborne early warning aircraft (Italian national AWACS) in the training.</p>
<b>6.</b>	<p><b>2019 ETAP-T versus Flag Exercise / Options / Final solution</b></p>
	<p>A participation in or a replacement of an ETAP-T by a FlagEx is not in line with the draft 'EATT-CONCEPT' (former name of ETAP-T), which is still one reference document for the execution of any ETAP-T as the ETACCOM explains. The philosophy of an ETAP-T is a training 'à la carte' and shall not be considered as an ordinary exercise. The Centre is considered to be a 'school' for air transport assets in the tactical domain and not a global multirole exercise provider.</p>
<b>7.</b>	<p><b>Programme of Work 2019</b></p>
	<p>ETAC-calendar and PoW 18 of the current year are reviewed. Unanimity prevails about no generic approval will be granted for a use of the still open slot in ETAP-C 18-4 by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party (so far US or UAE interested).</p> <p>Before the POW 19 is introduced, the outcome of ETAC query is presented, made among the represented EATF nations during the 32nd AHWG O &amp; T:</p> <p>The appetite of the EATF-nations with 3-4 ETAP-Cs/1 ETAP-Ts and 4 ETAP-Is is in accordance with the planned PoW 19 and ETAC's future ideas.</p> <p>2019 ETAP-T is planned to be executed in Spain, since no other nation volunteered (PRT is unable to host one until 2022, ITA has volunteered to host the project in 2020.)</p> <p>ETACCOM explains that ETAP-S will not be a substitute for an EATS, but will be specialised on tactical transport topics only. ETAC plans, to convene a first ETAP-S in 2019.</p> <p>PRT states its interest to host the ETAP-S in 2019 (AI 05/6).</p> <p>For the PoW 2019 (and its following editions) the SB gives the guidance that instead of a calendar and a blank table they rather want to approve a filled version once the EATF-nations have requested to participate in any of the projects. (AI 05/7) In consequence the approval of the Pow19 is delayed until the nations put in their interest. (AI 05/8) The aim is to provide an approved version to the nations attending the 33<sup>rd</sup> AHWG O&amp; T. (AI 05/9)</p>

8.	<b>Programme of Work 2020 / Initial Approach</b>
	<p>The Italian representative states again the offer to host the ETAP-T in June 2020 (fall back Oct/Nov 2020). (AI 05/10)</p> <p>Due to the early national planning cycles and with reference to the outcome of the latter agenda item, PoW 20, which has already been presented in an early draft status, will be consecutively fine-tuned and distributed asap to the EATF-Nations, so that they can apply for the various projects. Subsequently the PoW 20 will be distributed to the SB-representatives for an approval before the next SB in 2019. (AI 05/11)</p>
9.	<b>Initial Operational Capability and Final Operational Capability criteria (IOC-FOC)</b>
	<p>'IOC' and 'FOC' (2017/2019) of the Centre have already been defined in terms of time by documents of former planning bodies or by previous SB-minutes. However, ETACCOM explains that the status 'IOC' and 'FOC' commonly are granted after the evaluation by an independent third party. Since the Centre after its inauguration in June 2017 is presently running the yearly PoW successfully, he suggests to the SB that 'IOC' is achieved. For 'FOC', however, he proposes to be tasked by the SB to develop proper criteria until the next SB in 2019.</p> <p>His proposal is approved. (AI 05/12)</p>
10.	<b>Coffee Break 1110 - 1130 (delayed)</b>
11.	<b>Review of 2017 Budget (execution report)</b>
	<p>ETACCOM explains the execution of the 2017 budget: All TA-nations funded a full annual budget, although the Centre was inaugurated not before mid of 2017. Despite exceeding the credits for IT, software and customer support (related information has been distributed in 2017 and overstepping was not refused), the spent budget - covering the period the Centre was active - did not exceed the limit. ETACCOM explains all expenditures in detail, no question from the SB-representatives is staying unexplained. The execution report of the MB 2017 is considered as approved.</p>
12.	<b>Introduction of 2019 Budget / Caveats for an early approval</b>
	<p>ETACCOM introduces his idea for the budget 2019. The budget 2019 need to be approved by the SB nlt. 15 Oct 2018. He states that due to some uncertainties (travel budget, a missing quotation from FlightPro for prolonging the contract) the figures might not be accurate and that these are some caveats for an early approval. The necessity to enlarge the Centre's IT-Pool by a second server as a back-up to the one donated by EDA and the purchase of tablets to be used by the TacIPs during the flying projects will have an impact on the budget. The SB advises the ETACCOM to approach EDA with the current server problem and to ask EDA to support financially the procurement of an additional server. (AI 05/13) The Italian representative states that an increase of more than 10% against the budget 2017 and 2018 would not be acceptable, since the increase of his national military budget is limited to approx. 2% a year. ETACCOM advices that with the expectable access of new nations (e.g.: Romania) the MB in 2019 will be shared by more nations and the financial burden will decrease.</p> <p>However, the Centre is young and the budget so far is developed without having any references. ETACCOM suggests to delay the approval to a later stage, when more precise figures are available. Some representatives are missing the transfer of the balance of 2017. ETACCOM will provide a balance at the same time forwarding the MB 2019. (AI 05/14)</p>

	<p>The SB accepts to follow the ETACCOM's proposal of delaying the approval until autumn iaw the TA. (AI 05/15)</p> <p>Same time a Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) iaw the TA for the upcoming five (5) years will be elaborated by the Centre and delivered. (AI 05/16)</p>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Third (3<sup>rd</sup>) party participation in the events / Extra Fee for 2019</b>
	<p>ETACCOM explains the rules for the application or cessation of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee. Up to the year 2017 (included) no 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee was claimed from non-signatory TA-nations to participate in any project. For 2018 no 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee is requested so far, due to a misunderstanding within the ETAC. Due to the required early distribution of the Letters of Activation (LoAct) almost all invitations to non-signatory nations to participate in any project in 2018 are sent out meanwhile without the demand of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee. Considering this fact, the SB agrees that for 2018 no 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee will be raised anymore.</p> <p>However, ETACCOM encourages a discussion and a decision about whether and the amount of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee in 2019. The fee described in the Budget and Financial Regulations (BFR) is considered as being as too high. The SB decides that the 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee in 2019 shall be regarded as a kind of an entry fee for 3<sup>rd</sup> parties in order to be allowed to participate in the projects of 2019 programme – no matter how often they participate. The 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee for 2019 will be equal to the amount of the annual financial contribution each TA-nation will provide to the ETAP in 2019. However, for ETAP-Is a 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee is still waived, since TaclPs, who support any flying project are rare, but always welcome and vital. All EATF - 3<sup>rd</sup> party nations will be properly informed prior to the distribution of the PoW19. (AI 05/17)</p> <p>About the procedure in 2020 the SB will decide upon on the next meeting.</p>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Status of the Romanian request to join ETAP/ETAC TA and other countries' interest to join the ETAP/ETAC TA</b>
	<p>ETACCOM informs the representatives about the status of the Romanian accession to the TA. Despite an informal approval by the TA-nations already given in the year 2017 (Jul-Sep) and the subsequent early distribution of the official Note of Joining in Oct 2017, not all the approvals are received by the centre yet.</p> <p>In addition ETACCOM clues up about further interested nations: Austria, Finland and Poland as EATF-Nations as well as the US and Emirates as Non EU-Nations. He briefly points out possible reservations (yearly financial, but especially the personnel commitments) which nations might prevent from joining the TA, however, no discussion arise on that.</p>
<b>15.</b>	<b>Proposal to change TA Annex F: Note of Joining</b>
	<p>ETACCOM presents his proposal of a modified 'Note of Joining'. The TA itself does not dictate any 'modus operandi' to be followed for the accession of new nations to the TA. However, the way the template of the 'Note of Joining' is set up, requires a sequentially delivery of the 'Letter of Joining' to each TA-nation. This lengthens the procedure immensely and at the same time increases the chance of losing the document by post. The proposed new format allows a distribution to each Nations in parallel. No changes at all to the content of the document are made.</p> <p>The proposal is approved.</p>
<b>16.</b>	<b>Any Other Business (AOB)</b>
	<p>Finally ETACCOM mentions some difficulties regarding the timelines for the 'Letters of Activation' (LoAct) and the replies (Letters of Acceptance - LoAcc) as well as problems arising from last minutes cancellations, having a big impact on the ETAP staff and their final preparations.</p>

	<p>Despite the ETACCOM's invitation to the SB to gather next time in Zaragoza in order to show the ETAC premises, the majority of the SB members preferred to kindly meet in Madrid again. Some representatives request a two (2) day meeting in order to stretch the very tight agenda and to have more time to discuss.</p> <p>If no other nation shows an interest in hosting the next SB in 2019 (AI 5/18), the next SB is to convene on two days in the time frame of 11-22 Mar 2019 in Madrid, Spain.</p> <p>At the end of the meeting the floor is given to Antonio De Sessa, EDA. He explains to the SB and ETACCOM the possibility of inviting representatives of civil or military companies in order to allow them to demonstrate or exhibit their products during ongoing projects. Such a possibility might be beneficial to any project. However, ETACCOM and some representatives state that the level of the participants in the projects is not the proper floor companies are interested in. The only project it will concern, is an ETAP-S.</p>
	<b>Lunch break</b>
	<b>Continuation of AOB (if required but not expected) - Not required</b>
	<b>Bus transfer to Barajas Airport</b>

<b>Summary of the approvals made by the 5<sup>th</sup> SB:</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New PE and the required change of Annex A.</li> <li>• Implementation of AWACS and POLYGON in the ETAP on a participants cost sharing modus.</li> <li>• PoWs to the approval of the SB after being filled with national requests.</li> <li>• As of the year 2019 execution of a first ETAP-S led by the ETAC and limited to tactical air transport aspects, planned to take place in PRT.</li> <li>• Waiver of the 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee for 2018 projects.</li> <li>• Introduction of a 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee for 2019 in height of the current annual membership fee.</li> </ul>

<b>Pending decisions and approvals:</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chairmanship of the SB.</li> <li>• Job descriptions (will be communicated with the final minutes).</li> <li>• National commitment to fill permanent post at the ETAC.</li> <li>• PoW 19.</li> <li>• PoW 20.</li> <li>• Budget (MB) 2019 (will be fine-tuned by ETAC and transmitted until Sep 2018).</li> </ul>

50001 Zaragoza, 04 May 2018

Approved by Chairman:

Signature

Composed by Secretary:

Signature