



# MINUTES OF THE 7<sup>TH</sup> ETAP/ETAC STEERING BOARD (SB)

14 OCT 20 as VTC

**Participants:** See Annex 2. The representatives from Czech Republic and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg did not attend the SB.

**Chairman:** COL Fernando Raimundo Martinez (ETAC COM)

**Secretary:** LTC Nicola Ferrario (ETAC Training Branch)

**Annexes:**

1. – List of Action Items
2. – List of Participants
3. – Adapted Agenda
4. – PowerPoint Presentation (provided only as electronic version)
5. - 2021 PoW Draft

**Start:** 08:30 MEZ

**End:** 19:45 MEZ

Due to the current COVID-19 crisis and its effects all around Europe, the Steering Board is held using Webex as a video tele-conference (VTC) and reduced to one working day, instead of two as previously programmed for the face to face meeting.

These minutes follow the adapted agenda, and thus record the sequence of events and present at the same time the meeting results (additionally summarized at the end). The agenda is attached as Annex 3.

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome address by the Austrian Air Force representative</b>
	<p>After a short “Roll Call” to verify the presence of all the participants the Austrian (AUT) representative takes the floor.</p> <p>Col. Otto Naderer, Austrian Air Force Defence Staff Directorate General, Transformation Division/Subdivision International Force Planning, welcomes all participants of the 7<sup>th</sup> SB. He points out the COVID-19 international situation that forced the AUT to cancel to host the meeting in Salzburg. Col. Naderer highlights the importance of the meeting as it is a milestone in the further proceeding of the European Tactical Airlift Centre (ETAC/the ‘Centre’).</p> <p>He also mentions the will of the AUT to welcome the next year’s Steering Board meeting in Austria. He concludes with wishing all representatives a fruitful meeting.</p>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Chairman’s opening remarks</b>
	<p>Col Fernando Raimundo, ETAC COM and Chairman (CM) of this SB takes the floor and welcomes the ETAP/ETAC SB representatives as well as the representatives from EDA &amp; EAG, Hungarian &amp; Finnish Air Force.</p>

	<p>The Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19) is a crisis that demands decisive action now from all partners, all individuals and the international community alike. The ETAP/ETAC SB is not an exception, the current situation demands unity of effort, consensus and consistent decisions.</p> <p>He highlights the importance of the meeting as an essential tool to keep national representatives well informed about the ETAP and the Centre. He reminds all that it is the proper forum to discuss matters related to both. Nevertheless, he emphasizes that in the context of this meeting, the top priority for the SB is to make decisions. Notwithstanding, consensus cannot be adopted since there is neither representation nor national position from LUX &amp; CZE. The Chairman reviews the meeting agenda.</p> <p>The Chairman's objective is not to make a deep analysis of every topic in a few minutes. Thanks to the information distributed by ETAC COM via the "Read ahead" (RAH) package he suggests not to enter too much in details in all the topics of the meeting.</p> <p>Finally, he encourages the attendees to share and to discuss their national positions - if any (just 3 nations formally provides it in time) - to promote a more proactive approach to improve interoperability and knowledge management in the tactical airlift domain.</p>
--	--

<b>3.</b>	<b>Summary of the ETAC Activities</b>
	ETAC COM reports to the SB the 2019 ETAP/ETAC activities, starting with the ETAP-C, ETAP-T and the ETAP-I with the figures representing the flying hours, graduated crews and new Tactical Instructors trained. Special focus on the "academia" – one of the parts of ETAC's job with the EATC support - done in 2019, is given as well.
<b>4.</b>	<b>Review/Approval of the 6<sup>th</sup> SB minutes &amp; Action Items</b>
	<p>1. Concerning the Intel Officer (INTELO) the position is still vacant. ROM supported the Centre by providing an INTELO on request for all projects. (In retrospect the ROM representative confirms the availability of a ROM INTELO until Summer 2021 and maybe thereafter for all projects.) BEL states its intention of taking the INTELO position starting from summer 2021.</p> <p>2. Modification of Annex F: done</p> <p>3. Distribution of the ETAP/ETAC TA: done</p> <p>4. Extension of the Tactical Instructors (TaciP): FRA and ITA extended the assigned TaciPs until summer 2021. ETAC COM highlights the fact that in summer 2021 all TaciPs of the 'Centre' will change at the same time which might have a negative impact on the September projects should the TaciPs' replacements aren't properly prepared. The PRT TaciP recently assigned to ETAC will stay only 11 months instead of the expected 3 years. However, PRT will assign a different person for the remaining period, until summer 2023.</p> <p>5. ETAP-T 20: Unfortunately ETAP-T 20 has finally been cancelled though the preparation of the project had been taken to a good level by a big effort from the Core Planning Team, consisting of the RP Italy, EATC and ETAC personnel. ETAC COM presents his appreciation for the good job done permitting potentially up to 20 crews to train on the airlift domain.</p> <p>6. PoW 20 has been presented several times during EATF AHWG O&amp;T meetings.</p> <p>7. Other than requested by the SB to increase the number of ETAP-Ts, only one ETAP-T could be offered in the draft PoW 21, since no other nation than HUN volunteered for hosting the project.</p> <p>8. Third (3<sup>rd</sup>) Party fee: All SB nations agreed on not to charge 3<sup>rd</sup> party nations for the 3<sup>rd</sup> party fee participating in any ETAP-I project.</p>

	<p>9. FOC criteria: FOC was expected to be achieved in 2019, however the final decision was postponed to a date after the 7<sup>th</sup> SB meeting. ETAC COM presents again the need to have a completely filled PE. He claims that the SOP and all documents used to run any project of the ETAP need to be finalized by ETAC and to be approved by ETAP/ETAC SB before declaring the FOC. Conditions for the FOC declaration to be approved by SB <b>(AI 7/1)</b></p>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Cold weather OPS training proposal</b>
	<p>The FIN representative gives a short presentation on the preferable periods of the year, a location to deploy and the kind of training activities that his nation can support, should FIN will host a cold/bad weather OPS training in 2022. The Chairman welcomes the proposal requesting the possibility to perform a first Site Survey IOT investigate deeper on how a project might be performed in the future. <b>(AI 7/2)</b></p>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Hungarian offer for ETAP-T 21</b>
	<p>The HUN representative gives a presentation about the HUN proposal to host the ETAP-T 21 in September 2021. The Hungarian proposal includes the same services and facilities as used in ETAP-T 18. He reminds all SB representatives that HUN isn't able to provide the support for any airdrop activities (DZ CO, material and riggers for the airdrop). The parking plan will permit a/c types of the size 2 A400M (retrospect HUN stated 3 A400M) and 7 C-130.</p> <p>Since the proposed period from 02 - 19 Sep 21 is overlapping with the ETAP-C 21-4, this project might have to shift. The ESP representative explains that although ESP's first and best period for hosting the ETAP-C 21-4 is September 2021, ESP might consider to postpone ETAP-C 21-4 to 02 - 19 November 2021, subject to the result of the Site Survey that ETAC will conduct. Concerning the ETAP-T 21 the ETAC COM asks to the ITA representative to confirm the unavailability of Italy to host the project. The ITA representative confirms not to be able to host an ETAP-T next year, but offers the possibility of being considered as a candidate for the 2022. <b>(AI 7/3)</b></p>
<b>7.</b>	<b>HERMES Offer for ETAP Projects</b>
	<p>The European Air Group (EAG) representative shows a brief presentation about the new Harmonized European Red Air Means Exchange System: HERMES. This system can support any nation requiring support in providing red forces, Red Air fighters, EW/EA, SBAD, CAS, JTAC and simulator training, to improve the training scenario. This capability is open to all nations willing to host ETAP projects but is a matter of being requested by each Receiving Participant (RP). HERMES is still growing offering more proposals and might use ATARES as a financial balancing.</p>
<b>8.</b>	<b>External support for ETAP by industry and service providers</b>
	<p>From EDA the SB representatives receive a presentation concerning EDA's role in promoting industry participation in any existing project based on the needs identified by the bodies involved.</p> <p>Even CM is surprised by EDA's remark/intention to hand over their responsibilities for planning and executing all airlift exercises in the framework of EATF to ETAC.</p>
<b>9.</b>	<b>New training deliveries/New training Approach: Tactical Instructor LM (TacILM) training &amp; Transport Package Leader Module (TPLM)</b>
	<p>TacILM Course and TPLM are presented by the Chief TacIP of the ETAC. He explains the reasons why the two modules are important for the program –incorporated as a new training approach for the ETAP- and how they will be performed without any extra support: to obtain the approval from the SB and to start the implementation of the two upgrades in the annual PoW. Those modules are part of the New ETAP/ETAC Training Approach delivered by ETAC COM to the nations in the RAH Package. There are no questions or objections to the upgrades and both modules might be incorporated to the ETAP portfolio embedded into existing projects. On a later stage the SB will have to decide, if the TacILM training can be considered as a Course and consequently as a stand-alone Project. <b>(AI</b></p>

	7/4)
<b>10.</b>	<b>2021 ETAP PoW &amp; 2022 draft PoW</b>
	<p>An up-dated version of the PoW 21, including the last information provided by the BGR, the ESP and HUN representative, is discussed and each nation is asked to confirm their non-/participation to any project in 2021. The pending decision on the ETAP-T 21 in Hungary and the required shift of ETAP-C 21-4 to November results in some uncertainty regarding the participation of some nations to the projects in the second half of the year. About the ETAP-C 21-1 ESP states that the primary location for the course will be Zaragoza and as backup will be Canarias Island <b>(AI 7/5)</b>. Concerning the ETAP-C 21-2 BGR confirms that the project is cancelled and request to the participants to book slots well in advance for next year 2022. The ETAP-C 21-3, Element Lead course in which the AATTC participation is approved, need to have an even number of participants for that reason FRA states that will decide later if reduces or increases one crew in their participation <b>(AI 7/6)</b>. The intentions to participate in an ETAP-T 21 are requested to the SB representative in order to test the appetite for the Training in 2021. By Dec 2020 the SB will receive a final proposal to decide on the opportunity to go for ETAP-T 21 or not. <b>(AI 7/7)</b></p> <p>The increased number of ETAP-Is offers a bigger variety to the nations and almost all available seats are already filled in. The draft PoW 2021 is attached as annex 5. A draft PoW 22 is requested by the nations later on during the meeting. ETAC COM provides verbally a rough idea of the program which is pending on each possible RP's confirmation to be announced as soon as possible the draft PoW 22 elaboration via e-mail. <b>(AI 7/8)</b>.</p> <p>The PRT representative confirms availability to host ETAP-T in June 2022 and possible as well in June 2023 and 2024. Regarding that all nations approved the ETAP-T to be hosted in PRT for the tree mentioned years, this proposal has to be staffed at PRT MOD level in order to have the final government approval until march 2021. ETAC COM welcomes the offer and publically thanks PRT for its commitment with ETAP.</p>
<b>11.</b>	<b>2018 &amp; 2019 ETAP-I invoicing</b>
	<p>As set by the ETAP/ETAC TA project costs are independent from the ETAC Multinational Budget (MB) and hence purely lay in the responsibility of the receiving participant. In case of the respective ETAP-Is: Italy. The unfortunate matter does not fall into the area of competence of the SB and its tasks as written down in the ETAP/ETAC Technical Arrangement (ETAP/ETAC TA Sec. 2). PRT asks for a POC in the Italian Air Force Logistic HQ but the ITA representative explained that the best option is to go through him for any request. (ITA POC LTC Gino TOFFOLI <a href="mailto:gino.toffoli@aeronautica.difesa.it">gino.toffoli@aeronautica.difesa.it</a>) No further discussion have been required for this topic.</p>
<b>12.</b>	<b>Formalization of ETAP projects costs in advance</b>
	<p>The Chairman requests to all nations that are hosting a project to provide <b>by letter</b>, the earlier the better, and the estimated project costs that will be included into the LoAct 8 months before each project starts. ETAC will include in the LoAct the sharing costs method. The FRA representative provides an explanation why they prefer to give a 'flat rate' to the ETAC concerning the ETAP-C Element Lead in Orleans, but finally agrees on sending the total estimated project costs of the project by an official letter. <b>(AI 7/9)</b></p>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Legal status ETAC personnel. New TA?</b>
	<p>ETAC COM clarifies the legal status of the personnel assigned permanently to ETAC and emphasizes the need for all of foreign personnel to provide to the Spanish Authorities, as requested by the Spanish Defense Diplomacy Directory through the nation's Embassies, the NATO Travel Order (NTO) stating the assignment to ETAC and not to TLP, the tour of duty and the dependents under responsibility staying in Zaragoza <b>(AI 7/10)</b>. Although ETAC is not a NATO body the NATO SOFA is applicable to all the foreign assigned personnel, however the Supplementary agreement is not and the ETAC members were not entitle to tax exemption in Spain in the past, neither in the present nor in the future</p>

	<p>unless a new TA is adopted with that particular clause. The “Foreign Identification Number” (NIE) has been requested and provided to all the personnel but the process to receive a “Green Card” has been voluntarily interrupted by the individuals. That interruption prevents the ETAC foreign personnel to benefit among other huge list of specific and NIE ownerships oriented services offered by the ESP authorities.</p> <p>The PRT representative explains the particular situation of the provisional assigned PRT TacIP to the ETAC and informed that will be issued a NATO Travel Order (NTO) to the next TacIP.</p> <p>The FRA representative asks to the HN, ESP, to formalize the implementation of all the NATO SOFA terms that are in-place and in use already.</p> <p>The ESP representative declares that the NATO SOFA has been implemented to its extent and it is applicable to the ETAC personnel.</p> <p>The NLD representative asks, if in future there will be any possibility to have including the supplementary agreement. ETAC COM explains that the only option might be to re-write the ETAP/ETAC TA, specifying special conditions IOT obtain those privilege. NLD asks to open an action item to investigate what would be necessary to have the full NATO SOFA. ESP doesn't support the idea to develop a new ETAP/ETAC TA since the current TA is considered sufficiently guarantee. Besides, not even a new higher-level Technical Arrangement would ensure the application of a “Supplementary Agreement to the SOFA” because the recognition of ETAC as an International NATO Headquarters depends on an external organization (NATO).</p>
<b>14.</b>	<b>Close of 2019 financial year</b>
	<p>ETAC COM shows the 2019 financial year budget explaining that in the past year no 3<sup>rd</sup> party fees have been added to the ETAC budget, but because of the lower travel expenses the final result is a surplus that will reduce the 2021 nations' participation expenses. ETAC COM anticipates that due to the project cancellations in 2020 the surplus linked to the lower travel expenses is going to be bigger. The 2021 budget have been agreed by the nations. Nations should receive by November the 'Call for Funds' for the MB 2021 from ESP <b>(AI 7/11)</b>.</p>
<b>15.</b>	<b>ETAP/ETAC SB Terms Of Reference (TOR)</b>
	<p>Chairman's proposal for SB TOR is presented, pointing out the importance of having an Advisory Group dedicated to the Steering Board. The BGR representative stated that without minor changes, a mismatch with the ETAP/ETAC TA could be possible. He agreed on the need of TORs. In principle all the SB's nations agree on the proposal of the establishment of an Advisory Group and to have more than one meeting per year having the video conference as an option to avoid travelling. <b>(AI 7/12)</b>.</p> <p>The NLD representative, commenting the content of the TOR, points out his need to have more often meetings in order to discuss urgent topics of the PoW early in advance. He proposes to have a minimum of 2 meetings per year preferably in person with a Video Conference option for one of those.</p> <p>The EATC representative suggests to have a rotational chairmanship within the participating nations. The suggestion is refused by the participating nations and concur on leaving the chairmanship to ETAC in order to provide a better continuity to the Steering Board.</p>
<b>16.</b>	<b>ETAC PE rotation plan: bidding process</b>
	<p>ETAC COM presents the ETAC PE with the current situation of the national contributions requesting to all nations to confirm their commitment for the following years. EATC doesn't provide any position to the ETAC Peace Establishment in a permanent basis but support the ETAP Projects (annex A Updated in 5<sup>th</sup> SB). ETAC COM specifies that the CDir/C-ChOPS, held by ESP, is currently vacant and might be filled before December 2020.</p> <p>The ITA representative states that the intention is to keep the ChTacIP position for the complete program period, but its staffing process is not yet finished.</p> <p>The FRA representative confirms the commitment to offer for 3 years, with the 4<sup>th</sup> year extension option, a replacement in 2021 for a TacIP.</p> <p>The PRT representative commits on assigning a TacIP from August 2021 till August 2023.</p>

	<p>NLD confirms the availability of the person in place for the position of the TacILM until 2023, the possibility of replacing him need to be analyzed and staffed after an ETAC request.</p> <p>BEL confirm the commitment to send an Intel Officer from summer 2021 till summer 2024. NOR is staffing internally the opportunity to replace BEL in 2024 with the IntelO.</p> <p>BGR, due to budget restrictions, can't fill any position before 2023. The BGR representative asks to have written down in a future TA a stronger statement that forces the nations to commit with personnel IOT help the staffing of the request. The BGR representative will keep trying to find resources for a position in the ETAC, but requested to remove the BGR flag from the document.</p> <p>ETAC COM asks to AUT and NOR, if their nations would be willing to send one officer each for the new proposed 'ChPlans' position. Both nations explain that the vesting of positions abroad is based on voluntariness. They can't confirm now the commitment and that there is no chance to have it in 2021 anyway. <b>(AI 7/13)</b></p> <p>ESP confirms its commitment to fill the new "Support/Logistic" position.</p> <p>DEU representative states that the person vesting the Cmdr's Asst can be extended up to the end of 2024 or beginning of 2025 on the position of the Cmdr's Asst or on another position in ETAC's new PE.</p>
<p><b>17.</b></p>	<p><b>Amendment of TA annexes A,C,D,G.</b></p>
	<p>ETAC COM presents proposals for amending of the annexes to the TA.</p> <p>Annex A: A new version of ETAC's Peacetime Establishment (PE). He explains the supporting relationship with other entities or units. ETAC COM stresses the need to understand the difference between the ETAC PE –which has to be permanently filled for the day to day business of the Centre - and the Command and Control Structure (C2S) for ETAP projects. The latter one has in the past been supported by EATC, sending personnel to fill positions (Training Supervisor &amp; Chief Ops) required for the conduction of ETAP-C/ETAP-T but inadequate in the Centre's Peace Establishment.</p> <p>The ITA representative expresses his understanding of the importance to keep the previous involvement of the EATC, as Training Supervisor and Chief OPS, in the ETAP. ETAC COM clarifies that although the EATC flags are not appearing anymore in Annex A, EATC will be asked to support all the ETAP projects with the same positions as before, but since they are not permanently present at ETAC, they are not reflected in the PE.</p> <p>The DEU representative wants to keep EATC involved in the ETAP projects as harmonization and standardization body. ETAC COM confirms that will continue happen in the future regardless the new annex and explains that EATC's role as harmonization and standardization body was never under discussion.</p> <p>Even though there is no objection for the new Annex A as well as for a new PE with additional positions, no final decision is made. <b>(AI 7/14)</b></p> <p>Annex C: The proposal for the Letter of Activation (LoAct) is described by ETAC COM pointing out the changed part of the document that includes the obligation of augmenting the C2 structure of the any project. There is no objection for the new Annex C other than the BEL representative requests to make it clear that the augmenting personnel requested in the new version is not the Tactical Instructor always required for the courses. Plus, the ESP representative requests to establish the same number of requested augmentees both in Annex C and D <b>(AI 7/15)</b></p> <p>Annex D: On the example of the Finnish case for ETAP-C 20-1, ETAC COM explains his proposal for a new Letter of Acceptance (LoAcc), which would allow a Project Participant (PP) to enter his national requirements of in Sec. 3 of the letter. This proposal is not approved by the ESP representative, since it will be in conflict with the overarching TA. All nations agree on the rest of the Annex.</p> <p>Annex G: Referring to the discussions led on the occasion of the ToR topic all EATC nations state that EATC will have the single nation's voting right provided a specific delegation process. Nations request to modify the Annex G in coordination between EATC and EATC nations IOT find the best wording that will reflect the agreement between the organization and their member nations.<b>(AI 7/16)</b></p>

<b>18.</b>	<b>ETAC &amp; EATC relationship</b>
	<p>The Chairman explains that this section aims to address the most salient way in which the relationship between the two organizations should be understood under the mutual respect basis, no matter either the size of the organization or the Commander rank. The supported-supporting ETAC &amp; EATC relationship is deemed controversial by the Chairman of ETAP SB &amp; ETAC COM.</p> <p>Mr. Chairman offers the floor to the EATC Representative to explain how EATC understands the support relationship should be in the future between the two organizations and their Commanders. EATC representative takes the word and explain how EATC understands the support to the ETAP (not to the Centre) by cooperating during the Projects.</p> <p>Mr. Chairman explains how the external support to the ETAP has been along the years, recognizing the robust support given by both the EDA and the EATC with their personnel and expertise, by the Project Participating nations with their augmentees and the Receiving Participant hosting the Project.</p> <p>ETAC is growing in height, weight and knowledge. ETAC has analyzed, taken into consideration, and developed the small day to day stuff to create a growth oriented atmosphere. Consequently, the support required –although still deemed necessary- is lesser than before. Growth requires change, and both internal and externals partners should be willing to accept the changes that occur as a natural part of that. ETAC is to make sure that its goals and visions are not only made available, but shared with the supporters.</p> <p>The EATC representative recognizes the growing process achieved by the ETAC since the opening of the Centre in 2017. He states that the mission of EATC is not limited to the harmonization and standardization of techniques, tactics and procedures (TTP) used by the transport aircrews. EATC will continue supporting the ETAP in all activities, determined by the SB. The BEL representative highlights his understanding of the EATC role in support of the ETAC and for all projects and these responsibilities are: EATC shall have supervision on the harmonization and standardization portion and the tactical execution remains to the ETAC. ETAC COM refers to his explanations made in the RAH-package.</p>
<b>19.</b>	<b>Suspension of ETAC_ EATC Implementing Agreement (IA)</b>
	<p>The EATC representative takes the floor to state that ETAC COM questioned the status quo of the IA –considered as a legal document by EATC- and unilaterally put the IA signed by the formers Commanders on hold. In his opinion, from this point on, the overall EATC support provided to ETAC has been questioned. In particular, it is said that ETAC COM would rather replace EATC staff supporting ETAP by additional permanent positions and responsibilities within its Centre. Plus, he considers that the acknowledgement of EATC being validating authority of training syllabi was also denied. EATC decided to wait until the ETAP/ETAC SB in which the representatives have the possibility to state their national position. In EATC Representative’s opinion, the fact that the current ETAC COM also holds the function of ETAP/ETAC-SB Chairman is biasing the role of a neutral ETAP/ETAC-SB Chairman’s position. Mr. Chairman thanks the EATC representative for his transparent intervention.</p> <p>ETAC COM explains his position about the validity of the Implementing Arrangement signed by formers EATC &amp; ETAC Commanders in 2018. The IA was never submitted neither to the nations for staffing nor to the governing bodies of the Organizations for its approval and endorsement. The document is not legally passed and cannot be considered as a formal document –as claimed by EATC – being binding for both Organizations. The document has to be understood as a “gentlemen agreement” between the former Commanders of the two organisations. Former ETAC COM –Col José Romero- made the proposal for the Annex A amendment in the 5<sup>th</sup>&amp;6<sup>th</sup> SB meeting based on that questioned</p>

	<p>Implementing Arrangement. It is unusual that any annex of a legal document is expanding matters which have been restricted differently in a basic document – the TA body-. That is why ETAC COM, in his dual capacity as Chairman of the SB and Commander of the Centre, in December 2019 share with the SB members the decision to put it on hold until – at least - the issue is openly discussed in the 7<sup>th</sup> SB meeting.</p> <p>Concerning the validation of the syllabi allegedly denied to the EATC COM, he says that ETAC is not interested in taking any responsibility on the syllabi, recognizing EATC role in that particular matter. However, the syllabi is just the syllabi and EATC shouldn't go further than this, making the Course Manuals, Concepts, SOPs, and reference Documents for ETAC and ETAP projects. ETAC is producing its own Library with different Concept, Manuals, SOPs and Reference Books. It is being a really hard work but it is part of the growing process as ETAC goes mature. Nevertheless, ETAC is not deviating at all from the ETAP syllabi and will not, those documents are consistent with it. ETAC keeps them aligned.</p> <p>Mr. Chairman says that it is a policy issue the EATC contribution to the ETAC Peace Establishment in a permanent basis, as it was discussed during the PMG meetings for the creation of the Centre. The amendment of the ETAP TA Annex A (ETAC PE), in which the EATC contribution to ETAC dramatically changed from the original inception, should have been previously approved after consultation with EATC nations in a different fora.</p> <p>Both Commanders should receive direction and guidance from their governing bodies in order to establish a permanent and honest cooperation implemented through any kind of arrangement or agreement and subsequent authorization. The Commanders by their own are not entitle to deviate from their steering committees or boards.</p> <p>There is a common agreement among just the Participants attending the meeting that the current IA is not the best document for establishing the support relationship among the two organizations neither it was the best way to be implemented. It is obvious the necessity of having a formal document regulating the relationship between EATC &amp; ETAC and their Commanders. Plus, it is accepted by the participating nations that ETAC COM must receive a clear and transparent national position on the content and extent of the direction and guidance (D&amp;G). Nations will provide D&amp;G to ETAC COM in order to draft a new document. Once the nations come up with a positive answer for the final version, it will be sent out to EATC for its review <b>(AI 7/17)</b>.</p> <p>No consensus is achieved about status quo of the IA. Notwithstanding, some national representatives attending the meeting propose to keep the questioned IA active and current until the new one is approved and signed. Although the proposal sounds good for a number of representatives, there is no formal decision nor consensus because some ETAP/ETAC TA participants don't have a solid position on it. ETAC should make every effort to keep the content in place until having back in ETAC mailbox all the national positions.</p>
<p><b>20.</b></p>	<p><b>C2 structure in ETAP projects. Liability Waiver</b></p>
	<p>ETAC COM shows the C2 structure that he intends to use in the future, pointing out that some of the CPT positions are ETAC responsibility and thus ETAC will ask the support from other international entities or SP nations. He also explains the Liability Waiver requested to all participants prior the project's start.</p>
<p><b>21.</b></p>	<p><b>TACOM of assets during the projects: Exercising Control of the Project</b></p>
	<p>The 'exercising Control of the Project' concept is explained by the ETAC COM. The NLD representative points out that providing the TACOM to the ETAC will not solve the problem as the proposal designs. The ITA and FRA representatives believe that this solution will increase the complexity of the process and not solve the issue.</p>

<b>22.</b>	<b>Action item/decision review</b>
	<p>Reviewing all topics the Chairman/ETAC COM states that in no topic all nations provided a decision and asks to the SB representatives to return the National Position documents distributed prior to the meeting IOT provide the national opinion or decision on each items. <b>(AI 7/18).</b></p>
<b>23.</b>	<b>Closing remarks</b>
	<p>Closing the meeting the Chairman apologizes for any misunderstanding during the session. He thanks all participants for their effort and their attention for such a long time. The next meeting is planned for the middle of April 2021, 21 and 22, in Salzburg, AUT. The NLD representative requests to have a meeting early in February IOT address as soon as possible the POW 22.</p>

**Summary of the agreements made by participants at the 7<sup>th</sup> SB:**

- Cold Weather OPS training for 2022 (Site Survey in Finland in MAR21)
- ETAP-T 21 in HUN assessment after Site Survey Report
- Creation of Advisory/Working Group for SB working
- New drafting of SB ToR.
- The chairmanship of the ETAP/ETAC SBs stays with ETAC COM.
- Closure of Budget 2019 is approved
- Distinction between the Permanent Peace Establishment for daily work in the Centre and the Command and Control Structure for ETAP projects in which EATC will fill positions not related to daily work of the Centre (Training Supervisor & Chief OPS)
- New wording for Annex A, C, D, G
- The PoW 21 is partially approved except for ETAP-T 21 and a possible shift of ETAP-C 21-4
- Review the relationship between ETAC & EATC. To formalize the relationship with a document endorsed by the governing bodies.
- Liability Waiver prior to start of the project.
- More SB Meetings in VTC format.
- 8<sup>th</sup> SB meeting in Salzburg

**Pending decisions and agreements (Action Items):**

- See Annex 1

Zaragoza, 01 December 2020

Approved by Chairman:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature