

**NATO UNCLASSIFIED**

30 June 2009

**DECISION SHEET**  
NIAG-DS(2009)0002

**NATO INDUSTRIAL ADVISORY GROUP (NIAG)**

**Meeting held at NATO Headquarters, Brussels, on 3rd and 4th June 2009**

**1. OPENING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

The Chairman:

- 1.1 welcomed NATO NIAG Delegations to the meeting and noted the apologies received from Mr Kemos (Greece) and Mr Richardson (United Kingdom);
- 1.2 also welcomed Cdr. Nilsen and Cdr Brunett from ACT, Mr Karwalski from RTA;
- 1.3 advised that the main subjects for discussion in the meeting would be the new developments in NATO's transformation, particularly the new NATO Defence Planning Process, item 4, the "High Level Advice" studies, item 5, and ACT's Framework for Collaborative Interaction (FFCI), item 7;
- 1.4 thanked the Head of the Danish Delegation for hosting the buffet-luncheon to which all participants and guest speakers were invited.

**2. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

The NIAG:

**A. Approval of Agenda**

- 2.1 Approved the agenda for the meeting issued under NIAG-A(2009)0002 dated 12 May 2009;

**B. Approval of Decision Sheet of last meeting**

- 2.2 Approved the decision sheets of the last meeting issued under PFP(NIAG)DS(2009)0001 dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2009 and NIAG-DS(2009)0001 (INV) dated 16<sup>th</sup> March 2009;

**NATO UNCLASSIFIED**

**C. Reports on Actions from last meeting**

- 2.3 Noted the report by the Coordinating Staff Officer (CSO) on the actions from the last meeting and that action items not completed would be addressed under the agenda items.

**D. Follow-on meetings**

- 2.4 Noted that the next meeting is to be held in Rome between 28<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> October 2009, with the meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> October open to Partners;

- 2.5 Noted the briefing by the Italy on the arrangements for the meeting and invited delegations to register their attendance and make hotel bookings by the end of June (registration website: [niagboardinrome@gmail.com](mailto:niagboardinrome@gmail.com));

***Action: National Delegations***

- 2.6 Noted that the follow-on meetings 2010 are proposed for:

- 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> February at NATO HQ, the meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> being open to Partners,
- 18<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> June hosted by France in Paris, the 18<sup>th</sup> being an arranged visit to the 'Eurosatory' Exhibition, with the NIAG meetings on the 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**3. ADDRESS BY THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY GENERAL ARMAMENTS**

The NIAG:

- 3.1 Noted the address by Mr Richard Froh in which he advised on the decisions by Heads of State and Government (HoSG) at the Strasbourg/Kehl Summit on 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> April and the main areas of business at the 30<sup>th</sup> April CNAD meeting;
- 3.2 Noted that the new NATO Secretary General, Mr Anders Fogh Rasmussen, Denmark, will assume his duties at NATO Headquarters on 1<sup>st</sup> August;
- 3.3 Noted HoSG agreed that the Secretary General proceed with the NATO reform agenda to address new ways of conducting business in the Headquarters, the introduction of a new NATO Defence Planning Process and the implementation of the review of the NATO Agencies;
- 3.4 Noted the appreciation of Mr Froh for the very high level of industrial participation in the BELCOAST 09 event, 5<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> October, and encouraged those not involved to attend the event as visitors.

#### **4. NATO DEFENCE PLANNING PROCESS**

The NIAG:

- 4.1 Noted the briefing by Mr Robert Wenmakers, IS-DPP(FPD) outlining the new NATO Defence Planning Process (NDPP) and the elements of the process where industry will have a role;
- 4.2 Noted that the NDPP aims to bring together military and non-military aspects of planning and that two key features will be the Bi-Strategic Command (SC) Priority Shortfall Areas and the setting of capability 'Targets', in terms of required 'effects', for national, multinational, or NATO Capability Package realisation;
- 4.3 Noted that, of the five steps that make up the NDPP, step 2, which includes addressing future trends, step 3, determining capability shortfall solutions, and step 4, supporting implementation, provide opportunities for industrial involvement;
- 4.4 Noted, in response to questions, that one intent of the NDPP was to achieve consistency and better use of resources when addressing short and longer term shortfalls; that the NDPP could potentially address non-military capabilities that nations may be able to offer to NATO led operations, for example medical capabilities; that whilst NDPP was not seeking to involve NATO directly in national procurement plans, it was placing emphasis on NATO priorities; and that interoperability was to be part of the NDPP thinking.

#### **5. SUPPORT TO CNAD**

The NIAG:

##### **A. Interoperability**

- 5.1 Noted the update on the NATO Interoperability Review by Mr Henrik Dam, Head JAIS, in his role as Chairman of the Special Working Group on Interoperability;
- 5.2 Noted that the review had identified a comprehensive listing of interoperability shortfalls and that, for CNAD, the ongoing work was to develop practical options to mitigate interoperability shortfalls, considering the potential for cooperative approaches to system, sub-system and interface development as well as the qualitative and possibly quantitative assessment of the cost of such options;
- 5.3 Noted the update on the ongoing NIAG Study "The industrial contribution to achieving interoperability" by the Chairman of Sub-Group (SG) 137, Maj Gen (Rtd) Frans Picavet, the Netherlands, in which he advised of his expectations from the study;
- 5.4 Noted that the study final report will be available in October and that delegations, through their participating companies, were invited to contribute to the current

phase of the study which is addressing primary research questions related to the industrial involvement in interoperability.

**Action: National Delegations**

**B. Government-Industry Partnerships**

- 5.4 Noted the update on the NATO initiative addressing Helicopter shortfalls by Mr Henrik Dam, in his role as Chairman CNAD Helicopter IPT, in which he advised that current work in CNAD was focusing on the development of business cases for helicopter lease options with, at the same time, ongoing work on the development of a Future Heavy Transport Helicopter requirement and addressing helicopter survivability;
- 5.5 Noted that the proposed NIAG study addressing Government Industry Partnerships, a follow-on activity to the CNAD Transport Helicopter Conference held in 2008, was to be addressed at the Exploratory Group meeting arranged for 5<sup>th</sup> June 2009.

**C. Trans-Atlantic Defence Industrial Cooperation Conference**

- 5.6 Noted the briefing by Mr Richard Williams, Deputy Director, Armaments Directorate, outlining the planning for the CNAD sponsored conference on Trans-Atlantic Defence Industrial Cooperation to be held in conjunction with the October CNAD meeting in NATO HQ;
- 5.7 Noted that the Conference aim was to seek potential solutions to improve government-industry defence technological and industrial cooperation with a view to achieving improved capabilities and interoperability and was to be build around four panels;
- 5.8 Noted that NIAG Delegations were invited to offer suggestions to Mr Williams for suitable experts to be considered for the panels and also those whom it would be appropriate to invite as participants to the conference.

**Action: National Delegations**

*Post meeting note: Conference document e-mailed to Delegations 15<sup>th</sup> June 2009.*

- 5.9 Noted that NIAG was invited to support the Conference Management Team and invited Mr Robert Bell, Chairman of the Study SG 114, to lead the NIAG support to the Conference.

**D. Defence Against Terrorism Programme of Work**

- 5.10 Noted the update on the BELCOAST 09 preparations by Dr Pietro Tonini, Italy, the NIAG Defence Against Terrorism (DAT) Programme of Work (POW) point of contact in which he advised on the organisation and scenarios for the demonstrations addressing Critical Infrastructure Protection, CBRN, Counter-IED, Non-Lethal Capabilities and Defence Against Mortar Attack;

- 5.11 Noted the brief by Mme Françoise Perret, IS-Head of CTTU, on the intention to conduct a DAT POW Strategic Survey with the aim of ensuring that the programme remains aligned with the Alliance's objectives and relevant to the evolving security environment;
- 5.12 Noted that, through Dr Tonini, NIAG was offering to support BELCOAST 09 follow-up assessment as may be required and that the Bulgarian, Hungarian, Spanish and United Kingdom Delegations had expressed interest in contributing to such a project;
- 5.13 Noted that the DAT POW Strategic Survey will involve "sounding board" discussions in September and October and NIAG will be invited to participate in these discussions when organised;
- 5.14 Noted also in discussion that ideas from delegations concerning the future DAT POW are welcomed by the IS-CTTU.

***Action: National Delegations***

## **6. SUPPORT TO CNAD MAIN GROUPS**

The NIAG:

### **A. NATO Army Armament Group (NAAG)**

- 6.1 Noted with appreciation the Final Report briefing on the NAAG sponsored study "Achieving Ground Based Air Defence (GBAD) systems integration and interoperability with NATO deployed assets", by the Chairman SG 124, Mr Bruno Di Marco, Italy;
- 6.2 Noted the extensive work that had been undertaken in this study to describe the NATO GBAD integration and interoperability challenges and to develop proposals for demonstrating improved system-to-system coordination in a multi-national NATO GDAD force package, including providing a proposed demonstration roadmap to guide the work of the study sponsor LCG/4;
- 6.3 Supported the Vice-Chairman in thanking Mr Di Marco for his Chairmanship of SG 124 with the presentation of a NATO Certificate of Appreciation;
- 6.4 Noted the Interim Reports of the following NAAG sponsored studies as posted on the NIAG website:
- Soldier Systems Communications Interoperability Validation, SG 123, Chairman Mr Mario Di Stefano, Italy;
  - Auxiliary Power Unit for Military Vehicles, SG 135, Chairman Mr Alexander Lau, Germany;
  - Vehicles Mounted Light Multi-Role Weapon System, SG 136, Mr Gerhard Hubricht, Germany.

- 6.5 Noted that the study SG 123 involved simulation and simulation analysis work and, as agreed with the study sponsor LCG/1, was running on a further six months because of delays in determining Information Exchange Mechanism (IEM) prototypes for the simulation;
- 6.6 Noted that the study SG 135 was proving a complex study and would welcome access to experts in “power budgets”, inviting delegations to investigate assistance in locating such experts;

**Action: National Delegations**

**B. NATO Air Force Armament Group (NAFAG)**

- 6.7 Noted the interim reports of the following NAFAG sponsored studies as posted on the NIAG website:
- Future Battle Damage Indication (BDI) and Battle Damage Assessment (BDA) for Complex Weapons applications, SG 132, Chairman Mr Nigel Slade, United Kingdom;
  - Use of Digital Video Broadcast – Terrestrial Waveform for ISR Data Links, SG 133, Chairman, Mr Bruno di Marco, Italy.
- 6.8 Noted that, with study SG 132, the scope was being restricted to tactical BDI/BDA and that the study team is European in make up;

**C. NATO Naval Armament Group (NNAG)**

- 6.9 Noted the interim reports of the following NNAG sponsored studies as posted on the NIAG website:
- Weaponising Unmanned Air Systems, SG 125, Chairman Mr Douglas Gregory, United States;
  - Sense and Avoid Requirements for UAV operating outside segregated airspace, SG 134, Chairman Mr Norbert Tranapp, Germany;
  - Short Range Anti-air, Anti-surface and Gun launched ammunition against Unconventional Threats, SG 138, Chairman Mr Giuliano Franceschi, Italy.
- 6.10 Noted that study SG 125 is proceeding satisfactorily following a delayed start awaiting ITAR exemption for certain aspects of the industry participation;
- 6.11 Noted that study SG 134 had attracted 43 participants from 14 nations;  
*(Note by CSO – budget reallocation made to provide €400,000 to this study)*
- 6.12 Noted that study SG 138 was based around a workshop to be held with the sponsor group on 17 September 2009, with preparation meetings prior to the workshop and a post workshop assessment meeting to complete;

**D. CNAD Life Cycle Management Group (AC/327)**

- 6.13 Noted, in the absence of the Chairman of the NIAG Industrial Interface Group (IIG) to AC/327, Mr Peter Janatschek, Germany, an update by the CSO on the IIG programme of work in support of AC/327 activities published in document: PFP(AC/327)D(2009)0011 dated 30 April 2009;
- 6.14 Noted that the Chairman NIAG IIG sought advice from the NIAG on the issue of the newly agreed NATO IPR policy to be applied to STANAGs which potentially affects the relationship between nations and industries in multinational programmes;
- 6.15 Invited NIAG delegations to advise the Chairman IIG, copy to CSO, if the Disclaimer Statement to be included in NATO STANAGs is considered to present a problem to their industries in dissemination of information on STANAGs in responding to, or implementing, government contracts.  
**Action: National Delegations**
- 6.16 Noted that the NIAG IIG, with the AC/327, were to support the 6<sup>th</sup> NATO Life Cycle Management Conference to be organised by the German CALS Forum on 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> January 2010 in Brussels and that offers of presentations were being sought, with the deadline for submission of abstracts being the **28<sup>th</sup> August 2009**.  
**Action: National Delegations**

**E. Preparation of NIAG Studies Programme of Work 2010**

- 6.17 Noted that a 'round table' meeting of the MAG Secretaries, CNAD Capability Group study sponsors, the NIAG Chairman, Vice-Chairman and available NIAG points of contact to the MAGs and a representative of the NHQC3 Staff had been held on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2009 to discuss 18 proposals for NIAG studies in 2010;
- 6.18 Noted that the 'round table' discussion was based on criteria including relation to NATO priorities and industrial interest and that the MAGs would be determining the priorities to be accorded to these study proposals at their forthcoming meetings, taking note of the assessments offered at the 'round table' meeting. The 2010 studies proposals package will be submitted by DASG/Armaments to NADREPs for approval;
- 6.19 Noted that the Civil Budget Committee has been deliberating on budget allocations for 2010 and 2011 in the context of nations' 'zero growth' budget policy and that the Defence Investment budget for Industry Cooperation, from which the NIAG studies are funded, is likely to be reduced by 9% in 2010;
- 6.20 Noted the serious concerns expressed by delegations at such budget reductions and the message this sends to industrial companies who are contributing the greater part of the costs of the NIAG studies;

- 6.21 Invited the Chairman to write to ASG/DI expressing the serious concerns of NIAG Delegations to proposed cuts in the NATO monies allocated to industrial cooperation;

**Action: Chairman**

- 6.22 Agreed, in discussing potential High Level Consultative Advise study work for 2010, that consideration first be given to follow-on work from current advisory work, that is on Trans-Atlantic Defence Industrial Cooperation and Interoperability.

## **7. ACTIVITIES WITH OTHER NATO BODIES/ORGANISATIONS**

The NIAG:

### **A. Allied Command Transformation (ACT)**

- 7.1 Noted with appreciation the briefings by Cdr Kenneth Nilsen on the ACT Framework for Collaborative Interaction (FFCI) initiative and Cdr Chris Brunett on the preparation for ACT Industry Day 2009 to be held on 8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> October 2009 in Washington, DC;
- 7.2 Noted that the theme of the Industry Day was to be “Working together to improve interoperability” and that information on the event would be available on the website – [www.act.nato.int/industryday](http://www.act.nato.int/industryday) .
- 7.3 Noted the list of pilot projects for working with industry that were being considered with a view to launching potentially three such projects at the Industry Day;
- 7.4 Noted the Chairman’s comment that NIAG would be in a position to contribute to the general theme of interoperability with a report on the SG 137 study, was currently working with ACT and the NC3A on the subject of Distributed Networked Battle Labs (DNBL), the project launched at the 2008 Industry Day, and would potentially be able to contribute to the subject of Multinational Logistics from the study concerning “Government-Industry Partnerships”;
- 7.5 Addressing the ACT FFCI<sup>1</sup>, noted that NADREPs had invited NIAG to advise them on the FFCI and particularly whether CNAD would be able to meet the FFCI need using NIAG as the existing mechanism to seek industrial advice;
- 7.6 Noted the summary of NIAG considerations on the FFCI compiled by the CSO based on the contribution of the United States Head of Delegation in his appointed capacity to advise ACT on the FFCI development on behalf of NIAG;
- 7.7 Noted additional comments by nations:

---

<sup>1</sup> FFCI – Framework for Collaborative Interaction

- 7.7.1 Germany emphasised that when referring to company business cases to participate in FFCI projects, it should be borne in mind that the business cases for SME differed from the larger and multinational defence companies;
- 7.7.2 the Netherlands drew attention to the concern of companies that work under FFCI addressing future capability requirements could exclude such companies from bidding for subsequent contracts and advised that there needed to be clarity in this regard;
- 7.8 Agreed the summary of NIAG considerations at Annex C, which include the above comments;
- 7.9 Agreed that, working to the NIAG “model”, NIAG is very prepared to work with ACT to provide industrial advice in the areas related to Capability Development and to extend the scope of the work to date, with the proviso that some level of financial contribution is offered for studies and additional staff support can be made available;
- 7.10 Noted with appreciation the interim report on the Study addressing Distributed Networked Battle Labs, SG 141<sup>2</sup>, by the SG Chairman Mr Louis De Chantal, France, this study sponsored by ACT and being conducted in conjunction with the NC3A;
- 7.11 Noted that this study is addressing the mechanics of connecting Battle Labs in a network to an NC3A hub as Phase 1 of a two phase ACT project. Phase 2 was to be a demonstration using connected DNBLs, this to be funded by volunteer nations and to which industrial participants would be invited to bid.

**B. Allied Command Operations (ACO)**

- 7.12 Noted the report by the NIAG Chairman on discussions he held in April with the Chief of Staff to ACO and the DCOS Support on how NIAG may potentially liaise with ACO. He advised that the Chief of Staff is to hold a discussion meeting with NAMSA<sup>3</sup> and the NCSA<sup>4</sup> in the September timeframe to consider how the agencies may contribute to the military decisions and offered to invite NIAG to be represented at these discussions.

**C. Research and Technology Organisation**

- 7.13 Noted with appreciation the update by Italy on the RTO Joint Operations 2030 Study / SAS-066, led by Mr Paul Massel, Canada, which advised that the study is

---

<sup>2</sup> DNBL – Distributed Networked Battle Laboratories

<sup>3</sup> NAMSA – NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency

<sup>4</sup> NCSA – NATO CIS Services Agency

on track to complete in December 2009 with the Phase III report on JO 2030 Capability Set Development currently being submitted to the RTA for publication.

- 7.14 Noted that the study included the planning and promotion of a Multinational Exercise (MNE) and that of subsequent interest would be a comparison of this futures technology study with the ACT Multiple Future study recently promulgated ([www.act.nato.int/multiplefutures](http://www.act.nato.int/multiplefutures))
- 7.15 Supported the Chairman's appreciation to Italy for leading the NIAG contribution to the JO 2030 study.

**D. NATO C3 Organisation (NC3O)**

- 7.16 Noted the update by the CSO on the discussions with the NHQC3 Staff concerning NIAG liaison and potential future studies work with the NC3O;
- 7.17 Noted that a recent meeting had been held attended by the Chairman, the NIAG POC, Mr Thomas Gottschild, Germany, and the Branch Chief, Policy Architecture, Interoperability and Operations, Col Burzlaff, NHQC3 Staff, together with supporting staffs, to discuss potential areas for NIAG studies in support of NC3 Board activities. It is anticipated that one or two proposed studies may be offered to NIAG in the latter half of this year, depending on availability of funding;
- 7.18 noted that Mr Gottschild will be invited to attend on behalf of NIAG the NC3B Sub-Committee 1 meeting in October.

**8. ACTIVITIES WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS – AFCEA**

- 8.1 Noted that the NIAG German Delegation, and in particular Mr Thomas Gottschild, was organising a NIAG contribution to the AFCEA event addressing Unmanned Air Systems at SHAPE, Mons, to be held on 25 June 2009;
- 8.2 Noted with appreciation the overview by Dr Norbert Tranapp, Chairman of NIAG study SG 134 on Sense and Avoid Requirements for UAV operating outside segregated airspace, of the presentation he would deliver to this event on behalf of NIAG;
- 8.3 Noted with appreciation the offer of the Italian Delegation that Mr Bruno Mazzetti of Alenia Aeronautica join the NIAG team for this event;
- 8.4 Noted that the Chairman would lead the NIAG presentation team and provide an overview of the NIAG work in NATO.

*POST MEETING NOTE: Regrettably AFCEA had to cancel this event.*

- 8.5 Concerning liaison with the Aerospace and Defence Industries Association of Europe (ASD), agreed with the suggestion of the Italian Head of Delegation that it would be appropriate to invite the ASD Defence Committee Chairman to a future NIAG meeting.

**Action: Chairman/CSO**

## **9. NIAG MANAGEMENT**

The NIAG:

- 9.1 Approved the NIAG Management Plan issued under NIAG-D(2009)0011
- 9.2 Noted the summary of the "Tour de Table" at the February 2009 NIAG meeting addressing delegations comments and issues related to their NIAG contributions as presented in NIAG-N(2009)0002
- 9.3 Noted the proposal concerning the follow-up to the NIAG Studies reports offered by Mr Ladislav Vargovcik, Head of the Slovak Delegation, that thought be given to a 'post studies' coordination activity whereby topics emerging from the NIAG studies reports are collated and passed to organisations or bodies able to further address these. Invited the CSO to further investigate this proposal with Mr Vargovcik;

**Action: CSO/Slovak Delegation**

- 9.4 Noted the proposals by the CSO to revisit the NIAG Handbook and further develop the NIAG website in 2009 and agreed to provide suggestions to the CSO on areas for improvement, or change, in regard to the NIAG administration;

**Action: National Delegations**

- 9.5 Agreed that the NIAG studies payment system does merit investigation and invited the NIAG 'management team' to advise on the scope for NIAG to consider alternative systems for allocation of studies monies to participating companies.

**Action: NIAG Management Team**

## **10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The NIAG:

### **A. Formation of NIAG Chairman/Vice Chairman Election Committee**

- 10.1 Supported the appointment of the Heads of the Belgium, Denmark and Netherlands delegations to form the NIAG Election Committee to advise the 2009 elections of the next Chairman and Vice-Chairman;

*POST MEETING NOTE: Election Committee met and appointed Mr Fogh, Denmark as Chairman*

- 10.2 Agreed to submit nominations from their national delegations, as appropriate, for the positions of Chairman and Vice-Chairman to the Election Committee, copy to the CSO, by 25<sup>th</sup> September 2009;

**Action: National Delegations**

- 10.3 Invited the Election Committee to deliver the nominations to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Heads of Delegations for 9<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

**Action: Election Committee**

**B. Armaments Cooperation under the NATO - Russia Council – status update - IS.**

- 10.4 Noted the update by Dr Christian Von Buttlar, IS/DARM/P3S, on the resumption of the NATO Russia Council (NRC) and considerations for ongoing work on armaments cooperation under the NRC;

- 10.5 Noted that a first set of studies addressing R&T Cooperation and Defence Industrial Cooperation were completed in 2007. The outcome of the Defence Industrial Cooperation study has been a handbook providing an overview of the procurement policies and procedures of NATO and Russia together with a supporting Russian-English glossary;

- 10.6 Noted that further discussion on areas for future work are being held between nations in the NRC “Defence Reform and Cooperation” Working Group and the IS will keep NIAG informed on potential future activities related to Industrial Cooperation as appropriate.

**11. CLOSING REMARKS**

- 11.1 The NIAG noted the closing remarks of the Chairman in which he thanked national delegations for their contributions to the meeting, the ACT representatives for their briefings and the IS interpreters and support staff.

(Signed) R Sladden  
NIAG Coordinating Staff Officer

**LIST OF ATTENDEES**

Chairman: Dr. R. Esposito (Italy)  
Vice-Chairman: Mr. H.J. Wieland (Germany)

<b>BELGIUM</b>	Mr. D. Van de Ven
<b>BULGARIA</b>	Ms. T. Chavdarova Mr. B. Penchev
<b>CANADA</b>	Mr. A. Falardeau Mr. D. Stapley
<b>DENMARK</b>	Maj.Gen. (Rtd) Ole Fogh
<b>FRANCE</b>	Adm. (Rtd) X. Rolin Mr. M. Imberti Mr. J. Duroux Mr. J.A. Epitalon Mr. Ch. Hamon Mr. L. de Chantal Mr. A. Hibon
<b>GERMANY</b>	Rear Adm. (Rtd) W. Kalähne Mr. J. Kruse Mr. M. Langer Mr. C. Stuve Mr. N. Tränapp (Chairman NIAG SG.134)
<b>HUNGARY</b>	Col. (Rtd) Laszlo Kocsis
<b>ITALY</b>	Mr. G. Grasso Mr. P. Tonini Mr Bruno Mazzetti Mr Bruno Di Marco (Chairman NIAG SG.124)
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	Mr. J. Jansen Mr F. Picavet (Chairman NIAG SG.137)
<b>NORWAY</b>	Mr. T. Svensgard
<b>POLAND</b>	Lt.Col. D. Sarna Mr. A. Szulborski

<b>PORTUGAL</b>	Mr. L.X. Cabrita
<b>ROUMANIA</b>	Mr. M. Gilceava
<b>SLOVAKIA</b>	Mr L. Vargovcik
<b>SPAIN</b>	Mr. A. Menendez
<b>TURKEY</b>	Mrs D. Kokden Mrs S. Cavusoglu
<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b>	Mr. M. Hill Mr. P. Collinsl Mr. P. Fentem Mr. E. Garcia Mr. A. Smith
<b>UNITED STATES</b>	Mr. W. Fujito Mr. R. Bell Mr. E. Cunningham Mr. T. Leris Mr. M. Clark
<b>ACT</b>	Cdr. C. Brunett Cdr K. Nilsen
<b>RTA</b>	Mr. M. Karwalski

**Defence Investment Division**

Deputy Assistant Secretary General and  
Director Armaments  
Head JAIS  
Industrial Outreach Unit  
Industrial Outreach Unit

Mr. R. Froh  
Mr. H. Dam  
Mr. R. Sladden  
Ms. G. Le Fournis

1.

**ACTION ITEMS**

	<b>Para.</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>By Whom:</b>	
1.	2.5	To register attendance at the NIAG meeting in Rome, Italy, 28-30 October.	National Delegations	
2.	5.4	To support study SG 137 (Interoperability) participants in responding to the study primary research phase questions.	National Delegations	
3.	5.8	To offer suggestions to Mr Williams (IS-DARM) for suitable experts to be considered for the 'TADIC' conference panels and also those whom it would be appropriate to invite as participants.	National Delegations	
4.	5.14	To offer, as appropriate, through Dr Tonini (ITA), proposals for consideration in the DAT POW strategic survey.	National Delegations	
5.	6.6	Concerning SG 135 (Auxiliary Power Unit for Military Vehicles) to assist the Chairman, Mr Mr Lau, Germany, in locating experts on "power budgets".	National Delegations	
6.	6.15	To advise the Chairman NIAG IIG, copy to CSO, if the Disclaimer Statement to be included in NATO STANAGs is considered to present a problem to their industries in dissemination of information on STANAGs in responding to, or implementing, government contracts.	National Delegations	
7.	6.16	To offer presentations to the 6 <sup>th</sup> NATO Life Cycle Management Conference on 19/20 January 2010, noting the deadline for abstract is 28 <sup>th</sup> August 2009.	National Delegations	
8.	6.21	To write to ASG/DI expressing the concerns of NIAG Delegations to proposed cuts in the NATO monies allocated to industrial cooperation.	Chairman	
9.	8.5	To invite the ASD Defence Committee Chairman to a future NIAG meeting.	Chairman/CSO	
10.	9.3	To investigate establishing a 'post NIAG studies' coordination activity along the lines proposed by the Head of the Slovak Delegation.	CSO with Slovak Delegation	
11.	9.4	To provide suggestions to the CSO on areas for improvement, or change, in regard to the NIAG administration.	National Delegations	
12.	10.2	To submit nominations from their national delegations, as appropriate, for the positions of Chairman and Vice-Chairman to the Election Committee, copy to the CSO, by 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2009	National Delegations	
13.	10.3	To deliver the nominations to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Heads of Delegations for 9 <sup>th</sup> October 2009	Election Committee (BEL, DNK, NLD)	

**NIAG considerations on the ACT Framework for Collaborative Interaction (FFCI)**

	<b>Points for consideration</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
1	<b>Early Industry Interaction with ACT:</b> NIAG strongly supports early involvement of industry in NATO capability development . (Reference: NIAG Study SG 120).	Concentrate on the FFCI 'levels' that address the early involvement of industry in the capability development work.
2	<b>"Costs lie where they fall":</b> ACT must recognise the need to provide Industry with sound incentives to participate. Companies will need to develop their own business cases for committing resources to FFCI projects. The NIAG 'model' of part financial 'contribution' offers considerable leverage of industrial support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid a blanket "Costs lie where they fall" approach. Rather consider each project against ACT budget priorities.</li> <li>• Early pilot cases is considered the way forward to test industrial interest.</li> <li>• Readdress the ACT emphasis on "non-procurement manner" of the FFCI concept by considering the NIAG model of enabling industrial participation.</li> </ul>
3	<b>Selection of Industrial Participants:</b> The selection of companies to participate in the FFCI projects is a potential pitfall in the NATO environment.	Avoid pre-set 'rules'; rather apply guidelines and enable the companies involved to work the issue as/if necessary.
4	<b>Trans-Atlantic Industrial Participation:</b> The location of ACT HQ in Norfolk, VA, favours the participation of US industry in FFCI. The need for trans-Atlantic equality of opportunity must be considered.	The use of NATO HQ Brussels and the Mons site, development of video-conferencing, and other such initiatives can contribute to better involvement of companies on both sides of the Atlantic.
5	<b>Enabling SME participation:</b> SME's represent a potentially rich source of innovation. Further, SME's form the defence industry sector for the majority of NATO nations. 'Business cases' in SME will also differ from those of the larger defence industrial companies.	Strong capabilities reside in SME's, therefore include in the FFCI thinking the smaller elements of industry as well as the more major players.
6	<b>Transparency in ACT FFCI implementation:</b> Achieving transparency in the initial advertising of project, through the duration of project and on the result of project is an important consideration.	The ACT CIM and its website are still under development. Both are seen as key elements to the success of FFCI and should be designed as a 'push' and well as 'pull' information system.
7	<b>Follow-on contractual implications:</b> A potential concern is that participation in requirement development through FFCI may lead to exclusion of the participating company from bidding for related follow-on contracts.	Make clear that participation in FFCI will not impact on follow-on contract opportunities and even that follow-on involvement will be welcomed.
8	<b>Scope for NIAG Support:</b> The "NIAG model" offers a pragmatic approach, with a "3 for 1" financial leverage for work undertaken. However, NIAG is <u>not</u> "Industry" in the sense of offering access to individual companies, but rather a provider of industrial advice. Working to the "NIAG Model", NIAG is very prepared to work with ACT to provide industrial advice in the areas related to Capability Development and to extend the scope of the work undertaken to date.	NIAG support be considered if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the work relates to NATO capabilities development;</li> <li>- some level of financial contribution is offered for studies;</li> <li>- additional staff support can be made available.</li> </ul>