

**Appendix to items 20.1, 21.1 and 26.1**

**FIG TASK FORCE – REVIEW OF COMMISSION STRUCTURE**

**INTERIM DISCUSSION PAPER**

*Dr Tom Kennie*

*Vice President – Chair of Task Force*

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The following paper is intended to act as a catalyst for debate on the second stage of the review of the Governance of the Federation. Stage 1 is now in the final stages of its progress through General Assembly and the main changes will start to be implemented following the General Assembly in Korea. In view of this the GA appointed a new Task Force on Review of Commission, Task Force and Permanent Institution Structure 2000-2002 (see Appendix 1 for details of the terms of reference and membership), to bring forward ideas and proposals relating to the detailed operating structure of the technical and professional activities of the Federation.

This paper offers some initial ideas for consideration at the General Assembly in Korea. A breakout session will be provided during the General Assembly (7 May 2001 from 13.30 to 15.00) to discuss and debate some of the key issues relating to any changes which might eventually be formally recommended. The paper is not making any formal proposals at this stage and is primarily concerned with the pressures for change which have been developing over the past few years, how any proposed changes might align with the future strategic direction of the Federation and outline some of the options for change to the current structure.

**2. HISTORY**

The existing Commission structure has formed the basis for organizing the Technical and Professional activities of the Federation for some considerable time. A Task Force, under the Chairmanship of Wally Youngs considered the need for change in the late 1980s and concluded that the status quo should continue. Modest changes have taken place over the past 10 years, primarily to the titles of the Commission and this has led to changes in e.g. the titles of Commission 3, 5 7, 8 and 9. Recently proposals have been made to establish an additional Commission concerned with Construction Economics. More significantly the past 10 years has seen a dramatic increase in the use of Task Forces and bodies to coordinate activities of cross-Commission interest (e.g. Standards).

Whilst it is recognized that the existing structure has in many senses served the Federation well, it is also necessary to recognize the major, in many cases revolutionary changes which have taken place in the practice of surveying, the organization of surveying nationally and internationally and how these have impacted on the employment conditions and careers of practicing surveyors and the structure and organization of the

FIG over this period. In view of the magnitude of these changes it is clearly important that as a progressive and responsive organization, the FIG should chose to undertake a review of its operational structure in 2001.

### **3. THE CONTEXT AND PRESSURES FOR CHANGE**

Before embarking on any change programme it is important to consider the context for such change.

Many of the reasons for reviewing the existing structure are also related to some of the arguments put forward for changing the overall Governance and Management of the Federation (Kennie, 1999)

- ❑ *Need for Enhanced Levels of Flexibility and Adaptability*
- ❑ *Need for Enhanced Geographical Involvement*
- ❑ *Need for Increased Levels of Involvement*
- ❑ *Need for Involvement of a New Generation of Contributors to FIG*

More specifically, some of the key reasons for change include;

*Flexibility and Adaptability* – the pace of change across the profession is considerable, and hence it is important that whatever structure the Federation eventually adopts it must have a high level of flexibility to adapt to rapidly changing circumstances. This implies an ability to initiate and resource work in a new area of practice with maximum speed. It could be argued that the current structure needs to be more adaptable to this increasingly rapidly changing external environment.

A related issue in this context is the capacity of individuals to commit to a period of office as a Commission officer of 8 years. In today's rapidly changing world it is becoming increasingly difficult for individuals to be aware of their personal career circumstances over this period of time – and hence increased levels of flexibility will be required if we are to attract individuals to such posts in the future.

*Integration* – With limited resources at its disposal the need for these to be deployed in a focused manner is becoming of increasing significance. The need to integrate the activities of several Commissions, to coordinate work across all Commissions and to align the work in the Commission with the overall strategy of the Federation has never been greater. Again many would argue that the current structure lacks integration, with Commission work plans designed in isolation from both the overall direction of the FIG and from each other.

*Participation* – The work of the FIG is heavily dependant on the voluntary activities of a relatively small number of enthusiastic converts to what might be called 'The FIG Way'. They enjoy being involved in international activities, they value making a meaningful contribution to developing the profession beyond their national boundaries and they enjoy the company of other like minded colleagues. However, it is evident that not only

is this number small, but it is also an ageing (and predominantly male) population. The number of young men and women engaged in the work of the Federation is of concern. Consequently it is important to use any changes to the structure to encourage greater levels of participation and engagement from a wider population than is evident today.

In addition it is also evident that the increasing expenses of attending events is limiting the participation from members from those member associations which are financially less strong.

*Networks* – A further pressure for change is the way in which international bodies are operating today. Increasingly it is important for bodies to work within and through networks. Partnership and strategic alliances are of growing importance. No longer can any one body operate in complete isolation from all other related organizations. Again any future structure needs to encourage and recognize the importance of working collaboratively with others.

*Regionalism and Cultural Diversity* – There is a growing need to recognize the regional needs of surveying organizations in particular areas of the globe. Their needs can and do differ considerably. Furthermore the needs of different cultural and linguistic groups is also of significant importance. Again any new structure needs to recognize these challenges. The work of the separate Task Force on Cultures and Languages will be of particular value in emphasizing this need.

### **QUESTIONS FOR BREAKOUT SESSION**

Do you agree with these pressures for change?  
Can you identify any others which should be emphasized?

#### **4. THE EMERGENT STRUCTURE**

Before considering the need for any major change in the longer term it may also be useful to make more explicit the ‘informal’ operational structure of the work of the FIG which has been emerging over the past 4-5 years including a formalisation of those activities which will be required to implement the new Governance model.

This emergent structure could be considered as existing in several ‘clusters’ and the following lists the existing elements of this structure together with some new elements which will be created to reflect the activities which have been developing in the recent past.

The structure does not imply any significant changes to the role of ACCO, although it clearly reinforces the need for this form of coordinating body.

#### **4.1 Committee(s) Accountable to the General Assembly**

4.1.1 Nominations Review Committee – *Responsible for reviewing nominations to the Council (This is a new element of the structure to reflect the new Governance procedures). The membership of the NRG would consist of 3 – 5 senior members of the FIG. Normally chaired by the immediate past president (PP), the Council would nominate 2–4 additional senior members to the NRG. The additional members would be selected to ensure a balanced committee taking into account of geography, and disciplinary background. Members would be invited to contribute for a maximum of 4 years. The nomination of the NRG shall be confirmed by the General Assembly at its meeting during the Congress. However, for the first time at the General Assembly in Seoul for 2001–2002. The NRG to be nominated at the General Assembly in Washington will serve from 2003–2006.*

#### **4.2 Committee(s) Accountable to the Council (Committees would normally be chaired by a member of the Council- typically a Vice President)**

4.2.1 International Standards Committee – *Responsible for links with ISO and the Commissions on standards issues. (This is suggested as a new, more permanent element, of the structure which reflects the importance attached to the work of the Task Force on Standards)*

4.2.2 Strategic Alliances Committee – *Responsible for Alliances with other professional bodies, NGOs, UN agencies etc. (Again this is suggested as a further new, more permanent element of the structure which also reflects the growing importance of links with a range of international bodies). This committee will be chaired by a Vice President assisted by a group of 3–4 people with specific alliance responsibilities*

4.2.3 Academic Members Coordination Group – *Responsible for the coordination of the interests of the growing academic membership base of the FIG. The relationship between this group and Commission 2 will require further discussion.*

4.2.4 Sponsor and Corporate Members Coordination Group – *Responsible for the coordination of the interests of the current sponsor and proposed wider ‘corporate’ grades of membership.*

4.2.5 The Advisory Committee of Commission Officers (ACCO) . – *Responsible for the coordination of the work of the Commissions.*

### **4.3 Task Forces Accountable to the Council**

Task Forces will continue, as at present, to be established for a limited time period to analyse a particular issue and report their findings to either the Council or GA (or both).

In the current structure this would include the;

- 4.3.1 Task Force on Culture and Languages  
*Final Report in Washington*
- 4.3.2 Task Force on Mutual Recognition of Qualifications  
*Final Report in Washington*
- 4.3.3 Task Force on Under-Represented Groups  
*Final report in Washington*

Other groups will be formed to deal with ‘hot-topics’ which require short term analysis and action.

As at present the Task Forces would be formed for a limited timescale (typically 4 years) with the intention that the work of the Task Force would then be integrated into the work of other more permanent structures.

### **4.4 Technical/Professional Commissions – Accountable to the Council**

The current structure consists of 9 Commissions and 1 Ad-Hoc Commission. The need for change in the current structure of the Commissions is becoming apparent in order to respond to the pressures highlighted earlier. Some options for change are outlined in section 5.

### **4.5 International Institutions – Accountable to the GA**

As certain areas of work of particular Commissions has evolved and matured, it has become apparent that the activity would benefit from a higher degree of autonomy. Consequently in recent years the FIG has established 3 FIG International Institutions, namely;

- 4.5.1 The FIG Multi-Lingual Dictionary Board
- 4.5.2 The International Institution for the History of Surveying and Measurement – Permanent Institution of FIG, and
- 4.5.3 OICRF – The International Office of Cadastre and Land Records

The terms of reference for the appointment of officers varies in each case, partly reflecting the historical evolution of the Institution. As part of the work of this Task Force

it is proposed that each Institution be invited to clarify their current approach to Governance with any proposed changes.

In due course following further debate in Korea the positioning of the FIG Foundation will also require consideration.

**QUESTION FOR BREAKOUT GROUP**

Do you feel the 'emergent structure' outlined above is an accurate reflection of the current framework (with appropriate modifications to reflect the changes introduced in the review of the Governance structure)?

**5. OPTIONS FOR ENHANCING THE COMMISSION STRUCTURE**

In an exercise to review the overall structure of the Commission framework it is important to ensure all possible scenarios are considered. Some (extreme) examples include;

*Scenario 1* – Increasing the number of Technical groups significantly and eliminating the existing Commission structure. In this scenario, Technical groups would be clustered around relevant themes (e.g. sustainable development, technology, promotion of the profession etc.) and report directly through a Task Force Chair to the Council via a Vice President. Groups would be able to be formed as and when a sufficient number of members from a specified number of countries were able to put forward a business plan to the Council to justify the establishment of a new group.

*Scenario 2* – Decreasing dramatically the number of Commissions . In this scenario perhaps only 3 or 5 major themes would be identified with each expected to support an increased number of working groups.

A less radical scenario could be:

*Scenario 3* – Review the current structure and update this to reflect changes which have occurred in the recent past in order to ensure it is sufficiently flexible to adapt to future changes.

Each of these scenarios has its attractions. Scenarios 1 and 2 offer radically different potential outcomes. In the first the possibility is offered to broaden the range of activities examined by members. On the other hand it presumes that it would be possible to identify individuals to progress the work of a series of working groups. Scenario 2 on the other hand limits the number of themes under consideration, but with a potentially much more demanding coordination role for each of the leaders of the (say) three 'super-commissions'. On the downside is the potential damaging consequences of the election of

a poor Chair who does not fulfill his or her responsibilities, with both short and long term consequences for the work in that area of activity.

An alternative perspective could be to suggest that the issue we face has less to do with the actual structure we create – and more to do with how we respond to the pressures for change outlined previously. In particular the need for a clearer long term strategy for the FIG and the need for a structure which can flexibly respond to this strategy in a coordinated and integrated manner.

The approach suggested for debate is closer to scenario 3 than scenarios 1 or 2.

## **5.1 Long Term Strategy**

The future Commission structure shall reflect the general strategies of the Federation. At the most recent meeting of the Bureau in December, 2000 the long term strategy for the FIG was debated and the following 6 priority themes were identified as being appropriate guiding principles for the long term strategic direction of the FIG:

- To promote and enhance the *global standing of the profession* by informing relevant stakeholders of the contribution which surveyors can make to the solution of relevant problems.
- To support the *growth of the profession* by encouraging the active development of, and progressive enhancement, of national member associations
- To identify and influence the creation of appropriate *best practice, international standards and qualifications* relevant to the practice of surveying.
- To maximize the *contribution of surveyors* to the development of the knowledge economy/society.
- To identify approaches which help deliver the agenda for *global sustainable development*, and
- To support and contribute towards *supporting international humanitarian needs*

## **5.2 Flexible Structure**

By identifying a set of ‘guiding principles’ to help direct the work of the FIG in the longer term, the issue of creating a structure which can respond to these long term principles becomes potentially clearer.

It is suggested that many features of the existing Commission structure, with some modifications in three key areas, could be adapted to meet the needs of the FIG in the longer term. The three areas of identified need include;

- The areas of enquiry addressed by each Commission
- The processes for electing those who are responsible for leading each Commission, and
- The processes required to create new Commissions to address new themes

### 5.2.1 Areas of Enquiry

The following revised and streamlined structure is suggested as a framework for the Commission structure after 2006.

<i>Existing Title</i>	<i>Proposed Revision</i>
Professional Standards and Practice	Professionalism & Business Management
Professional Education	Education and CPD
Spatial Information Management	Geographic Information Management
Hydrography	Hydrography and Offshore Surveying
Positioning & Measurement	Combine – Geomatic Surveying
Engineering Surveying	
Cadastre & Land Management	Land Management & Administration
Spatial Planning & Development	Planning & Development
Valuation and the Management of Real Estate	Combine - Property Development, Construction, Valuation and Management
Ad-hoc Commission on Construction Economics/management	

Whilst 8 general areas of enquiry are recommended, it is anticipated that an increased number of working groups would be established. Each WG would be chaired by a Commission Vice Chair which means that there will be more than one vice chair in each commission. It is anticipated that each Commission would establish at least one working group which required collaboration with at least one other Commission.

### 5.2.2 Elections

As mentioned before it is becoming increasing difficulty to accept a commitment to a 8 year period of office as a Vice Chair and Chair of a Commission. Consequently, in the longer term it is suggested that the practice of electing a single Vice Chair who would normally automatically become Chair of the Commission be discontinued. In addition it is suggested that all Chairs of Commission working groups be given the title of Vice Chair. The election of the Chair would then be left open – although it would normally be expected that the election would be based around those who had successfully progressed the work of a Working Group within the Commission.

An option worthy of further consideration would be to elect the Chair at the Working Week prior to the Congress. This would provide a period for the *Chair-Elect* to become familiar with the role of Commission Chair, but only for a 1 year, as opposed to a 4 year lead-in time which exists at the present.

A further refinement would be to encourage those who might wish to be considered for the role of Commission Chair to formally make this known to the NRG perhaps at the Working Week (WW) prior to the WW when the lection will take place.

### 5.2.3 Formation of New Commissions

To ensure maximum flexibility it would be possible for a proposal to form a new Commission to be considered by the Council at any time. The case for the establishment of a new Commission would then be put forward by the Council (with its recommendation) to the next meeting of the GA. Formation of new working groups would be the responsibility of the Commission, with the ability to create new, and disband old, working groups on an ongoing basis, apart form those involving collaboration with other Commissions which it is suggested should be considered and ratified by the Council.

#### **QUESTION FOR BREAKOUT GROUP**

Do you have any views on the suggested restructuring, the election processes and the flexibility offered to the Commissions to form new Working Groups?

Do you have any views on the option to elect the Chair one year in advance of the Congress?

## **6. Conclusions**

This discussion paper offers some suggested directions for evolving the Technical/Professional work of the FIG. It is offered as an initial catalyst for debate. In the light of the feedback from the discussions at the breakout groups in Korea, it may be possible to formulate some recommendations for consideration at the second meeting of the General Assembly for action in the short term. A final report with more detailed

recommendations for action in the longer term will be developed for presentation to the GA in Washington. This report will also consider point 5 on the terms of reference concerned with any changes to the arrangements associated with the arrangements for the Working Week.

## APPENDIX 1

### Task force - Review of Commission, Task Force and Permanent Institution Structure 2000-2002

#### *Terms of Reference*

In the light of:

- The changes which have been occurring in the practice of surveying
- The evolving strategic priorities of the FIG
- The need to integrate and coordinate the various work groups contributing to the work of the FIG
- The existing and future work plans of the Technical/Professional Commissions of the FIG
- The importance of involving in the FIG influential groups who are not currently catered for by the existing structure (e.g. government agencies),
- The need for the FIG to assure itself of ongoing financial support, and
- The new statutes relating to the Governance and Management of the FIG,

To consider and make recommendations for any changes to:

- **The current structure of the Commissions and Task Forces**
- **The process of identifying and electing members to progress the Technical/Professional work of the FIG**
- **The existing structure and links between the Task Force and the Technical/Professional work of the FIG,**
- **Enhance the linkages between the elected posts in the new management structure and the technical work of the FIG,**
- **The balance of responsibilities and the financial arrangements associated with the decision to award a Working Week/Congress to one, or more MA, and**
- **The desirability of establishing new categories of membership to engage influential new member groups into the work of the FIG**

#### *Proposed Membership of Task Force*

Dr Tom Kennie – Vice President (Chair).

Dr. Andreas Drees – Germany (Incoming Vice President).

Matt Higgins – Australia (Vice Chair, Commission 5).

Gabriel Dasse – Task Force Chair (Under-Represented Groups in Surveying).

Prof. Stig Enemark – Task Force Chair (Mutual Recognition) and Past Chair Commission 2.

Christian Andreasen – USA (Vice President).

Dr Michel Mayoud – France ( Chair, Commission 6)