

## IAC Chair bullet point email remarks to the BoG regarding future Committee Structure Proposal

- Size/complexity and resources is a concern. I would recommend this draft be taken one step further, looking for more detail of the functionality of the structure and the transition plan, outlining persons or positions in staff, and even industry, as an example(s) of how it may function, skeleton ToRs etc. One could use existing projects as samples.
- The relationship of the TAC to the BoG and/or the FSF should be well defined, i.e. reporting, what type of accountability (e.g. advisory or approval - and to what degree), functional reporting/accountability to whom at the FSF, or is the committee independent, etc.
- Some administrative functions are outlined and they diminish as we get deeper into the structure. These as well should be detailed as much as possible. The administration of the Work Groups is envisioned to be small and nimble with no engagement with the FSF staff, this may not work so well with some types of WGs (driven by the issue), so the ToRs should be flexible enough to allow for full engagement with the staff. This in itself could cause workload issues on the staff if not controlled.
- The TAC in one place is described as the Chairs of the 6 FGs, and in another described as diverse international balance and across several stakeholders and industry sectors. Both may not be able to occur.
- SAG makeup is of business aviation, commercial international aviation, European operations and the Eurocontrol regions, and the Asia Pacific region. This mixes aviation sectors and regions, but doesn't include all regions or sectors, this should be thought through a bit.
- I agree with Tzvetormir's remarks on the risk register for a transition. This is a very ambitious structure for which the transition needs close oversight. Before breaking down the current committee structure, as a Board, I would want to see proof of concept / function. In its final form this structure could be very large with many moving parts (as outlined upwards towards 30-40 groups), which is a bit concerning. Having a robust platform and software is a critical piece.
- Getting more engagement from membership is good, there is a risk of many of the same members (organizations - e.g. OEMs) being on several groups, might be difficult to manage.