



## Task Force on the Future Governance of FIG

### Final Report to Council 6<sup>th</sup> February 2021

#### Executive summary

Council wishes to understand if changes are required to our governance structure over the next two years. This will enable FIG to continue to provide leadership to the members in the immediate years ahead. To do this requires that we think about how we organise, communicate and collaborate with our stakeholders and partners.

This paper provides a framework for Council's discussion and has been prepared with oversight from the Governance task force members (Appendix 1). Council's deliberations will inform the direction of the TF report to the GA in 2021.

The TF has found limited appetite for radical change and no clear evidence for change to statutes in the short term. There is however, a clear need for a fundamental review of how FIG's operates in the areas that we call governance, conferencing and volunteering.

There are significant drivers of change across our sector which our profession needs to understand and address in the longer term, see

[https://www.fig.net/organisation/general\\_assembly/task\\_force/governance\\_19-22/material/Memorandum\\_Future\\_of\\_the\\_Profession-march2020.pdf](https://www.fig.net/organisation/general_assembly/task_force/governance_19-22/material/Memorandum_Future_of_the_Profession-march2020.pdf).

While a number of these drivers will take time to comprehend, there are also immediate practical steps FIG may take to respond to the needs of members in the short term.

A number of the challenges we need to consider are practical and indicate a way to be more collaborative, more effective and to drive inclusivity, this has been further amplified by the global covid-19 pandemic. Informed by the proposals in section 3, we have made 15 headline recommendations, listed in section 4

To ensure that FIG has a modernised future- facing form of governance fit for a 21st century professional body we also recommend that a strategic organisational review be undertaken.

Drawing from the work of the TF we recommend a number of proposed changes and ask Council to discuss and ratify and subsequently seek GA approval. This positive step will enable FIG to meet the changing expectations of members in the short term and continue to enable FIG to operate as a global network that is ready to equip the profession for the challenges and opportunities ahead.

#### D Dumashie

Chair Governance Task Force

## 1. Introduction

A Governance Task Force (TF) was established at the 42<sup>ND</sup> General Assembly (GA) in Hanoi, Vietnam, 2019 with the aim to consult with FIG members over the period 2019 to 2020 on the issue of the FIG Governance structure.

The TF was given the purpose to concentrate on the efficiency and effectiveness of the FIG governance structure; ultimately questioning the FIG's positioning for the longer term, i.e. 'Are we *"Fit for the Future"*'. The Task Force has sought the views of members, which in turn have been used to shape the TF proposals reported to Council.

The TF scope is to consider if any changes to our structure and way of operations are required in the short term; with operations over the longer term to be considered by the 2028 initiative. (Appendix 1). It was agreed that this reduces the depth of the original Terms of Reference because setting out a detailed governance review should consider fully the strategic organisational direction. With this caveat, the TF, by consulting with members, has addressed the TOR's:

- a) To evaluate the present internal governance framework of FIG, i.e the current administration and organisational structure; and
- b) If required, based on the findings, propose changes and, if necessary, an alternative internal structure of FIG to meet the future "needs and expectations" of its membership
- c) To propose any changes that will be implemented at the GA 2022 or earlier.

### ***Method and Timeframe***

Because the TF is operating in the short term, our work is effectively a rapid appraisal of the FIG's current position and looks forward to consider what is necessary for the organisation to be 'primed' and 'Fit for the Future'.

Our work is predicated upon the desire that Council wished to listen and have no preconceived ideas. This standpoint enables the TF to explore the problems, seeking to unearth the opinions, thoughts and perceptions of Member Associations (MA). We have aimed to use methods that reach the greatest audience as possible (Appendix 2), utilising the working week, E news, several on-line questionnaires, web resources and online facilitated discussions. For an oversight of the TF, see the FIG website at:

[https://www.fig.net/organisation/general\\_assembly/task\\_force/governance\\_19-22.asp](https://www.fig.net/organisation/general_assembly/task_force/governance_19-22.asp)

A qualitative approach to questions enabled the TF to explore the problems, seeking to unearth the opinions, thoughts and feelings of members and to develop further questions for members to debate in order to gain insights on their preferred direction of travel.

Although the first on-line SWOT questionnaire only elicited 31 responses, this is in excess of the usual survey % returns it underscored the need for a focussed face-to face exercise in 2020. Unfortunately the Covid-19 pandemic prevented a physical meeting; instead a further online roundtable meeting was convened, covering the detailed issues. Members responded in their capacity as Member Associations, Regional groups, Individuals, as well as administrative leads (21 + multiple members in CLGE, ACCO & Network chairs). The number of members who have responded represent the bare minimum needed to gain a fair sense of the direction of travel required to determine if change is required or not.

**In summary**, the TF has found that the administration and organisational structure as defined in FIG statutes broadly meets the short term needs of member associations, as identified; but to meet their future expectations, some purposeful changes are needed with regard to how these statutes are operationalised in a pragmatic way that ultimately depends upon people rather than the rules.

The report findings are supported by relatively low numbers of members who consistently engaged in the consultation, despite regular and targeted outreach. Further engagement has been further impacted by the covid-19 pandemic resulting in the lost opportunity for face-to-face meetings. Notwithstanding there is a clear direction of travel that business cannot continue as usual.

This paper discusses the outcome of the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation; ideas raised by the respondents have provided a direction of travel, with other comments tabulated in Appendix 4. Drawing from this evidence base, the Task Force has elaborated the operational changes as presented under the three main headings in section 2 below. The resulting proposals are then summarised in the recommendations presented in section 3 and put forward for Council discussion.

The Task Force analysis as presented in section 2 below is structured as follows:

<b>Key Area 1</b> Governance	<b>Key Area 2</b> Branding and Conferencing	<b>Key Area 3</b> People and Volunteering
<b>Key Issue A</b> The GA format and conducting business <b>Key Issue B</b> Increased Involvement of Members <b>Key Issue C</b> FIG Organisational structure	<b>Key Issue D</b> FIG branding and Conferencing	<b>Key Issue E</b> Establishing a nominations committee <b>Key Issue F</b> Increase Activities within commissions <b>Key Issue G</b> Engaging the involvement over generations

The TF analysis is intended to provide a framework for Council discussion on the future governance and management of FIG. The Council deliberations will inform the direction of the TF report to the GA in 2021.

## 2. Key Findings

This section documents our key findings and provides the evidence base of the consultations and the respondents comments (as presented in further detail in Appendix 4).

*The first on-line member consultation* focused on what we are doing well, what we can do better, challenges or trends affecting and influencing the future, and how to resolve such matters, i.e., a rapid SWOT exercise. (See Council paper 16/01/2020)

We found that our value is considerable with an international reach and that we provide a focal point of international representation of surveyor's interest and international cooperation on surveying across all disciplines. However, this rosy picture hides the disparity of concerns across the regions and also the disconnect that some members feel. A deeper

look demonstrated emerging issues in areas that we could do better. This formed the basis of the next round of consultations.

*The second on-line member consultation*, originally planned as a face-to-face activity to be held at the Working Week (WW) 2020, was adapted to an online event. Organisational restructuring is by its nature complex; but the emerging thoughts could be narrowed to 7 key issues (A- G). The consultation was formatted in a way to bring matters clearly to readers and listeners. The 7 issues were grouped into three main headings: Governance and Management, Branding and Conferences, and People and Volunteering. It is acknowledged that the comments are not necessarily boxed into these headings as some will be cross cutting in their dimensions, we attempt to take account of this in our proposals.

Responses have been submitted by MAs, individuals and CLGE on behalf of their own membership, in addition to holding an online meeting with ACCO and Network Chairs to gain further feedback. (List at appendix 3)

The submissions were reviewed, and recorded those comments that relate to the central question 'does the current administration and organisational structure meets the current and immediate needs and expectations of MA's and enable FIG to be primed for the future?'

Set out below is a summary of the thematic responses that we use as the evidence base for shaping our proposals for the direction of change. Noting that none of the proposals require any change of the statutes within the immediate future

### **3.1 Governance**

#### ***Key issue A: The GA format and conducting business***

There is continuing support for an annual General Assembly (GA). The GA is the key platform to disseminate information and gain input and direction from FIG Member Associations (MA) represented mainly by their Presidents, while noting that quite a few are likely to be newcomers to FIG. Although there is continuing support, there is also considerable room for improvement such as moving the conduct of affairs to a business format.

The 2020 pandemic has brought into sharp focus the need to enable remote access in conferencing (see issue C below). As applied to voting at the GA some form of digital democratisation will help with engagement amongst MA and their members, with a further added bonus to attract young surveyors, who see the procedures as archaic (see issue E below). However, a much wider member engagement will be needed on the right to vote .

#### **It is proposed that GA operational processes change to accommodate the following:**

- Reporting is streamlined to flash presentations and to facilitate debate around current council work and global trends e.g. in break out groups.
- Opening GA should allow sufficient time for discussion and aim to complete by mid-afternoon to allow for commission meetings in the afternoon (Congress may be a full day). Closing GA remains as a ½ day event
- Technology is integral to the way we develop and communicate. Online access should be provided to members unable to attend in person. This may also serve as a default platform (such as the 2020/21 WW).
- Increased liaison with MAs, via end of year Director reports and 'outcome' orientated Presidents meetings (NB Presidents meeting format is already under consideration)

### ***Key issue B: Increased involvement of members***

To continue to be able to respond to changing conditions it is vital that the FIG structure enables the organisation to respond quickly and effectively, whilst at the same time ensuring that appropriate levels of accountability exist.

The current GA role as an oversight forum is supported; it appears that members do not feel that there are any specific decisions in which they are not involved. It is recognised that it is their responsibility to articulate their own needs, to ensure timely contact with FIG office (regularly update, details share information etc) and to articulate what they want and the extent to which they wish to be involved in the decision making.

Because there is no clear direction from the responses, we consider that concerns made about decision-making are proxy expressions of frustration over poor communication. Thus, there is an underlying need to clearly inform, involve, and, above all, to communicate. Further, the TF is mindful that English, being the FIG working language (statute 9.1), does present some challenges and this suggests the need to remain ever diligent in communications at the GA and elsewhere. To assist non- native English speakers in the GA decision making a notable response is that decision making issues need to be highlighted at the opening GA, during the WW language specific break out meetings to enable fuller discussion tongues' are facilitated so that further (shorter) discussion may be brought back to the second GA. This will aid full comprehension and understanding to many more members.

#### **It is proposed that improvement be made in the way senior officers communicate:**

- Provide a President/ Director update before the end of each calendar year end, which is common practice for CEO's in many organisations
- Reinforce direct contact between the FIG President and the MA Presidents (over and above the annual Presidents meeting (e.g. format reconsideration, as above)
- Provide language specific break out meetings during the WW to enable discussion of key decision making issues highlighted at the opening GA and program the final decision to be made at the second/ closing GA.
- To improve and ensure an active organisation, members need to clearly see the benefit of FIG. This requires for FIG to really understand what we are trying to achieve and to have clear goals to meet the member's needs. A piece of work needs to be commissioned to modernise and articulate this message. (see branding D)

### ***Key issue C: FIG Organisational structure***

This theme sought to tease out views on the relationships in the operational work of FIG i.e collaboration and clear purpose relations between our various groups.

Most members are broadly happy with the current structure, described as a matrix. It was perceived as important not to label the organisational organigram as a matrix structure. This just serves to confuse. Notwithstanding, the Council, Task Forces, Commissions, and Networks each have their strategic and managerial focus.

Above all, to be fit for the future the structure needs to increase collaboration (i.e. people pulling together). Assessed in terms of outputs, the structure does effectively contribute to the range of work expected to meet members emerging needs; but there is a perception that the structure is not open, accessible and with unnecessary complex titles. To explain, although the structure of the TF and networks have a clear remit stated in the statutes; the confusion may arise when once operationalised these structures may have overlapping

goals and outputs. The result is members do not know how to access the relevant activity to their needs

Although FIG is a voluntary organisation, good business practice suggests a protocol should be in place to monitor and evaluate the organisation as well as the officers and staff. Clearly this will follow strict protocols, and perhaps be based on a 360-degree feedback basis.

A major topic to emerged was the commission terms of office, which points to the need for greater organisational flexibility. The first suggests adaptation such as the reduction of commission chair's terms either on a two-year electable term, or a sequential basis or co-chairing over the term. (The latter was piloted by Commission 8 in 2009). This would be a significant change to the operation of FIG and is best considered in the context of a strategic review. Such a debate also needs to involve the current chairs, chairs elect and the wider membership. Any change will require an amendment to the statutes, and, given the next call for chairs is underway, this is not developed further.

**It is proposed to:**

- Explore the use of constructive and productive feedback mechanisms for all officers drawing on business best practice.
- To undertake a short review of the Task forces, Networks and working groups to ensure effective working.

### **3.2 FIG Branding and Conferencing**

Clearly the 2020 pandemic has served as an accelerator in particular, the growth of the use of digital products, data and automation in the profession and the world in which the profession operates. This means that, organisationally, FIG has an imperative to improve the capacity for and use of digital communications, the creation and usage of new products and technological ways of doing things drawing on AI, Big data, in our conferences/ meetings but also with an eye on the relevance to our profession of emerging tools such as block chain technology.

The FIG office and ACCO have been agile in their efforts to reformat the 2020 and 2021 WWs. Further, the office is currently developing a conference model for the future.

It is important to note that in every TF consultation it has been made very clear that conferencing is seen as FIG's Unique Selling Point (USP), it is FIG's brand.

#### **Key issue D: FIG Branding and Conferencing**

The online discussion not surprisingly, provided a wealth of comments (tabulated in Appendix 4). Because the FIG office program of work is already underway, it is important to avoid duplication so the considerations from this review (See table at appendix 4) will feed into the existing FIG Office program of work. Therefore, the analysis here will only concentrate upon this issue as it relates to FIG brand.

Our brand defines our purpose and fosters forward momentum to achieve our strategy and above all sets our culture. Our brand is relevant and may be expressed in terms of a global organisation that on behalf of its members impacts on the world community. This is achieved because the organisation is non-political and provides professional solutions to global challenges. There is a core need, then, to consider how to become better at both effectively communicating our brand, both within and without the profession, as well as measuring our brand strength.

In the context of the comments these clearly highlight that the WW format needs reform, and importantly that the members wish it to evolve rather than revolutionise. This suggests that our brand is good and provides a clear promise to deliver conferences. There is a feeling that we need to do better to modernise and be more collaborative by expanding our horizons to involve influential leaders (in and external to our profession) if our brand is to remain in demand, sustainable and resilient.

There are further noteworthy points that relate to the effect on our brand. First, members have clearly drawn on their experiences from the year 2020 and are highlighting the need for a combined approach of physical and virtual meetings.

Second, the need to fully consider what our conference brand needs to represent. That is: Do we want or need our WWs to exceed numbers every year i.e. be larger, bigger, more attendees etc. Is this a sustainable business model and does this unnecessarily pressurise our host MA? Should the financial model, contract be published prior to members bidding? What does value for money really look like to our MA? What are the options to diversify from a single source of income (apart from fees) and consider a business model similar to Not For Profit For Purpose that may enable fund raising/ FIG consultancy/ sale of marketing products e.g ties, scarves, paper weights?

And related to this is the need to consider carbon footprint in our conference endeavours, do we wish our brand to represent our commitments and values to e.g. the SDG's/ climate change etc? If so, how our brand subscribes to a range of measures, e.g. carbon off-set, may be considered as well as using adaptive technology.

Finally, the importance of hosting regional WWs is back on the agenda. Considering that these are better able to recognise that there are both professional and political challenges within a given region. The YS is a good example of a regional structure with commitment. The re-introduction of regional working weeks will be helpful providing flexibility e.g. these could be held on alternative years to the WW and to consider the GA's to be held on line on alternative years. Notwithstanding the voting point in Issue A proposal above.

#### **It is proposed to**

- Undertake a reality check to fully consider what our conference brand needs to represent. It is realistic and expected that FIG continues to receive a profit to ensure sustainability of the organisation.
- Consider the appointment of an independent business strategy consultant to review the working week business, sustainability and inclusivity model.
- Consider how to become better at measuring our brand's strength regularly with our members and external stakeholders
- Ensure technology is integral to the way we develop our conferencing, and consider how to better integrate technology within the FIG brand, including through full or partial virtual meeting offerings. And if this is sufficient to work toward mitigating our conference carbon footprint, if not what else may be done.
- Consider hosting Regional WWs focused on the professional needs of the region, perhaps in odd years

### **3.3 People & Volunteering**

The current FIG four - year work plan 'Volunteering for the future of our organization', recognises that the nature of our organisation is predicated upon volunteering activities. The strategy seeks to embrace the people factor, considering mechanisms for 'purposeful'

individual engagement and attracting the next generation and above all encouraging nominations for officer positions.

### ***Key issue E: Establishment of a Nominations Committee***

FIG will remain relevant if it can continue to identify, attract and encourage global diversity and motivate people to be representative and engage as officers. To assist this process the possibility and desirability for a Nominations Committee was explored.

FIG is highly dependent on attracting capable leaders who drive the overall FIG agenda as well as the professional work of the commissions. Over the past 2 terms the evidence is that our current procedures do not really support our attempts to attract nominations.

There is support for such a dedicated group that will focus on the process of attracting the right candidates for all senior officer positions. This could help GA members, enhance the leadership and foster enthusiasm among members and MAs, and potentially prevent the lack of candidates.

To ensure openness it is considered that the group's name needs to be changed, perhaps to an *Engagement Committee sub group*. This better describes the role that will be to foster individuals' engagement at all senior officer levels, conduct a process of mentoring, encouragement and clearly not discouraging people to make contact and, or to have any fear about coming forward.

Above all the Engagement Committee remit will address the search for potential candidates in a structured way and encourage qualified people to apply. They will also address the issue of regional diversity as well as ensuring the balance between young and senior, and to assist in preparing the candidates for the job, bearing in mind that they are all volunteers.

#### **It is proposed that**

- An engagement committee be established, selected by Council. This could be announced at GA 2021 and the group subsequently selected and mobilised.

### ***Key issue F: Increase activity within commissions***

Engaging members successfully in commission work is largely not a structural issue. The key to increasing activity lies in a combination of the commission work and members willingness to participate. How the chairs resolve their work will result in differing delivery across commissions. Importantly there are different measures for success. Some commissions are hosting successful and well attended WW sessions with key outputs because that is what is needed. Others will have consistent and ongoing activities throughout the year. A further consideration is to give greater visibility to members to encourage them to collaborate with commission chair to nominate working groups.

The idea of incentive systems to encourage members to be active seems a moot point given FIG is their network. It is their debating forum and their responsibility to decide on what they wish to draw from it. The issue may be two-fold. First a feeling of not getting value, so rearticulating the benefits (see e.g. the FIG Profile pamphlet) and ensuring FIG is inclusive to meet the needs of All members on fully a diversity and inclusive basis (D&I). And in turn, second, this links to the FIG brand (See issue D).

In general, the responses focused on the problems that are well known; but receiving feedback that chairs may feel isolated during their work is key to address. Ideas to build

greater cohesion included: a buddy system to help them to align to the FIG culture and a more active involvement of VP's in the commission's program of work

It is not generally realised how much the chairs are doing to prepare and to keep the conference operating (via the technical sessions). The role of the chair is an enormous work load and arguably ever increasing. More needs to be done to support, either by helping them to identify their own vice- chair/ secretary, this perhaps may be via the engagement committee sub group (issue E above), or by the FIG office or a 'buddy' Vice President. Ideas to provide supporting administrative and process orientated tools e.g. relating to project management, standard forms/templates, knowledge management, and as needed best practice in volunteer engagement, decision making and communication, etc.

A consistently recurring theme is that FIG appears to be European centric, there needs to be a continuing and purposeful attempt to draw upon regional talent across senior office positions. Although geographical diversity is counteracted by the global spread of WW venues;, being mindful that a drift toward European centricity imposes a larger burden on office holders – in terms of time (time difference + travel time) and cost, which in turn hampers information flows.

**It is proposed to support the chairs, by:**

- Providing a detailed and purposeful induction of new commission chairs and chairs elect, including issues such as: FIG Purpose and Mission, How to manage volunteers, Developing a work plan (as above etc). These could be online modules) and consider the need for guidance documents that may reduce the administrative burden.
- Facilitate greater networking amongst chairs of all officer positions
- Consider holding introduction activities for potential chairs, these could be both on-line modules and physical meets convened at the WW.

***Key Issue G: Encouraging the involvement over generations***

FIG is a special type of international body, one which leads to strong and lasting friendships, many continuing for 20 years and more. This has clear benefits and helps assure the ongoing work of the Federation. On the less positive side, this has, over the past 15 years or so led to a dramatic 'greying' of the active membership. With only a limited number of new, younger faces involved in the past years, FIG recognises this as a continuing challenge to involve new and younger professionals into its active membership.

The online responses focused upon ways to help the generation of our young surveyor members (YS). Interestingly this is also a pressing consideration for the MA's as well as FIG. This discussion will benefit from sharing country experiences with both organisations.

To encourage greater innovative discussions and decision making the FIG structure and culture needs to be demonstrably much more open and enable YS to consistently engage. Particularly 'the high level' talk becoming more inclusive to all generations, and such diversity will create innovated conversations. A purposeful approach to achieving this, e.g. by creating mentoring programs, will provide space for a game change and encourage YS into decision making processes.

The YS network was established to promote FIG to a young generation, to function as bridge between young surveyors and the experienced professionals already active within FIG, and to better integrate the youth perspective within FIG activities. It was initially assumed that young surveyors would transition seamlessly into the wider body of FIG. This draws on the

assumption that it may work well in MA country's because there is a career path. It is less effective in a network body such as FIG and unfortunately and inadvertently, a separation between the YS network and FIG is emerging.

It is a bigger question on how to enable YS to transition. The complexity arises because they are at their busy career period. And any benefits accruing to them to volunteer has to have a clear map that furthers their lifelong learning and careers. A program needs to go beyond exposure at FIG WWs to one that nurtures, maps and points to how a progression can relate to them. This will help transition and ongoing retention.

**It is proposed to:**

- Establish a cross generation sub group to develop a transition program for YS. MA's should be included in order to ensure that the learnings can be shared in-country
- Work with YS network and current and incoming chairs to investigate how YS may be better embedded into the commission, and
- Outline in each commission work plan a strategy to proactively engage YS across the 4-year term

### **3.4 Strategic oversight**

There is a clear need for a fundamental review of how FIG operates in the areas that we call governance, conferencing and volunteering (above). Because our current operational processes have developed organically over time, the journey thus far identified proposes that there are immediate practical steps FIG may take and plan to respond to the needs of members in the short term.

Above all, the journey to be 'fit for the long-term future' needs to continue. In the medium-term FIG cannot continue with business as usual. To ensure that FIG has a modernised future-facing form of governance fit for a 21st century professional body we also recommend that a strategic organisational review be undertaken.

This is a significant piece of work which needs to be undertaken as an independent exercise. The TF work should be seen as the first stage of such a comprehensive work program together with upgrading the FIG 2028 think tank initiative to become a full standing Council led, strategy sub group with the remit to study trends, anticipate emergent and disruptive changes and formulate strategies.

**It is proposed that:**

- Upgrade the FIG 2028 think tank initiative to become a full standing Council led, strategy sub group tasked with horizon scanning. And actively include YS representatives in the debate.
- As the first stage of deliberations, this can be informed by the rapid assessment that has been taken over the last 2 years by this TF work.
- Appoint an independent organisational consultant to assist the strategy sub group to comprehensively review FIG with a focus on its operating structure, a resilient business model in the context of a volunteering members led organisation

These proposals form the basis and detail to the recommendations outlined in section 4, below.

#### 4. Recommendations

Council is keen to ensure that FIG has a modernised future-facing form of governance fit for a 21st century professional body. Clearly there are significant drivers of change across our sector which we need to understand and address in the longer term. While a number of these drivers will take time to comprehend there are also immediate practical steps FIG may take and plan to respond to the needs of members in the short term

The recommendations build on the proposals that are drafted in full in section 3 and headlined here. These recommendations are not listed by importance, or weighted. They are recommendations that are capable of being implemented in the short term.

##### **Governance:** The assurance of working within our rules

1. That the GA business is streamlined and modernisation is undertaken at the next GA 2021. Such modernisation actions to include: time allocations, reporting and electronic access. Further request for feedback from the members is used to improve the subsequent GA (2022)
2. That an end of (calendar) year update is circulated by the FIG President/ Office Director to all member categories
3. That FIG develops, publishes and implements a clear short document that articulates the benefits of FIG relevant to All member categories. (see branding)
4. That a short structural review of the collaboration mechanisms and purpose i.e between our task forces, networks and working groups is effective, enables cross relationship working, and that any inconsistencies in their respective terms of references are removed/ clarified
5. That a briefing paper is prepared for a facilitated discussion on the desirability to extend voting to academic and corporate members at the GA.

##### **FIG Branding and Conferencing:** What is FIG's Unique Selling point

6. That technology is integral to the way we develop our conferencing, and consider how part of the meetings may be made available virtually, and review the ways in which emerging tech can better facilitate the full scope of FIG work.
7. That an independent consultant is appointed to help FIG consider what our conference brand needs to represent, including a commitment to carbon footprint reduction measures, and how it goes about leveraging our brand, and
8. That we need to consider how and become better at measuring our brand strength regularly with our members and external stakeholders

##### **People and Volunteering:** How we ensure the ongoing resilience of FIG

9. That Engagement Committee sub group be established to support Council. It will aim to identify a flow of, encourage diversity, and as required mentor interested parties, above all to be an open process to encourage people to come forward.

10. That we provide greater support to the chairs of commissions. This includes convening a detailed and purposeful induction at the beginning of office, holding an immediate discussion on what high level support would be beneficial (buddying with a VP?), and facilitate greater networking amongst chairs of all officer positions
11. That we work to attract nominations for commission chair elect, hold awareness raising activities, provide information resources online. And, to consider further what might be limiting individuals to stand for commission chairs.
12. That the YS expectations on best means to continue their engagement are reviewed and an inter- generation sub group be established to develop a transition program for YS. MA's should be included in order that the learnings can be shared in-country
13. That a clear map of YS involvement is developed at commission level, working with the YS network and current and incoming chairs to investigate how YS may be embedded into the commission, and ensure that each work plan has a strategy to proactively engage with them.

**And, further cross cutting strategic recommendations:**

14. That a purposeful and thorough review of FIG's strategic vision, and mission that will underscore the organisational structure be undertaken. This will require the upgrading of the FIG 2028 think tank initiative to become a full standing Council led strategy sub group
15. That the appointment of an independent assessor be made to assist the sub group, with a focus on benchmarking FIG operating structure, options for a resilient business model in the context of a volunteering member led organisation.

Drawing from the work of the TF we have recommend a number of proposed changes to be discussed and ratified by Council and subsequently GA. This positive step will enable FIG to meet the changing expectations of members and continue to enable FIG to operate as a global network that is ready to equip the profession for the challenges and opportunities ahead.

***D Dumashie***  
***Chair Governance Task Force***

## **Appendix I: The Governance Task Force**

### ***Members of the Task Force:***

- Chair: Diane Dumashie Vice President FIG
- Jakoba Kgopolelo, Botswana
- James Kavanagh UK
- Hansjoerg kutterer Germany
- Kate Fairlie Australia
- Kwabena Asiamah Ghana
- Maurice Barbieri, Switzerland
- Mikael Lilje Sweden
- Pekka Halme, Finland
- Melissa Harrington USA

### ***TOR's- Context for updated focus***

With the advent of the FIG 2028 initiative the distinguishing terms of reference for each are defined as follows;

- **FIG 2028:**  
refers to the visionary processes by which a body assures itself that the long terms interests of its stakeholders\* are satisfied.
- **FIG Task Force 2021:**  
the Task Force on Governance refers to the short-term process (2 year horizon) by which a body plans, organises, implements and monitors its day to day operations and administrative matters, and if a change is required to its statutes.

## **Appendix 2 TF Key engagement activities**

- **May 2019** Working week 2019 Hanoi: GA presentation and Roundtable
- June- December 2019 E news: Articles in FIG Newsletters and dedicated newsletter items
- **September- November 2019** On-line questionnaire: A "SWOT" analysis of the FIG governance framework involving FIG members and the FIG Office
- **January 2020** Assimilating and developing key issues arising from members perspectives and reporting to Council
- **March 2020** Developing a thematic summary of members responses and drafting questions that need to be asked in readiness for the WW (2020).
- **March- April 2020** Web site resource including 'Futures' references. I.e. identifying some of the driving forces of global change and the main issues and trends arising from them
- **April 2020** Video presentation by D Dumashie and P Halme of the Key themes and subsequently inviting discussions
- **June- September 2020** Facilitated online discussion by D Dumashie to ACCO and CLGE (to its members)
- **November- December 2020** Received and considered detailed responses from 12 organisations, noting that some of these were groups (CLGE and ACCO)/ Networks/ T Forces)
- **January 2021** With oversight from the TF, preparing discussion report for Council's consideration.

### **Appendix 3: Responses from the second on line consultation – Contributions from Member Associations**

- **Austria:** Austrian Society for Surveying and Geoinformation (OVG),
- **China:** China Institute of Real Estate Appraisers and Agents, Department of Overseas Communication
- **Denmark:** Den Danske Landinspektørforening (Ddl), Torben Juulsager, President Ddl
- **Finland:** Kalle Konttinen, Finnish Association of Geodetic and Land Surveyors MIL
- **Germany:** German Association of Geodesy, Geoinformation and Land Management (DVW), Prof. Dr. Hansjörg Kutterer President DVW
- **Latvia:** State Land Service of Latvia, Deputy Director-General
- **Mexico:** National Institute of Statistics and Geography. Ms. Pilar García Velázquez, Director of International Affairs (INEGI)
- **Netherlands:** Geo- informative Nederland (GIN), Ron Rozema Chairman of the Board
- **Nepal:** Nepal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (NICS) - Punya Prasad Oli
- **Nigeria:** Surveyors Council of Nigeria (SURCON), Kabir, M. M, Chief Registrar
- **UK:** Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, Ben Elder International head of Valuation, James Kavanagh head of Land and Resources, Standards and Practice

#### **Contributions from sister organisations:**

- CLGE Vladimir Krupa, President

#### **Contributions from Affiliates:**

- Survey of India, Technical Section, Surveyor General's Office

#### **Contributions from FIG Administration**

- Advisory Commission of Council Officers (ACCO)
- Network Chairs (Africa Region, Pacific Region, Standards Network, Young Surveyors Network)
- Alan Muse, Chair Commission 10

#### **Contributions from individual professional members:**

- Peter Dale, UK
- Prof Joel van Cranenbroeck, Belgium
- Prof Stig Enemark, Denmark,
- Prof Muzaffer Kahveci, Turkey
- Jürg Kaufmann, (Retired) and Dr Daniel Steudler, Switzerland
- Dr David Martin, France
- Helge Onsrud, (Retired), Norway
- Teresa Sa Pereira and Maria Joao Henriques (Portugal)

**Appendix 4: Table of additional responses arising from the second on line consultation**

**Table A**

This table aims to:

- **Record** comments that relate to the central governance question: ‘Does the current administration and organisational structure meets the current and immediate needs and expectations of MA’s and enable FIG to be primed for the future?’
- **Compile** the comments as extracted from the submitted letters. They remain largely unedited; because these have been taken out of the wider context of each letter, occasionally and to avoid loss of meaning, the [brackets] indicates the authors added words

Key issue	Respondents comments
<b>Governance</b>	
<b>A: The GA format and conducting business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It needs modernising including: streamline reports, online participation (live channel) and voting, much more interaction</li> <li>• It is important for communicating the work of the FIG. Without this MA may fall away due to lack of appreciation of the relevance of FIG..and it sells the FIG brand as something different from just another conference.</li> <li>• Ensure technology is integral to the way we develop and communicate, particularly developing a digital concept as a default or optional procedure (as being done for WW 2021)</li> <li>• Appetite largely remains to retain two GA sessions, the first possibly to be reduced to management items and essential updates, and enabling the commission meetings and activities to be held the afternoon</li> <li>• Digital attendance.</li> <li>• There should be room in GA for observers, it is an opportunity to market what FIG does; if an FIG participant wishes to attend FIG GA, could they indicate on their registration and could a seat be allocated to them at their country table? I love sitting with my country and flag and friends; and</li> <li>• It is a long climb in the MA’s to be to sit in the GA as official representative [especially for YS]</li> <li>• The FIG Fanfare should be reconsidered - it is perhaps rather culturally alienating? It may not appeal to the youth of all nations.</li> <li>• And although not a majority views, a few noteworthy comments on:</li> <li>• Organisational culture; To be mindful to avoid the leadership becoming disconnected from members; further this is also likely to be off-putting to the younger generations. This can also be seen in the Presidential meetings where many are frustrated by the lack of follow up</li> <li>• Establish a formal feedback mechanism for MA’s at year end, to cover salient operational issues and key trends that may affect the organisation and where necessary a</li> </ul>

	request for MA input
<b>B: Increased involvement of members</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be a feeling that decisions are narrowed down to WW venues and appointment of council- members. Should there be more?</li> <li>• If all members were involved the result would be ineffective and difficult to organise feedback, decision making will be by committee. Pragmatically, not all MAs have time or resources to be involved, so all members should be informed and involved</li> <li>• if MA's are fully informed and have (regular) opportunities to feedback and input then the current statue delegation structure is acceptable. FIG needs to improve this channel of comms considering a CEO update, before the calendar year end.</li> <li>• There is very little knowledge filtered back to MA members from the MA rep who attends the FIG GA, expecting MAs to correspond on behalf of the FIG with their members is a false expectation. A simple link to an online update from FIG office could be available for Mas to send th their members thereby inlcuing MAs and their own members.</li> <li>• A useful point on comprehension highlights the difficulties faced by non-English speakers</li> <li>• Noting by FIG statutes that the working language is English, it is noted that there is a general perception that native English speakers have the advantage. non-native speakers may feel disconnected to the decision making because they may miss vital parts of the discussions, particularly, during the GAs, so they don't express themselves.</li> <li>• There is a vacuum in communication among FIG Member Associations at country level and regional levels and across the globe. The Presidents of Member Associations hardly meet, communicate or coordinate on matters pertaining to FIG. Organised by the office, the creation of online discussions among these leaders e.g a special portal. This will promote understanding and synergy among members.</li> <li>• Regional networks should be further encouraged and empowered by the Federation and by member states to perform functions of FIG in their respective regions.</li> </ul>
<b>C: FIG Organisational structure</b>	<p><b>Terms of office:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reduce the commission chair terms was consistently mentioned, justified by jobs that are no longer for life and inferred lack of employer support.</li> <li>• On the one hand, reduction has the advantage of a regular refresh of people, ideas and enthusiasm, on the other hand, a 4-year term is helpful if the chair is new to FIG.</li> <li>• There are variations on how a reduction may be achieved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consider a three-way sequential chair system.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>That is three persons hold each position over a 4-year period. So, hold a vice chair (1 year), a chair (2 years) and be a mentor (1 year optional) - each stepping into the next role so the commission chair will be elected for a three-year period (mentoring is preferred)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Elected for a 2-year period with the option to be re-elected for only a further 2 years (4 in total) if an evaluation of delivery and outputs supports. ed this proposition. the chair elect also serving 2 yrs,</li> <li>• The Task forces need to operate in a faster time frame of say 2 years (<i>as this TF does</i>).</li> <li>• Whilst commentary remained silent of the terms of Council and President, it was noted that a president elect prior to the term of office would help in continuity and particularly so, for strategy work plan at all levels of the organisation.</li> <li>• There is currently no real monitoring and evaluation and feedback of officers, this practice is common in many organisations and with the right procedures could be introduced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Voting rights:</b> Increasingly diversity is at the heart of efficient and progressive organisations reflected in comments promoting increasing member stakeholder collaboration to allow a wider pool of voting based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persons attending GA's with formal voting rights are not always those who actively contribute</li> <li>• Consider that affiliate and academic that show regular attendance should be given the opportunity to vote.</li> <li>• Similarly, so too voting for Corporate sponsors</li> <li>• There are dangers to conference attendance format if voting goes online</li> </ul>
<b>Conferencing</b>	
<b>D: FIG conferencing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Things do need to change, progressive conference organisers can help. Young people have different expectations and ways of engaging.</li> </ul> <p><i>Timing and Value:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual rather than biennial is generally preferred for a number of reasons including offering delegates the opportunity to meet at FIG rather than choosing a competing annual conference. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to rebrand to maintain enthusiasm and loyalty of existing members; .</li> <li>• And similarly our sponsors have a pivotal role, their importance needs to be recognised more</li> <li>•</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Physical meeting venues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overwhelming support that physical meetings are important <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The cost to attend is, for many, becoming less cost effective (Americas, Africa etc); consider compromising by using less iconic venues/ secondary cities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Venues in academic institutions will add to the profile and</li> </ul>

	<p>delivery, particularly if these are located in cities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the current venue selection process appropriate for member's needs?</li> </ul> <p><i>Hosting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed look at the function and purpose of the conferences will ensure the balance between the host city/member needs and the needs of FIG.</li> <li>• A balance between striving to improve WW each year within reason; but the competition to generate ever larger and more lucid WW does not produce an effective improvement in FIG operation. Rather this leaves out many participants from developing countries [due to meeting cost of expensive events].</li> <li>• Conferencing lead in times are several years; but how to reconcile the voting GA members may not be around to attend</li> <li>• Resources needed for bidding are too high; should be about resources for the conference, the overly competitive drive towards bigger and better conferences is not the way to go</li> <li>• Review the basis and requirements imposed on the LOC's are they fit for purpose to deliver what is needed?</li> <li>• Outsourcing some of the conference organisation is preferable. The local MA organisers can no longer play this role given the complexity of legislation and logistics.</li> <li>• A key element is the legacy our WW leave behind.</li> <li>• Technical sessions and program:</li> <li>• If these events not well attended is that the best use of people's time?</li> <li>• Tends to be more academic not practitioners, who need standards and tool kits that affect practice and implementation, have a parallel professional stream of engagement and an academic (technical) stream</li> <li>• Modernise the technical program and revisit quality of technical papers rather than quantity, such as introducing poster or pitch variant on flash sessions)</li> <li>• rhetoric of leadership needs to translate to SMEs combine both- mind the gap</li> <li>• Hybrid between knowledge share of FIG and</li> <li>• Greater presentational diversity drawing on other stakeholders for different points of view and further increase corporate involvement</li> <li>• The ever-increasing demand on WW timeslots [remains a challenge and impacts] YS engagement to attend events with conflicting timeslots. This is another argument for 'virtualising'/digitising conferences.</li> </ul> <p><i>Regional</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set up regional FIG WW this will recognise that there are both professional and political challenges on a regional basis, the re-introduction of regional working weeks will be helpful and that these could replace the global WW every two years. The YS is a good example of a regional structure with commitment.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the best FIG events have been the regional conferences</li> <li>• Increase cooperation at the WW with regional organisations and regional bodies such as CLGE and others</li> </ul>
<b>People &amp; Volunteering</b>	
<b>E: Establishment of a Nominations Committee</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change the name, perhaps call it a Human Resources sub group.</li> <li>• To overcome the possibility of constricting diversity in the process, such as unconscious bias to encouraging people that they like the sub group itself needs to be fully diverse (geography, across all member categories and ages).</li> <li>• Further the TORs will ensure it is not a selection committee, or perceived as such, and</li> <li>• The role will be to foster individuals' engagement at all senior officer levels, be an open process of mentoring, encouragement and clearly not discouraging people to make contact and or to have any fear about submitting</li> </ul>
<b>F: Increase activity within commissions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commission joint working needs better work plan alignment to FIG strategy and greater active participation (webinars and digital sessions) throughout the year.</li> <li>• Find common issues to collaborate with government agencies, corporates as well as local MA's/ Regional bodies)</li> <li>• It is important to have a strong and differentiated professional structure via the commissions, so that members can find and engage in relevant professional topics. And, not necessarily mutually opposite, some commissions activity overlap, but not by very much</li> <li>• Do chairs need more visibility at WW</li> <li>• Communication from the Chairs to the commission members could be better. The use of best practice protocols to assist the chairs in their endeavours in volunteer engagement, decision making and communication In addition there is a need for more commission meetings throughout the WW</li> <li>• Incentive systems are needed for members to be active</li> <li>• A consistently recurring theme is that FIG appears to be European centric</li> </ul>
<b>G: Increasing the involvement over the generations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The need is to be much more opening and welcome to the young to avoid the perception that the seniors have created an "old boys club" with the old guard still sitting at the table, their talk is often is positively at the high level; but may be not innovative.</li> <li>○ It is important to have a generational diversity in FIG. To enable YS into decision making processes could be encouraged by a specific mentor approach to support and build confidence. To be inspired is to involve them in officer activities. In addition, the transitioning should be considered for the cohort- not just one or two individuals,</li> </ul>

	<p>this may be a function of the commissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ It is a long climb in the MA's to be to sit in the GA as official representative [especially for YS]</li> <li>○ A challenge is that the 'old guard' doesn't always 'see' the new influx, or recognise YS inputs as substantial. There is a further challenge that the new faces are sometimes hiding behind the older faces – whether because the latter are recognised names, continue to be asked to keynote or because they choose to.</li> <li>○ We should put more effort into involving young people- Give the YS the space to be game changers. The need to open up new trends where young people will dominate</li> <li>○ There are a few aspects to the challenge (1) getting YPs to the event (2) getting YPs to take full advantage of the event (3) sustaining YP action beyond a single interaction, also working closely with MAs and then addressing FIG inclusivity and perhaps the exclusivity of the old guard. Point 2 can be supported through mentoring and initiatives already undertaken – perhaps a forum that actively invites YP input, a president's meeting of YPs</li> <li>○ Focusing on single issue 'start and finish taks' helps demonstrate value to YS e.g. Plastics in the ocean.</li> <li>○ Bring YS closer to FIG is a [recurring theme] and one also seen in MA's. MA's have their own programs (SURCON, RICS etc)</li> <li>○ On points around digitalisation/virtual work environments, knowledge management , there needs to be better engaging with the YS in 'future of FIG This means tasking them to host their own session/event/research that would make recommendations on the future of FIG as distinct from the wider membership.</li> <li>○</li> </ul>
--	---