

The Proposal of the Working Group, November 4, 2019

1. The task of the Working Group was to:
 - 1.1. Evaluate and review the purpose and the goals of the PCC as well as objectives and mission in the statutes.
 - 1.2. Work out a proposal to an appropriate organisational structure of the PCC.
 - 1.3. Work out a proposal to a suitable legal form. What are the requirements to be acknowledged by the European Commission?
 - 1.4. Evaluate if a permanent bureau is appropriate and how it should look like. One member organisation could have the responsibility for 3-4 years.
 - 1.5. How the PCC should cooperate with other organisations.
2. There are alternative possible ways of organising the activities of the PCC in the future.
 - 2.1. No changes are done

This means that the PCC continues as before without any changes whatsoever. This is per se against the given task.
The Working Group does not recommend this.
 - 2.2. An extended Steering Committee is introduced

To strengthen continuity, the Steering Committee would comprise six members i.e. the past and current Presidency and the four incoming Presidencies.
The Working Group recommends this.
 - 2.3. A Secretariat (Bureau in 1.4) is introduced as a new body.

The Secretariat would assist the Presidency, Steering Committee, and Working Groups in their functions. The Secretariat would for example maintain and update necessary mailing lists and contact information. In general terms the Secretariat would be responsible for secretarial, clerical, and administrative duties, maintaining records etc. including arranging meetings, taking minutes and collecting and circulating documents to support the effective and smooth operation of the PCC.

Although the work load is not very heavy on an annual basis the task can be hectic at times before the conferences and plenaries. The Presidency in charge would hence be freed from those routine duties and would be able to better concentrate its resources on furthering the cause of the PCC.

The Secretariat can be organised in three different ways.

- 2.3.1. One volunteering (or rotating) member agency at a time provides the necessary resources for the task for a set period of 2-4 years.

This is the simplest solution organisationally and probably the most efficient in minimising communication problems.
- 2.3.2. Several (2-4) member agencies form a network where each of them provides resources for the task. The division of responsibilities and other relevant issues are defined in an agreement between the parties.

There is an inherent possibility of hassle (unclearly) in this kind of an arrangement. It however puts a smaller strain on a single member agency.
- 2.3.3. The task is outsourced to an external actor.

This alternative removes the task from the PCC, or its Presidency and the service would be provided by another organisation. This alternative must be based on a clear agreement including a description of the task, response times, cost, responsibilities of the parties etc.

The working group recommends that a secretariat is set up based on alternative 2.3.1.

2.4. A “working team”

The idea of a team or a group “doing the work” has its roots in the nature of the PCC’s organisation and its history of facing some difficulties in accomplishing things. Setting up this team would improve the situation. The working team would support and assist the Steering Committee in matters requiring special attention. These matters can base on the strategic plan which the Steering Committee draws or on developments outside of the PCC.

Keeping in mind the overall goal to keep the organisation simple the Working Group sees that this team should be set up as a normal working group according to the statutes when necessary. To introduce a new type of a permanent formal body would make the organisation heavy and the mandates between its parts complicated and unclear. A benefit of having designated teams to work on different issues and objectives would also offer more opportunities to engage and encourage PCC members to be more participative. The team would be called “Working Group on xxx”.

2.5. The PCC would register itself as a legal not-for-profit entity.

This alternative comes with requirements and responsibilities. Though meeting the goals of the current statutes, it would change the nature of the PCC and most probably lead to increased costs to be covered and consequently to a need to collect membership fees. It would be a feasible thing to do if the PCC really wanted to become a contact channel between the European Commission and the national cadastral agencies and felt that its message would not reach the ears and eyes of the Commission otherwise. In that case the PCC would not only need the legal structure but also the resources to work out the messages and build the contacts through which to convey them. The Working Group sees this as a slightly unlikely progress.

3. Proposals to revised statutes are drafted according to alternatives 2.2 and 2.3. If the Plenary decides to proceed towards establishment of legal entity, the statutes will have to be written to meet all the legal requirements.
4. The group’s overall sentiment is as was the general atmosphere at the previous Plenary in Bucharest in June 2019 that a simple informal organisation suits best the mission and situation of the PCC. That excludes, however, the possibility to be formally recognised as a discussion partner of the EC, which was not seen as a major drawback by the group. See also point 2.5.