

13 February 2025

Hi Alan,

Many thanks to you and your OEC colleagues for meeting with us to discuss the Pilot Holistic Review (PHR).

As is demonstrated by the survey of Review Team members, the PHR does not have consensus on the scope and purpose of the Holistic Review (HR) that the PHR is charged with designing. This lack of consensus appears in part to stem from the ambiguous phrasing of the Terms of Reference for the PHR and ATRT3 recommendations.

Based on the input from the PHR and our discussions with you, it seems that the most likely correct interpretation of the ATRT3 recommendations is that the HR should do 2 things:

1. Review SOs, ACs and NC in respect to effectiveness, accountability and the interface between each of them. This review work is driven by the CIP work of each of the SOs, ACs and NC.
2. Review the structure of the SOs, ACs and NC individually and as a whole – this would be a “Structural Review.” This would allow the reviewers to recommend new SOs or ACs be introduced and existing SOs and ACs be restructured.

Assuming this interpretation to be correct, a number of things are clear:

- a) in respect to 1 above such an HR requires at least 1 iteration of CIP work by the SOs, ACs and NC before it can happen. Further, it would be a more effective use of resources for the set-up of the CIP to have been completed before the PHR starts working on the structure of the HR that will review that work.
- b) in respect to 2 above it is not clear that the wider community understands that this “Structural Review” is intended to be a part of the work of the HR and, in any event, the current terms of reference of the PHR do not provide us with the ability to undertake the structuring of such a “Structural Review.” Significant matters will need to be clarified if the PHR is to proceed with this portion of the work. These include such matters as guidance on whether the skill sets for the two described elements of HR are compatible or whether 2 different reviews and review teams would be preferable; whether recommendations would be binding; to whom recommendations would be made (SOs, ACs and NC or the Board or the empowered community); whether the review team would be required to utilise the services of outside experts or could undertake this review on their own and so on.

One suggestion that arose in our discussions was that we, in essence and at least for now, bifurcate the 2 sides of ATRT3 review recommendations and:

- i. adjust the timing of the SOs, ACs and NC CIP part of the PHR work so that the PHR team can observe the finalisation of the structuring of the CIP and then commence the work of structuring the HR that will review the CIP efforts of the SOs, ACs and NC and,
- ii. ii) coordinate discussions with the Board, SO/AC leadership teams, and a section of the PHR team (hopefully in Seattle) to consider the "Structural Review" side of the recommendation and agree a path forward for that.

We hope the above is useful and look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible so we can agree next steps.

Sophie Hey
Chris Disspain
Co-Chairs, Pilot Holistic Review