

When we have a good idea, we should understand the differences that will effect any change in the format of that idea.

This is especially true with the proposed mergers of the three institutions and the makeup of the proposed Board. Two military schemes and one civil scheme, however Finance gets to nominate five people plus three from the union, leaving only two defence nominees - how out of balance is that, or is it just the government not understanding(again) what the military means and what they have done. The Board should have some representative standing to the schemes they are being formed from with 4-5 are defence appointments, 3-4 and finance appointments and leaving one appointment for unions.

This is the same style of issue where the Matthews report was so fully endorsed by the government and treasurer, that it missed the mark in supporting the people that the government was saying that they were doing. If that were to be true then everyone would have agreed the Matthews got it wrong - his report was wrong and non-justifiable.

Tidy up the Board structure if you have too, make schemes effective and efficient, however make the decision structure reflect who the scheme represents.

Rodd Chignell