Meeting: Risk & Issue Review
January 22, 2026

Facilitator:	Corbin Ray, Nadeem Noormohamed	**Scribe:**	Jenna Stoll
Attendees	**AA:** Angela Hudson, Angela Lorenzen, Lakshmi Lanka, Srikanth Patel, Brantley McDaniel, Keith Curtis, Sameera Papulla, Pramod Kumar, Lea Slatter, Lee Meador, Roger Jarboe, Justin Hull, Christina Jenkins **OW:** Corbin Ray, Nadeem Noormohamed, Daniel Rye, Jenna Stoll, Lindsay Grant		

Discussion notes

<u>Issues</u>

IS-108 — Misalignment on timeframes, prioritization, and capacity of enterprise shared services

- Clarified that this issue applies to enterprise teams the Program depends on - not all shared services; recognized this as a very broad bucket; consensus to break it down for clearer ownership and to list only the impacted teams for their area

    - The dependency on some enterprise teams is likely more pronounced than on others. Important for each workstream to name the team(s) they are dependent on and evaluate risk severity from there

    - While the Program has dependencies on enterprise teams, those teams need greater clarity from the Program on what is expected of them in order to allocate resources effectively

- Approach agreed to:

    - Each workstream (single owner) logs a specific risk for their area where applicable, ensures proper ownership, and adds their respective mitigation plan

    - Program-level issue to be closed once workstream-level items are confirmed to be documented properly, and mitigations can be managed at the workstream level vs. at the program level

    - Workstreams to mark this as a 'risk' not an 'issue'

- **Summarized Action (AA):** Workstream leads to ensure risks are logged only for respective impacted shared-service teams; create workstream-level risks in tooling and assign owner and potential target closure date; articulate next steps

IS-112 — External Stakeholder Management and Participation (e.g. Vendors, Business, other IT Functions)

- Workstream team questioned whether current severity, likelihood, owner, and closure date are appropriate

- For some workstreams, this is not an issue, but expect that it may be later

- Note (side-bar discussion, not related to Issue but more broadly on governance): Go forward consensus was that any items be captured/logged before they materialize into impacting issues to ensure appropriate mitigations can be put in place

- Group agreed the approach to this issue should be similar to that of IS-108; program level risk to remain open and each workstream to confirm their own risk and stakeholders involved; workstream to add specific risk/issue as appropriate including specific vendors in question

    - Not all workstreams may have a high-severity issue with external stakeholder group

- **Summarized Action (AA):** Each workstream lead to confirm whether a workstream-specific risk is required based on assessment of external stakeholder groups and requirements; assign owner and potential target closure date; articulate next steps

IS-180 — Crew Pay vendor contracting delay

- Ownership confirmed as Angela H and Procurement to be engaged appropriately

- Target closure date confirmed as February 16

    - Identified that it will be critical to continue to work through Finance to hit this date

- **Tactical next step:** Agreed to have a critical path discussion to align on the implications of missing this milestone and the expected deployment date

    - Procurement needs to be added to this discussion; team to work backwards from implementation to determine where there is slack vs. not in the system

- Impact to be updated, emphasizing that missing the date could push delivery into 2028

- **Action (OW):** Assign Angela H. as the owner and set target closure date for Feb 16, 2026; update next steps in tooling based on below and modify impact to include go-live will move to 2028 if contracting delay is not resolved in a timely manner

- **Action (Joint):** Schedule critical path conversation for Crew Pay milestones to understand what true "drop dead" date for vendor contracting, include Procurement in this conversation

- **Action (Joint – tangential to issue):** Conduct similar sessions for other systems (TPS/LPS, CMS etc.) to determine critical path milestones

IS-212 — FOS Decomm Flight may not be able to execute capability discovery in line with timelines due to the limited number of FOS Flight developers

- Owner confirmed as Roger; item confirmed as low severity since it is actively being worked on and because resourcing is a fixed constraint

- Mixed views on whether this should remain an issue or transition to a risk

- Milestones delivered so far are on track, but upcoming discovery estimate is key to next steps

- Decision to keep issue open until estimate is reviewed on Friday 23rd; will reassess status in next week's session

- **Ask from the group:** Confirm and document the number of FOS Flight and Crew developers to quantify the impact of the risk. Separately, the ask was echoed for any risk/or issue to document the number of individuals in question (it was discussed ~6 developers associated with this issue, but action item is to confirm)

- **Action (OW):** Assign Roger J. as the owner to add specific next steps post 1/23 discussion

- **Action (AA):** Based on new timeline estimate, Roger J. to revise impact to timeline and determine next steps accordingly and if Leadership escalation is required

IS-105 — Enterprise policies and procedures stressed to support a program of this scale

- Issue considered unclear and no longer active; likely source of this issue was during the creation of SharePoint tooling where enterprise review cycles contributed to a delay in the timeliness of tooling deployment

- Decision to close the issue --> Originated from tooling approval delays that have since been resolved

    - New risk to be created with more specific language as needed

- Noted that other future policy-related constraints will be logged as new, specific risks if and when they threaten milestones

- **Action (OW):** Close Issue

- **Action (Joint):** Create a new risk if and when policy-related constraints re-emerge in the future

Risks – discussion transitioned from Issues to Risks

RI-102 — Influence of AA priorities outside the Program on architectural design

- Risk noted as vague but likely originated during architectural guild review process; the speed of this review process had threatened timelines for FXIP and ASM

- Workstream teams noted that we should be mindful of enterprise review processes and capture those risks when they materialize

    - If something could pose a risk in the future, it is prudent to log that risk in advance rather than wait for it to materialize

    - In the interim, team noted that more specificity is required when surfacing risks, ensuring that context and date of creating are provided to add more context during risk

> review sections; asks of risk owners for the Wednesday deadline to review all their risks and provide the necessary information to help triage

- **Action (Joint - tangential):** For future risk review sessions, ensure original "Created by" and "Date Created" are captured

==Note: approximately 10 minutes left in the meeting at this point==

RI-132 — Challenges in aligning on foundational definitions

- Workstream teams noted that this risk was also ambiguous and required greater clarity; the likely intent was to communicate that terminology and principles may not be standard or mutually understood across NXOP

- Conversation digressed into ownership and it was agreed that this risk is a change management topic (not Foundational Build as it had been labeled)

    - Change Management progress in this area has been ongoing and decision made during meeting to reduce severity from high to medium

- **Action (OW):**

    - Engage with original submitter and rewrite the risk to ensure appropriate level of detail

    - Remove Foundational Build from workstream and tag to Change Management instead

    - Reduce severity of risk to medium

RI-210 — The FOS Modernization Program may be unable to adequately test the migration of capabilities out of FOS

- Limited discourse but owner confirmed as Roger J.

- Team noted that this risk refers to how the Program will approach testing capacity limitations with the current FOS environment

    - One option includes purchasing a new environment ($~10M), but team acknowledged that this may not be the most effective allocation of capital and that ultimately, Leadership decision will be required to provide appropriate steer

    - Conversations are ongoing between Roger and Prem to align on how to best approach, what decisions are required, and what alternatives exist

- Pending conversations between Roger and Prem, action will be taken to rewrite this risk with greater specificity and revisit in upcoming session

- **Action (OW):** Assign Roger J. as the owner within tooling

- **Summarized Action (Roger):** Rewrite risk to specify testing scope and required decisions; share outcomes with group following discussion with Prem

Meeting: Risk & Issue Review
January 22, 2026

RI-211 — Preliminary target dates for TPS/LPS and Crew Pay capability discovery milestones may need to be adjusted in early Q1

- Conversation was limited given timing, but team noted that the risk is too broad in its current form; team suggested splitting risk into separate a separate TPS/LPS risk and Crew Pay risk, with respective ownership

- Roger and Sameera agreed to have follow-on discussion to assign ownership and next steps for this risk, with Pramod taking the Crew Pay portion of the risk

- **Action (Roger & Sameera):** To repurpose risk RI-211 for TPS/LPS and update description, impact, mitigation, and next steps

- **Action (Pramod):** Create new risk to capture Crew Pay discovery timeline delays; update description, impact, mitigation, and next steps

RI-189 / RI-190 / RI-191 — FOS knowledge and resourcing constraints

189: "The FOS Modernization Program may run out of people with extensive knowledge of the FOS codebase at DXC"

190: "The FOS Modernization Program may run out of AA experts with FOS knowledge"

191: "The FOS Modernization Program may run out of TPF developers with knowledge of the FOS codebase"

- These three risks were submitted separately but the team acknowledged that there was opportunity for consolidation

- Recognized that RI-189 and RI-191 were similar in that they both dealt with resource knowledge of FOS codebase --> team proposed to consolidate into a single risk and then decision was made to merge

- Noted RI-190 refers to AA experts who know FOS (limited number of experts on AA's staff that have extensive knowledge of FOS; staff that do have extensive knowledge of FOS have worked at AA for a long time and are at risk of retiring)

- **Summarized Action (OW):** Merge RI-189 and RI-191 into a single consolidated risk

- **Action (Pramod):** Re-write RI-190 to clarify AA experts are limited (vs. running out

RI-192 — Competing priorities impacting FOS decommissioning

- Many key stakeholders in the FOS Decomm effort have responsibilities outside of the workstream and often cannot dedicate adequate capacity to FOS Decomm

    - Noted that this risk is borne by the prioritization model and how Product teams must balance both multiple needs across their teams and Program

    - General action taken to rely on Product Managers, Owners, and delivery teams to escalate when prioritization presents a potential risk

    - Ownership confirmed as Angela H.; likelihood reduced to medium and severity reduced to low

- In the future, teams will log discrete issues (as opposed to being bundled under this risk) when prioritization issues materialize

    - In the interim, this risk will remain open for awareness as an ongoing condition

- **Action (OW):** Assign Angela H. as the owner in tooling; change likelihood to medium and severity to low

- **Action (AA):** Keep risk open as ongoing; log discrete issues if they materialize