

**Responses to NCRI WG Questions about
GAC Appointments to the Nom Com**
(Submitted to NCRI WG Google Form on 31 January 2020)

Question 1 –

Is the GAC planning to continue to not make appointments to the NomCom?

GAC Answer to Question 1 –

GAC Members continue to explore the potential for future GAC appointments to the Nominating Committee and treat each year as a new opportunity to consider making an appointment. The GAC has formed a special working group to help facilitate GAC consideration of NomCom participation and each year GAC Members explore the opportunity to explore the potential for a GAC appointment to the NomCom. The lack of an GAC appointment in any given year should not create an assumption that no future appointments will be made.

Question 2 –

The GAC has indicated they are not planning to make any appointment to the NomCom but would like to keep that seat open. Please explain why the GAC is reluctant to fill that seat.

GAC Answer to Question 2 –

In recent years the GAC has not achieved a consensus about the appointment of a NomCom representative, but the resulting vacancies during several NomComs should not be interpreted to mean that the GAC will never make an appointment in the future.

As explained by some GAC members in the past, certain NomCom processes and procedural considerations (e.g., the requirement for confidentiality) have been noted as creating problems of accountability and transparency for the GAC. This has caused some GAC members to not support making a GAC appointment to the NomCom.

The flexibility to make or not make an appointment to the NomCom in any given year should not be changed due to the anticipation of future action or inaction due to the GAC's internal consensus process.

As an alternative to making appointments to the NomCom, the past two years the GAC has provided the Nom Com with guidance as to the skills and capabilities that the NomCom should consider in making appointments to the Board. That practice has provided GAC members with a capability to contribute to the NomCom, during those years when an appointment is not made.

Question 3 –

If the GAC is not planning to make appointments to the NomCom for the foreseeable future, should the GAC seat on the NomCom be preserved or can it be 'reallocated' during the re-balancing process? Please, provide a rationale for your answers.

GAC Answer to Question 3 –

The GAC NomCom seat should be preserved. The flexibility for the GAC to make or not make an appointment to the NomCom in any given year should not be changed due to the anticipation of future action or inaction by the GAC. The lack of a GAC appointee in any given year should not affect the balance of the NomCom membership or prompt any further need to consider re-balancing as it relates to potential government participation in the NomCom. Given the current large number of community appointees on the NomCom, the lack of a GAC appointment in any given year should also not be viewed as impacting the balance for any community other than governments. If it would facilitate annual NomCom planning, perhaps the annual NomCom appointment timetable could be revised to get an early indication of whether the GAC intends to make an appointment in any given year.

#