Question: "**Do you believe there would be any objections from your groups, and potentially delegates that you have already identified, to proceeding with a simple path forward in which we randomly select three of seven GNSO delegates to serve one-year terms?**"

Firstly, the recommendations appear internally inconsistent and should not have been approved. While they aim to ensure continuity through staggered terms, they simultaneously mandate all representatives be new appointees at the start of the new term structure, which seems contradictory.

We also note that while the random selection of lengths of initial terms might be appropriate for an AC like ALAC that doesn't have multiple constituencies with diverging interests and uneven representation. We don't think random selection is appropriate for the GNSO and therefore oppose the suggestion.

In addition to the issue about initial terms, we also want to once again note another reason the recommendations should not have been approved. In the draft recommendations there was almost to the end a recommendation for a NomCom rebalancing. It is our understanding that that recommendation was removed at the last moment, based on a vote taken at one single meeting where none of our constituencies were represented. We don't feel that is how consensus policy should be decided.

On behalf of the NCSG, NCUC and NPOC,

Julf Helsingius, NCSG Chair