

Board Composition Gaps: Where Board Search Begins

Director search connects future board decisions to missing capability, then tests experience, independence and capacity against that requirement.

IRFAN NAZEEF · FOUNDER DIRECTOR, STRANCE – MARKET MAPPING AND LEADERSHIP INTELLIGENCE.

12 OCTOBER 2026 · 12 MIN READ

Board composition gaps are weaknesses in the collective capability a board needs to oversee its strategy and challenge management. A board search should begin by identifying those gaps, then defining the contribution required from the incoming director. Familiar names become useful only after that requirement is clear.

IN BRIEF

- 01 Define the decisions the board must oversee before listing the experience it wants.
- 02 Use a skills matrix to examine evidence, depth, recency and concentration of capability.
- 03 Assess director contribution, formal independence and capacity as separate requirements.
- 04 Connect the appointment to committee needs, induction and future board succession.

01 · Future Agenda

Which Decisions Will Test the Board?

A board's existing composition reflects earlier strategies, ownership conditions and appointment decisions. Those experiences remain valuable, but they may not cover the enterprise's next set of decisions. The search brief should therefore begin with the forward agenda.

A proposed acquisition may require stronger integration oversight, while international expansion may demand familiarity with unfamiliar regulatory environments. Greater digital dependence may require directors who can challenge technology investment and operational resilience. The relevant capability follows the decisions, rather than a fashionable label.

Consider an illustrative board with strong financial and domestic operating experience preparing to acquire a business overseas. The gap may concern integration governance, unfamiliar regulatory risk or management capacity. Appointing another accomplished domestic operator would not necessarily address those requirements.

Define what better oversight would look like before translating the gap into a preferred director profile. Examine which assumptions need stronger challenge and which decisions require experience that the current directors cannot demonstrate. Those questions give the search a defensible purpose.

02 · Evidence Matrix

What Should a Skills Matrix Actually Show?

A useful matrix records capabilities relevant to the strategy, current directors and the evidence supporting each capability. It should distinguish awareness from substantial operating experience and from experience overseeing the issue at board level. Titles alone cannot make those distinctions or establish whether experience translates into relevant judgment for this enterprise.

Define the capabilities precisely enough that directors can examine them against comparable evidence during the review. Technology experience, for example, might mean investment governance, cyber oversight or delivery of a major systems transition. Combining those different requirements in a single column can obscure the actual gap.

For each director, record the context, responsibility and recency of the experience that supports the assessment. A former chief executive may have led a relevant transformation but delegated its technical decisions. The matrix should capture the contribution actually demonstrated.

A matrix is a working record of judgment, rather than a scoring system that can decide the appointment. The chair and relevant committee should challenge the evidence and record uncertainty where necessary. A checked cell does not prove that the board can exercise effective oversight collectively.

03 · Depth and Succession

Where Is Capability Thin or Concentrated?

A board may appear well covered while depending on a single director for a critical capability. That creates a succession concern if the director leaves or becomes unavailable. Examine depth and concentration alongside the presence of experience.

Recency matters in areas where the operating or regulatory context has changed materially since the experience was acquired. Earlier experience can still contribute valuable judgment, but it may need support from current knowledge. The review should examine that distinction without using age as a proxy.

Some gaps can be addressed through director development, better management reporting or access to independent specialist advice. Those measures may strengthen how the board examines a particular issue. They do not replace the judgment and accountability directors must exercise themselves.

A new appointment becomes the appropriate response when the board needs sustained contribution that its current composition cannot reliably provide. It should have a clear rationale beyond adding another credible name. The matrix helps distinguish that requirement from an information or induction problem.

BOARD COMPOSITION GAP

A weakness in the board's collective capability to oversee its forward agenda, established through evidence of current directors' experience, judgment and availability. It may concern missing expertise, insufficient depth or succession exposure.

04 • Appointment Brief

What Contribution Should the Incoming Director Make?

Convert the identified gap into a contribution statement that explains what the new director should help the board examine. Name the strategic decisions, relevant experience and committee responsibilities that make this contribution important to the enterprise. Describe the evidence that would demonstrate fit before considering individual names.

The incoming director contributes to collective governance, rather than becoming an executive responsible for implementing the strategy. A director with integration experience can challenge the acquisition plan and management's assumptions. The management team remains responsible for execution within the enterprise's governance arrangements.

Committee requirements should form part of the brief from the outset, including any anticipated chair responsibilities. An appointment intended to strengthen audit, risk or nomination work needs corresponding experience and capacity. General seniority is insufficient evidence for a specific committee contribution.

Diversity also belongs in the composition review alongside capability, experience and the board's applicable obligations. Different perspectives can widen the questions the board considers, but contribution still requires evidence. A search should avoid treating demographic representation and relevant capability as competing objectives.

A REFERRAL AND A COMPOSITION BRIEF COMPARED

	REFERRAL CONSIDERED IN ISOLATION	REFERRAL TESTED AGAINST THE BRIEF
Starting point	Reputation and familiarity	Contribution the board needs
Experience	Broad leadership credentials	Evidence relevant to the forward agenda
Field of executives	People known to current directors	Mapped field, including relevant referrals
Independence	Assumed from reputation or distance	Formal eligibility and demonstrated judgment examined
Committee contribution	Decided after interest develops	Included in the appointment requirement
Decision record	Reasons to like the individual	Evidence of fit and remaining uncertainties

05 • Search Field

How Should Networks Inform the Search?

A referral can provide useful context about an executive's experience, judgment and professional conduct under pressure. It can also direct the board towards people whose backgrounds resemble its existing composition. Neither possibility should determine the appointment without further examination.

Treat referrals as a source of evidence and leads within a wider field mapped against the contribution statement. Market mapping can identify executives beyond the directors' immediate relationships. The purpose is broader examination of relevant capability, rather than a larger list for its own sake.

The mapped field might include experienced directors, current or former executives, and specialists with demonstrable governance judgment. Prior board service can be valuable without becoming an automatic requirement for every appointment. First-time directors need careful assessment of the transition from executive authority to collective oversight.

Document why a proposed director entered the field and how their experience addresses the gap identified in the brief. Apply the same evidence standard to a trusted referral and an unfamiliar executive. Familiarity can inform the assessment, but it should not replace it.

06 • Independence

Can the Director Exercise Independent Judgment?

Formal independence and independent judgment are related concerns, but they require different forms of examination in the search. Eligibility depends on the applicable legal and regulatory criteria. Behavioural evidence concerns how a director examines assumptions, handles disagreement and acts when a difficult issue threatens a relationship.

A referral from the chair does not by itself establish a failure of formal independence or a lack of judgment. The assessment should examine relevant relationships and conduct without inferring a conclusion from the introduction. Equally, professional distance does not prove a willingness to challenge.

Ask proposed directors how they handled a disagreement, what information they sought and how they tested management's explanation. Examine whether they challenged constructively and recognised when an issue required escalation. References can help clarify the account while respecting confidential board deliberations.

Screen relevant relationships and conflicts early, with the company secretary or legal adviser checking applicable eligibility requirements. Continue examining them as circumstances change during the process. Behavioural assessment complements that work; it cannot replace formal independence checks or the required declarations.

07 · Indian Context

What Does the Indian Governance Framework Require?

The Companies Act provides the statutory framework for director appointments and independence, including the role of the nomination and remuneration committee where applicable. It should inform the appointment process alongside the company's constitutional documents. Applicability varies with company category and the relevant rules.

For listed entities, SEBI's LODR framework adds requirements concerning board composition, director independence and governance disclosures. It also addresses independent-director familiarisation and declarations. The applicable obligations should shape the appointment and induction work, alongside the capability assessment.

A skills matrix supports the board's composition analysis, but completing it does not establish legal compliance. Confirm eligibility, appointment approvals and disclosure obligations with the company secretary or legal adviser. The sources below provide the regulatory foundation; the search brief provides the commercial and governance rationale.

08 · Capacity and Contribution

Does the Director Have Capacity to Contribute?

Relevant experience has limited value if a director cannot devote the attention the enterprise and its committees require. Examine preparation, meetings, induction and availability when an unexpected issue arises. Capacity should be assessed alongside the director's existing commitments and applicable directorship limits.

Discuss the actual demands of the board rather than relying only on the number of appointments an executive already holds. A complex transition or a demanding committee chair role may require sustained attention. Expectations should be clear before the executive agrees to proceed, including availability when the enterprise faces an unexpected issue.

Potential conflicts extend beyond the eligibility test for an independent director appointment and deserve their own review. Other directorships, advisory relationships or sector interests may affect participation in particular decisions. The board needs clarity on how those situations would be identified and handled.

Assess how the proposed director works with others when their own specialist experience becomes central to a board discussion. A specialist should help the whole board understand the issue and test the options. Expertise contributes most when it improves collective judgment rather than creating dependence on an unexamined opinion.

A useful matrix shows where the board needs stronger judgment, not merely which experience its directors can list.

09 · Decision Evidence

What Evidence Should Support the Appointment?

Leadership assessment can examine the proposed director's contribution against the board brief through structured interviews, scenarios and references. The discussion should test oversight judgment as well as expertise. Executive achievement alone does not establish how someone will contribute as a director.

An illustrative acquisition discussion could explore which assumptions the director would challenge before the board approves the transaction. Ask what information they would request and where they would expect management to retain responsibility. Their reasoning reveals more than a general claim of transaction experience.

Prepare an appointment record that connects the composition gap, search field, evidence and remaining uncertainties. Include committee contribution, capacity and the outcome of formal eligibility checks. The record should explain why the appointment strengthens the board rather than repeat the executive's biography.

The recommendation must follow the enterprise's applicable governance and approval process, including committee and shareholder requirements where relevant. A search partner can develop the field and evidence without assuming the authority to appoint. The distinction should remain clear throughout the process.

A checked cell does not prove that the board can exercise effective oversight collectively.

10 · Induction and Review

How Will the Appointment Strengthen the Board?

Plan induction around the enterprise's strategy, risks, operating context and the director's intended committee contribution. Access to relevant management, information and governance documents helps experience become useful board judgment. Induction should reflect the identified need and provide opportunities to examine how the enterprise actually makes its critical decisions.

Review contribution through the board's evaluation arrangements once the director has had an opportunity to engage with the enterprise. Look for stronger questions, better examination of alternatives and clearer oversight. An individual director should not receive credit or blame for company performance in isolation.

Keep the matrix current as strategy, experience and director availability change over the board's succession cycle. Record where an appointment has strengthened capability and where a gap remains. This turns the search brief into a continuing composition record rather than a document filed after appointment.

11 · Regulatory Sources

Primary Sources for the Indian Governance Context

Companies Act, 2013: Sections 149, 152 and 178, and Schedule IV. These address independence, appointments, nomination committee responsibilities and the independent-director code, subject to applicability.

SEBI LODR Regulations, 2015, consolidated text amended July 14, 2026. Relevant references include Regulations 16, 19 and 25, Schedule II Part D, and Schedule V.

SEBI LODR Master Circular, January 30, 2026. This consolidates compliance circular guidance for listed entities and should be read alongside subsequent applicable amendments and circulars.

QUESTIONS ABOUT BOARD COMPOSITION GAPS

Does a board search cover only independent directors?

Board search can concern executive, non-executive or independent directors, as well as chair succession, depending on the enterprise's need. The relevant contribution and appointment requirements differ. The brief should establish the category before assessing the field.

Must every capability gap lead to an appointment?

Development, specialist advice or improved information may address some gaps, while an appointment may be needed for sustained governance contribution. The board should examine the remedy against the decision it needs to oversee. External advice does not transfer directors' responsibilities.

Can a first-time director meet the composition brief?

A first-time director may qualify if their experience, judgment and capacity address the requirement and the applicable appointment criteria are satisfied. Assessment should examine the transition from executive delivery to collective oversight. Induction and committee expectations should reflect that transition.

Who should own the board skills matrix?

The board should own the composition judgment, with the chair and relevant nomination committee leading the review under the enterprise's governance arrangements. A search adviser can support research and assessment. Management can inform the forward agenda without determining the appointment.

Can board search remain confidential?

Initial research and approaches can be handled discreetly, with information released in stages as interest develops. Confidentiality does not remove required approvals or disclosures. The process should align discretion with the enterprise's applicable governance obligations.

12 · Where to Begin

Start With the Contribution the Board Needs

The strongest starting point is a contribution statement grounded in the board's forward agenda and evidence of its current capability. It should identify the decisions the appointment will help directors examine. Names can then be assessed against a clear requirement.

STRANCE's executive search and leadership intelligence practice connects that requirement to a mapped field and structured evidence. The board remains responsible for its composition judgment and appointment rationale. The purpose is a director who strengthens how the board governs the enterprise.

RELATED: BOARD SEARCH — [STRANCE.NET/SERVICES/BOARD-SEARCH](https://strance.net/services/board-search)