

18 June 2007

ANNEXES

**FOR DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT OF THE
BOARD GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE'S GNSO REVIEW
WORKING GROUP**

ON

GNSO IMPROVEMENTS

- 1. *LSE Recommendations (2006) (“Executive Summary and List of Recommendations”)* <http://www.icann.org/announcements/gnso-review-report-sep06.pdf>**
- 2. *Sharry Recommendations (2004) (“Appendix 5: Summary of recommendations”)* <http://gnso.icann.org/announcements/announcement-22dec04.htm>**
- 3. *GNSO Self Review Recommendations (2004) (“Section 10. Summary and recommendations”)* <http://gnso.icann.org/reviews/gnso-review-sec2-22dec04.pdf>**
- 4. *BGC WG Charter and Board Resolution* http://icann.org/minutes/resolutions-30mar07.htm#_Toc36876533**

1. LSE Recommendations (2006) (“Executive Summary and List of Recommendations”) <http://www.icann.org/announcements/gnso-review-report-sep06.pdf>

LSE Report Executive Summary and List of Recommendations

Executive Summary

1. Scope of the Review. The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) seeks to put in place a unique model of governance for the Internet’s domain name system, one that rests on ”bottom-up stakeholder involvement“. ICANN has several Supporting Organizations that form a key part of this model, along with a statement of values underpinning how this system should operate (see Annex Figure A3). The Supporting Organizations make possible the policy development processes which provide the foundations for ICANN’s legitimacy as an open and global policy-making body for the Internet.

2. One of these bodies, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) plays a key role in relation to policy development about generic domain names (such as .com, .net, .info, .biz etc). The GNSO is a relatively new body, but in the space of a few years it has responded to rapid changes in the operations and stakeholders of the Internet. It has successfully generated a set of institutions and procedures for policy development on generic names issues, and has generated policy on a wide range of issues involving complicated and often technical issues, such as access to personal data, integrity of domain names, and procedures for growing the gTLD space. This study reviews the operations of the GNSO in terms of their representativeness, transparency, effectiveness and compliance with ICANN’s Bylaws.

3. Representativeness. There are six GNSO Constituencies that firms, other organizations or individuals in the area of generic names may join as members. The Constituencies and their councilors on the GNSO Council undertake a large amount of work to do with policy development on generic domain names. The Constituencies are necessarily diverse in their nature and activity, and generally take the view that a reasonable amount of autonomy from ICANN staff structures are an important component of their bottom-up consultation work. The Constituencies show a mixed pattern of participation, with relatively high levels of involvement in two Constituencies covering Registries and Registrars, but relatively narrow participation in four others, covering business users, intellectual property, internet service providers and non-commercial users.

4. The current pattern of Constituencies is relatively complex and no longer seems well-adapted to the needs of all stakeholders in the rapidly changing Internet community. Although the Constituency structure does provide a potential home for almost all types of

interest, there are signs that the current structures tend to reflect a snapshot of interests that were present at the beginning of this decade and lack internal flexibility to incorporate new types of stakeholders from commercial and civil society. There is consequently much scope to grow and diversify membership of the GNSO, and to adapt structures in such a way that they are flexible and agile enough to respond to new policy development issues. There are some worrying signs of dominance of some constituencies by a small core people and of low participation rates in policy development work by Constituency members.

5. *Transparency.* ICANN itself is a highly visible international body and its decisions and activities are much discussed in the Internet community. However, the external visibility of the GNSO Council is poor, largely because of past inadequacies in the ICANN website. Potential members of ICANN with interests in generic domain names currently have to join sub-organizations (GNSO constituencies) rather than being able to join ICANN itself. Yet GNSO Constituencies are even less visible internationally than GNSO itself. So joining a Constituency has unacceptably high information costs for anyone who is not already a deep insider in ICANN. This presents considerable barriers to a functioning and diversified bottom-up policy development process. The processes and policy development exchanges of the GNSO Council are highly transparent, more so than most similar organizations. There are however some signs that Constituencies are hard to penetrate for newcomers and that baseline standards such as disclosure of interests are not adequately enforced.

6. *Effectiveness.* The work of the GNSO Council focuses on formally designated “policy development processes” (PDPs) whose supposedly rapid timings are laid down in ICANN’s Bylaws, timings which it has not proved practicable to adhere to. Many PDPs take quite a long time to complete and their impacts are not easy to assess. Council members devote huge amounts of unpaid time to its deliberations with face-to-face meetings, many conference calls and much email business. The GNSO Council has a “legislative” pattern of operating with frequent votes, while task forces have become essentially only sub-committees of Council members. The process of reaching “consensus” on major policy issues is often arduous because of conflicting interests and weak structural incentive for Constituencies to identify core issues early and work deliberatively to agree widely acceptable positions. The current arrangements for voting introduce further complexities by assigning double-weight votes to two Constituencies (Registries and Registrars).

7. *Compliance.* Apart from the unrealistic timings for policy development process, the GNSO’s operations comply with the ICANN Bylaws. There is however relatively little sign that policies developed by the GNSO since its establishment have been subject to comprehensive impact assessment.

8. *Principles for making changes.* Any changes made to the GNSO’s operations need to follow through on four key principles:

- The GNSO’s operations need to become more visible and transparent to a wider range of stakeholders than at present.
- Any reforms made need to enhance the representativeness of the GNSO Council and its Constituencies.
- The GNSO’s structures need to be more flexible and adaptable, able to respond more effectively to the needs of new and old stakeholders in a rapidly changing Internet environment.
- Changes in the GNSO Council’s operations are needed to enhance its ability to reach genuinely consensus positions, enjoying wide support in the Internet community.

9. *Specific suggestions for reform.* We formulate a set of 24 evidence-based and practicable recommendations to help GNSO to improve where there are currently problems. These suggestions can be accepted or not individually, but they hang together as a coherent body of reforms. Some main points include:

- cutting down the number of Constituencies from six to three, covering registration interests, business users and civil society;
- creating a direct (primary) membership in ICANN for firms, other organizations and individuals. Newly joined members interested in generic names issues would then be directed to also join one of the new, simpler and easier to understand Constituencies that we outline below. The Constituencies would receive more ICANN support to sustain their activities and outreach work, while being run by and accountable to their members as now;
- creating radically improved ICANN and GNSO websites that can effectively represent the GNSO to the Internet community as a whole;
- abolishing the current weighted voting for registration interests but giving both them and business users (broadly construed) an effective veto over non-consensus change;
- raising the threshold for consensus policy from 66 to 75 per cent agreement;
- radically reducing the use of telephone conferencing and shifting to more face to face GNSO Council meetings, for which all participants would receive reasonable travel and accommodation expenses;

- making more use of intensive task forces to bring in external expertise, to broaden the involvement of interests from the Internet community and to speed up policy development;
- using staff expertise more fully and constructively to speed up policy development and to help focus GNSO Council’s attention on making key issues and decisions;
- creating term limits for GNSO councilors (of either three or four years) and putting in place stronger protections against the non-disclosure of interests.

List of recommendations

(In this list the paragraph number given in black refer to the specific point in the main text where the full recommendation is spelt out and explained. There is generally some analysis of the need for change given in the main text paragraphs immediately before each recommendation).

Recommendation 1

A centralized register of all GNSO stakeholders should be established, which is up-to-date and publicly accessible. It should include the members of Constituencies and others involved in the GNSO task forces. (Paragraph 2.5)

Recommendation 2

GNSO Constituencies should be required to show how many members have participated in developing the policy positions they adopt. (Paragraph 2.14)

Recommendation 3

There needs to be greater coherence and standardization across Constituency operations. For this to work effectively, more ICANN staff support would be needed for constituencies. (Paragraph 2.22)

Recommendation 4

A GNSO Constituency support officer should be appointed to help Constituencies develop their operations, websites and outreach activity. (Paragraph 2.23)

Recommendation 5

Constituencies should focus on growing balanced representation and active participation broadly proportional to wider global distributions for relevant indicators. (Paragraph 2.39)

Recommendation 6

The basis for participation in GNSO activities needs to be revised, from Constituency-based membership to one deriving from direct ICANN stakeholder participation. (Paragraph 2.44)

Recommendation 7

The GNSO should improve the design and organization of the current website, develop a website strategy for continual improvement and growth over the next three years, and review usage statistics on a regular basis to check that traffic to the website is growing over time and understand more fully what external audiences are interested in. (Paragraph 3.10)

Recommendation 8

Document management within the GNSO needs to be improved and the presentation of policy development work made much more accessible. (Paragraph 3.14)

Recommendation 9

The GNSO should develop and publish annually a Policy Development Plan for the next two years, to act both as a strategy document for current and upcoming policy work, and as a communications and marketing tool for general consumption outside of the ICANN community. It should dovetail with ICANN's budget and strategy documents. (Paragraph 3.16)

Recommendation 10

The GNSO and ICANN should work proactively to provide information-based incentives for stakeholder organizations to monitor and participate in GNSO issues. (Paragraph 3.19)

Recommendation 11

The position of the GNSO Council Chair needs to become much more visible within ICANN and to carry more institutional weight. (Paragraph 3.26)

Recommendation 12

The policies on GNSO Councilors declaring interests should be strengthened. Provision for a vote of "no confidence" leading to resignation should be introduced for noncompliance. (Paragraph 3.28)

Recommendation 13

Fixed term limits should be introduced for GNSO Councilors either of two two-year terms (as applied in some Constituencies already) or perhaps of a single three-year term. (Paragraph 3.30)

Recommendation 14

The GNSO Council and related policy staff should work more closely together to grow the use of project-management methodologies in policy development work, particularly focusing on how targeted issue analysis can drive data collection from stakeholders (rather than vice versa). (Paragraph 4.14)

Recommendation 15

The GNSO Council should rely more on face-to-face meetings supplemented by online collaborative methods of working. The Chair should seek to reduce the use of whole-Council teleconferencing. (Paragraph 4.19)

Recommendation 16

The GNSO Councilors should have access to a fund for reasonable travel and accommodation expenses to attend designated Council meetings, instead of having to meet such costs from their own resources as at present. (Paragraph 4.21)

Recommendation 17

The GNSO Council should make more use of Task Forces. Task Force participants should be more diverse and should be drawn from a wider range of people in the Internet community, and national and international policy-making communities. (Paragraph 4.26)

Recommendation 18

An ICANN Associate stakeholder category of participation should be created, so as to create a pool of readily available external expertise, which can be drawn upon to populate Task Forces where relevant. (Paragraph 4.27)

Recommendation 19

The current GNSO Constituency structure should be radically simplified so as to be more capable of responding to rapid changes in the Internet. The Constituency structure should be clear, comprehensive (covering all potential stakeholders) and flexible, allowing the GNSO to respond easily to the rapid changes in the make-up of Internet stakeholders. We suggest a set of three larger Constituencies to represent respectively Registration interests, Businesses and Civil Society. (Paragraph 4.35)

Recommendation 20

A reorganization of GNSO Constituencies would also allow the Council to be made somewhat smaller (we suggest 16 members) and hence easier to manage. (Paragraph 4.36)

Recommendation 21

The definition of achieving a consensus should be raised to 75 per cent. Weighted voting should be abolished. Both measures could help to create more incentives for different Constituencies to engage constructively with each other, rather than simply reiterating a “bloc” position in hopes of picking up enough uncommitted votes so as to win. (Paragraph 4.38)

Recommendation 22

The way in which the GNSO Council votes to elect two Directors to the ICANN Board should be changed to use the Supplementary Vote system. (Paragraph 4.40)

Recommendation 23

The amount of detailed prescriptive provision in the ICANN Bylaws relating to the operations of the GNSO should be reduced. ICANN Bylaws should outline broad principles and objectives for the GNSO but the detailed operational provision (including the section on the PDP) should be transferred to the GNSO Rules of Procedure. This would allow the GNSO to agree amendments and to introduce new innovations in its working methods and timelines in a more realistic and flexible way, while operating within ICANN's guiding principles. (Paragraph 5.7)

Recommendation 24

Both ICANN and the GNSO Council should periodically (say once every five years) compile or commission a formal (quantitative and qualitative) assessment of the influence of the GNSO's work on developing policy for generic names. This should include an analysis of how the GNSO's influence with national governments, international bodies and the commercial sector might be extended. (Paragraph 5.12)

2. Sharry Recommendations (2004) (“Appendix 5: Summary of recommendations”) <http://gnso.icann.org/announcements/announcement-22dec04.htm>

Sharry Recommendations (2004)

Appendix 5: Summary of recommendations

Recommendation 1: The Council has made a significant contribution to other ICANN core values such as outreach, bottom-up consensus based policy development, geographical diversity and transparency. It has endeavoured to make good use of the ICANN meetings to conduct outreach activities with other ICANN organizations and with the broader internet community. The Council should plan to expand and enhance these activities.

Recommendation 2: The appointment of liaisons is a good step in building links with other parts of the ICANN structure. Again consideration needs to be given to the best way that these liaisons can be used to raise awareness of Council issues. The crafting of a “role description” or “partnership agreement” may assist with setting clear expectations and maximizing outcomes.

Recommendation 3: While it is healthy that the Council has representation from four of the ICANN regions, the Council should develop a plan for increasing representation so that all regions are covered.

Recommendation 5: The Council should seek approval from the Board for a revised policy Development Process. The alternative process should have the following elements:

- Scoping phase (history of the issue, key questions, contractual issues, terms of reference, timelines, milestones including deliverables and check points for legal opinion) which should be done as quickly as feasible, probably within the timeframe of the current issues report
- Policy work (including research, consultation with constituencies, periods for public comment) with timelines set in the scoping phase according to the complexity of the task
- Regular reporting to Council on milestones as established in the scoping [sic]phase
- A final report and public comment period as in the current PDP

- A Council vote as in the current PDP

Recommendation 6: The Council should develop a formal process for seeking input from other ICANN organizations for each of the policies it is developing.

Recommendation 7: In addition to these changes, the Council should consider other measures to speed up the consensus process, including the greater use of time at ICANN meetings to discuss issues face to face, and possibly the use of facilitators to move more quickly to understanding of issues and building of consensus.

Recommendation 8: ICANN should move to put in place a high calibre staff policy support person at the earliest possible opportunity.

Recommendation 9: The Chair of the GNSO Council and VP Supporting Organizations should oversee an effective handover from the current staff support person to ensure that lessons learnt over the past year are not lost.

Recommendation 10: The Chair of the GNSO Council and the VP Supporting Organizations should establish a service level agreement between the GNSO Council and ICANN management that specifies the amount and type of support that is to be provided. Where possible, this should include measures (e.g. turnaround times for legal opinion, delivery of reports by agreed dates, minutes posted within a certain number of days) The Chair should consult the Council to ensure the targets meet the needs of the Council and its taskforces. The VP Supporting Organizations and Chair of GNSO Council should meet quarterly to review performance measures and report these to the President.

Recommendation 11: The Council should work with the ICANN General Counsel to establish clear communication channels for the request for and provision of legal opinion. At a minimum this should include detailed legal input at the scoping phase of each PDP. Wherever possible, “check points” for further legal input should be established as part of the scoping study.

Recommendation 12: The Council needs to ensure the viability of implementation of each of the policy recommendations that it makes to the Board.

Recommendation 13: ICANN needs to put in place a compliance function to monitor compliance with policies.

Recommendation 14: The Council needs to work with ICANN operational staff to develop a compliance policy with graded penalties.

Recommendation 15: Council needs to have a built in review of the effectiveness of policies in the policy recommendations that it makes to the Board.

Recommendation 16: The GNSO Council should utilize the Ombudsman and any reports produced by the Ombudsman as source of systematic analysis of complaints and therefore of issues that may need to be addressed through the PDP.

Recommendation 17: The Council should continue to explore ways in which the Nominating Committee members can add value to the Council process.

Recommendation 18: The Council should draft “role descriptions” for the Nominating Committee which describe the skills, expertise (especially technical expertise) and attributes that are needed for the Nominating Committee members to be optimally effective members of the Council.

Recommendation 19: The Council is working well with three representatives from each constituency. No one who is involved with the Council perceives that having three representatives hinders the workings of the Council. The Board should change the bylaws to put in place three representatives from each constituency.

Recommendation 20: The GNSO Council should overhaul the website so that it better meets the needs of all who are interested in the work of the GNSO.

3. GNSO Self Review Recommendations (2004) (“Section 10. Summary and recommendations”) <http://gns0.icann.org/reviews/gns0-review-sec2-22dec04.pdf>

GNSO Self Review Recommendations (2004)

10. Summary and recommendations

The GNSO Council believes that the evidence shows that the GNSO Council has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure. The following recommendations relate to actions the GNSO requests the ICANN Board to take with respect to the bylaws, and to requests for additional ICANN staff resources to be applied in specific areas to make the bottom-up policy development process of the GNSO and ICANN more effective.

10.1. Required changes to ICANN bylaws

10.1.1. Maintain the present 3 representatives per constituency

10.1.2. Adjust the bylaws to specify that the timelines in the policy development process are guidelines, and allow the GNSO Council to set and revise timelines according to the level of consensus on a particular issue and the amount of volunteer and staff resources available for the specific issue.

10.2. Additional ICANN staff resources required

10.2.1. Prior to the commencement of policy development on a particular issue, ensure that ICANN staff provide an analysis and Issues Paper that provides sufficient background and information to support the development of the Terms of Reference and statement of work for a Task Force. . The issue report should indicate how the issue is currently handled within the existing contractual and policy framework. In some instances, it may be necessary for Council to agree to commission an independent expert to analyse an issue (which may include interviewing affected parties within the GNSO) and propose options for policy recommendations that may address the issue.

10.2.2. During the public comment process on a proposed policy recommendation, an independent expert may need to be commissioned to produce a report on the views of the GNSO community in relation to a proposed policy recommendation.

10.2.3. Provide staff support to the task forces and GNSO Council sub-committees that are skilled in creating reports that reflect the input provided by members of Council, and clearly identify where the areas of disagreement exist.

10.2.4. Provide staff support to the Task Forces and to the GNSO Council subcommittees that familiarize themselves with the bylaws and the policy development processes, as well as the relevant previous work of the Council.

10.2.5. Ensure that legal counsel is available for all GNSO Council calls, and ensure that legal counsel is available to task forces and subcommittees as required. With respect to policy development activity, ensure that the legal counsel is fully briefed on the existing contractual arrangements with registries and registrars that relate to the particular issue under discussion.

10.2.6. Prior to the development of a final policy recommendation for the GNSO Council, ICANN should ensure that the recommendation has been reviewed by legal counsel to ensure that the recommendation can be implemented and enforced via the relevant contracts.

10.2.7. Establish a project management process within ICANN that defines a plan and expected dates for implementation of a policy once it is approved by the ICANN Board.

10.2.8. Ensure that the mechanisms are established for monitoring and enforcing compliance with a new policy. This is particularly important in the first 6 months of a new policy, when registry and registrars systems are being modified to support a new policy.

10.2.9. ICANN staff develop a complaints handling process that is capable of logging complaints regarding gTLD domain name registration practices, and capable of producing data on a trend basis. This data reporting would be useful on a monthly basis.

10.3.Actions required by the GNSO Council

10.3.1. During the early public comment process, encourage members of the ICANN community to submit proposals for solutions to a particular issue.

10.3.2. Given that legal contracts between ICANN and registries and registrars may be open to different interpretation by the contracted parties. Ensure that legal advice from ICANN legal counsel (or external counsel to ICANN) is in writing, and allow affected parties (such as registrars and registries) to submit their own written legal advice for consideration by the GNSO community.

10.3.3. Ensure that the policy is ready for implementation after approval by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board.

10.3.4. As part of the Council report at the end of the policy development process, establish key metrics for measuring the success of the policy, and ensure that appropriate measurement and reporting systems are put in place.

10.3.5. To the extent that the lack of intermediate sanctions for non-compliance with contractual obligations presents a significant impediment to compliance activities, the GNSO should, without prejudice to efforts to enforce existing contractual obligations, develop recommendations for a system of graduated or intermediate sanctions for incorporation in revised contracts. As an initial step, ICANN legal counsel should brief GNSO Council (or a relevant subgroup/task force) on ICANN's current plans to correct ongoing harm and provide greater flexibility and legitimacy for the compliance function.

4. BGC WG Charter and Board Resolution

http://icann.org/minutes/resolutions-30mar07.htm#_Toc36876533

BGC WG Charter and Board Resolution

The Board Governance Committee (BGC) agreed to create a working group of the BGC comprising current and former Board members to manage the GNSO improvement process. The BGC approved, and submitted to the Board for approval: 1) a list of individuals to be appointed to the working group; and 2) a charter for the working group that includes the objectives, tasks and processes to be undertaken by this group. The BGC also approved draft Terms of Reference and recommended that the Board direct staff to post them for public comment and further consideration.

Background

In March 2007, the BGC agreed to create a "BGC GNSO Review Working Group" to provide focused attention and guidance to this effort. The working group comprises current and former Directors and will report to the BGC. The BGC considered and approved the following working group charter:

Charter & Statement of Process

The purpose of the working group is to: consider input (LSE report, Patrick Sharry Council review, public comments, GNSO Council and constituency input, and Board input); consider (as directed in the bylaws) whether, in general, the GNSO has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure; and, if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness -- and recommend to the BGC a comprehensive proposal to improve the GNSO's effectiveness, including the GNSO's policy activities, structure, operations, and communications.

The working group will:

- Develop a process and schedule that will use the extensive information available to develop draft and final comprehensive proposals for BGC consideration and public comment, including a draft report for the BGC at ICANN's San Juan meeting.
- A comprehensive proposal should include specific recommendations addressing all improvements deemed necessary for GNSO effectiveness, including changes to the GNSO's policy activities, structure, operations, and communications. The proposal should address issues raised in the above mentioned reports, including issues such as:

- o The PDP (policy development process prescribed in the bylaws);
 - o Voting and representation on the Council and Board;
 - o The GNSO's constituencies/stakeholder participation structure;
 - o Staffing and support of the Council and constituencies, and other operational issues; and
 - o The distribution of information and solicitation of comments (including use of on line communication tools).
- Post draft and final proposals (after BGC consideration) for public comment to help ensure transparency and participation, and provide ample public opportunity for input, discussion, and advice on proposed changes to GNSO.

Membership

The BGC considered and agreed to the following members for the working groups while noting that additional members may be added:

For the “BGC GNSO Review Working Group” -- Roberto Gaetano, Rita Rodin, Vanda Scartezini, Tricia Drakes, Raimundo Beca, Susan Crawford, and Vittorio Bertola.

Additional Information

Dedicated staff resource will provide support for the working group. Upon receiving the working group’s recommendations, the BGC will consider them and recommend Board action as deemed appropriate.

Board Approval

The ICANN Board approved the following resolution approving the BGC GNSO Review Working Group, and its proposed charter, statement of work, and membership.

30 March 2007

Board Governance Committee Recommendations on Independent Reviews

Whereas Article IV, Section 4 of ICANN’s Bylaws calls for the Board to cause periodic reviews of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, each Advisory Committee (other than the Governmental Advisory Committee), and the Nominating Committee by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review.

Whereas on 8 December 2006, the Board approved a comprehensive schedule for independent reviews that included an independent review of the Board, and directed staff to execute the reviews as scheduled.

Whereas the Board has considered the proposed Terms of Reference for the At-Large Advisory Committee that have been recommended by the Board Governance Committee (BGC) to be posted for public comment.

Whereas the BGC has recommended the creation of two working groups comprised of current and former Board members that would report to the Committee and would provide focused attention and guidance to the GNSO and NomCom review efforts – a “BGC GNSO Review Working Group” and a “BGC NomCom Review Working Group.”

Whereas the Board has considered the individuals to be appointed as working group members, and the charters for these working groups, that have been recommended by the BGC.

Resolved (07.____), the ICANN Board directs staff to post the proposed Terms of Reference for the At-Large Advisory Committee review for public comment and further consideration.

Resolved (07.____), the ICANN Board approves the Board Governance Committee’s proposal to create a “BGC GNSO Review Working Group” and a “BGC NomCom Review Working Group,” and appoints the following individuals, while noting that additional individuals may be appointed:

For the “BGC GNSO Review Working Group” -- Roberto Gaetano, Rita Rodin, Vanda Scartezini, Tricia Drakes, Raimundo Beca, Susan Crawford, and Vittorio Bertola; and

For the “BGC NomCom Review Working Group” -- Alejandro Pisanty; Peter Dengate-Thrush, Njeri Rionge, Mouhamet Diop, Jonathan Cohen, and Steve Goldstein.

Resolved (07.____), the ICANN Board approves the recommended charters for these two working groups that include the objectives, tasks and processes to be undertaken by these groups, and directs staff to support the creation and work of these groups.