

Board Governance Committee 2015 Annual Report on Accountability Mechanisms

Reconsideration Requests Independent Review Process (IRP) Requests Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) Requests

RECONSIDERATION REQUESTS

A. Bylaws Provisions Regarding Annual Report on Reconsideration Requests

- ICANN's Reconsideration Policy is set forth in Article IV, section 2 of ICANN's Bylaws.
- This annual report is presented in fulfillment of subsection 20 of that policy, which calls for the BGC to provide information found in this report.

B. Information on Specific Reconsideration Requests

Number, Nature, and Action

- Twenty-Four Reconsideration Requests were received from 2 October 2014 thru 19 October 2015.
- The BGC acted upon 18 Reconsideration Requests during the period of 2 October 2014 thru 19 October 2015: Requests 14-39 thru 14-41, 14-43 thru 14-46, 15-1, 15-4 thru 15-11, 15-13 and 15-18.
- The Board/NGPC acted upon three Requests during the period of 2 October 2014 thru 19 October 2015: Requests 14-37, 15-7, 15-13.
- Two Requests were withdrawn by the Requesters during the period of 2 October 2014 thru 10 October 2015: Requests 15-2, 15-12.
- Request 14-43 (filed by the City of Spa on 21 October 2014) – The requester sought reconsideration of ICANN's decision to process the applications for the gTLD string .SPA as non-geographic name applications. The requester claimed that ICANN's conduct violated applicable policies and procedures because it contended that: (i) ICANN violated provisions of the Guidebook; and (ii) ICANN contravened the GAC's advice. The BGC found that the requester failed to demonstrate that ICANN violated any policy or procedure, and denied Request 14-43.
- Request 14-44 (filed by dotgay LLC on 22 October 2014) – The requester sought reconsideration of: (a) the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Panel's Report, and ICANN's acceptance of that Report, finding that the .GAY application did not prevail in CPE; and (b) ICANN staff's response to the requester's DIDP Request for documents relating to the CPE Panel's Report. The BGC concluded that, upon investigation of the requester's claims, the CPE Panel inadvertently failed to verify 54 letters of support for the .GAY application, and that this failure contradicts an established procedure and warrants reconsideration. With respect to the requester's other arguments, the BGC found that the requester had not stated a sufficient basis for reconsideration. The BGC

determined that the CPE Panel's Report be set aside and that new evaluators be appointed to conduct a new CPE for this .GAY application.

- Request 14-45 (filed by .music LLC on 22 October 2014) – The requester sought reconsideration of the CPE Panel's Report, and ICANN's acceptance of that Report, finding that the requester did not prevail in CPE for .MUSIC. The requester claimed that the CPE Panel failed to comply with established ICANN policies and procedures in rendering its Report. The BGC determined that the requester failed to demonstrate that the CPE Panel acted in contravention of established policy or procedure in rendering the Report, and denied Request 14-45.
- Request 14-46 (filed by Little Birch LLC, and Minds + Machines Limited on 22 October 2014) – The requesters sought reconsideration of the Community Priority Evaluation ("CPE") Panel's Report, and ICANN's acceptance of that Report, finding that Big Room Inc.'s application for .ECO prevailed in CPE for that string. The BGC determined that the requesters failed to demonstrate that the CPE Panel acted in contravention of any established policy or procedure in rendering the Report, and denied Request 14-46.
- Request 15-1 (filed by Atgron, LLC on 15 January 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of ICANN staff's actions undertaken in accordance with the Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) in processing the requester's request to modify the registry services that the requester provides pursuant to its Registry Agreement for the .WED gTLD. The BGC concluded that the Requester did not demonstrate any misapplication of any policy or procedure by ICANN staff, which responded to the RSEP Request in accordance with the RSEP and related established processes and procedures. The BGC denied Request 15-1.
- Request 15-2 (filed by Big Room, Inc. on 20 February 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of ICANN staff inaction in connection with its failure to terminate the ongoing CEP pertaining to the .ECO gTLD subject matter. The requester subsequently withdrew Request 15-2.
- Request 15-3 (filed by Brice Trail, LLC on 12 March 2015) – The requester seeks reconsideration of the determination by ICANN staff and Board to require Brice Trail and other applicants for the .DOCTOR gTLD to "ensure that the domains in the [.DOCTOR] TLD are ascribed exclusively to legitimate medical practitioners." Request 15-3 is pending consideration.
- Request 15-4 (filed by Schwarz Domains & Services GmbH & Co. KG on 17 March 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of ICANN staff's denial of its change request seeking to change its application for the string ".SCHWARZGROUP" to an application for the string ".KAUFLAND." The BGC found that the Requester failed to demonstrate that ICANN's denial of the change request violated any ICANN policy or procedure, and denied Request 15-4.
- Request 15-5 (filed by Atgron Inc. on 21 March 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of the BGC's denial of Reconsideration Request 15-1. As Request 15-5 is based upon the exact same facts and circumstances as Request 15-1, and makes no claims that the BGC failed to consider material information, or considered false or inaccurate information, in deciding Request 15-1, the BGC summarily dismissed Request 15-5.

- Request 15-6 (filed by .Music, LLC on 17 April 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of ICANN’s decisions to: (1) approve a change request submitted by DotMusic Limited (DML) prior to the completion of DML’s CPE; and (2) defer the requester’s change request until after the completion of the Requester’s CPE. The BGC found that the requester failed to demonstrate any violation of an ICANN policy or procedure and denied Request 15-6.
- Request 15-7 (filed by Booking.com B.V. and Travel Reservations SRL on 13 May 2015) – The requesters sought reconsideration of the ICANN Board’s decision to approve Resolutions in which the Board accepted the findings contained in the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel in *Booking.com v. ICANN*, and directed the President and CEO to move forward with processing the .hotels/.hoteis contention set. The BGC concluded that the requesters had not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and recommended that Request 15-7 be denied. On 28 July 2015, the Board adopted the BGC’s recommendation.
- Request 15-8 (filed by Atgron, Inc. on 20 May 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of the BGC’s summary dismissal of Reconsideration Request 15-5, which sought reconsideration of the BGC’s denial of Reconsideration Request 15-1. Request 15-5 was based upon the exact same facts and circumstances as Request 15-1, and made no claims that the BGC failed to consider material information, or considered false or inaccurate information, in deciding Request 15-1. As, Request 15-8 was again based on the exact same facts and circumstances as Requests 15-1 and 15-5, and did not demonstrate that the BGC failed to consider material information, or considered false or inaccurate material information, in summarily dismissing Request 15-5, the BGC summarily dismissed Request 15-8.
- Requests 15-9 and 15-10 (filed by Atgron, Inc. on 4 June 2015 and on 17 June 2015, respectively) – The requester sought reconsideration of the same facts and circumstances addressed in Reconsideration Requests 15-1, 15-5, and 15-8, namely ICANN staff’s processing of the requester’s Registry Services Evaluation Policy (RSEP) request to modify the registry services provided in the requester’s registry agreement for .WED. The BGC issued a consolidated Determination regarding Requests 15-9 and 15-10 (both filed by Atgron, Inc. and regarding the same issue) finding that the Requester had not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore denied Requests 15-9 and 15-10.
- Request 15-11 (filed by Motion Picture Domain Registry Pty Ltd. on 27 June 2015) – The Requester sought reconsideration of ICANN’s response to the requester’s Request For Release Of Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels. In accordance with the Process for Requesting Authorization for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels (Process), ICANN authorized the release for registration of many (but not those objected-to) of the two-letter labels that the requester sought. The BGC concluded that ICANN’s decision to withhold all objected-to two-letter labels did not violate any established policy or procedure, because ICANN adhered to the Process in evaluating the Authorization Request and no other procedure has been finalized yet. The BGC therefore denied Request 15-11.

- Request 15-12 (filed by E-Flux.art, LLC on 9 July 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of ICANN’s denial of the requester’s change request regarding its application for the .ART gTLD. The requester subsequently withdrew Request 15-12 before it was considered by the BGC.
- Request 15-13 (filed by Commercial Connect, LLC on 10 July 2015) – The requester sought reconsideration of the CPE panel’s report, and ICANN’s acceptance of that report, finding that the requester did not prevail in CPE for .SHOP. The Requester also challenged various procedures governing the New gTLD Program, as well as the String Similarity Review process and the adjudication of various string confusion objections, which ultimately resulted in the contention set for its application. The BGC concluded that the requester had not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore recommended that Request 15-13 be denied. On 28 September 2015, the NGPC adopted the BGC’s recommendation.
- Request 15-14 (filed by Foggy Sunset, LLC on 6 August 2015) – The requester seeks reconsideration of the CPE panel’s report, and ICANN’s acceptance of that report, finding that Asia Spa and Wellness Promotion Council Limited’s (ASWPC’s) application for .SPA prevailed in CPE. Specifically, the requester claims that the CPE panel evaluating ASWPC’s application violated established policy or procedure by considering letters of support for ASWPC’s application that were submitted more than 14 days after the application was invited to CPE. Request 15-14 is pending consideration by the BGC.
- Request 15-15 (filed by Centre for Internet and Society on 8 September 2015) – The requester seeks reconsideration of ICANN’s responses to the requester’s requests for documents pursuant to the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“DIDP”), which sought disclosure of documents regarding ICANN’s “implementation of the NETmundial Principles,” and “raw data with respect to granular income/revenue statements of ICANN from 1999-2011.” Request 15-15 is pending consideration by the BGC.
- Request 15-16 (filed by CPA Australia Ltd. on 18 September 2015) – The requester seeks reconsideration of the CPE panel’s report, and ICANN’s acceptance of that report, finding that the requester did not prevail in CPE for .CPA. Request 15-16 is pending consideration by the BGC.
- Request 15-17 (filed by American Institute of Certified Public Accountants on 19 September 2015) – The requester seeks reconsideration of the CPE panel’s report, and ICANN’s acceptance of that report, finding that the requester did not prevail in CPE for the .CPA string. Request 15-17 is pending consideration by the BGC.
- Request 15-18 (filed by Ron Andruff on 11 October 2015) – The Requester seeks reconsideration of the BGC’s recommendation to the Board that someone other than the Requester be named as the Chair of the Nominating Committee for 2016, and the Board acceptance of that recommendation. Request 15-18 was addressed by the BGC on 18 October 2015, and as of 19 October 2015, pending consideration by the Board.
- Request 15-19 (filed on behalf of ICANN’s Business Constituency and ICANN’s Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group) – The Requesters seek reconsideration of the Board’s approval of renewal of the .CAT, .TRAVEL and .PRO Registry Agreements. Request 15-19 is pending consideration by the BGC.

- Request 15-20 (filed on behalf of the Internet Commerce Association) – The Requester seeks reconsideration of the Board’s approval of renewal of the .CAT, .TRAVEL and .PRO Registry Agreements. Request 15-19 is pending consideration by the BGC.

Number of Reconsideration Requests Pending

- As of 19 October 2015, there were six Reconsideration Requests pending BGC action, three of which will also be subject to Board action, and one Reconsideration Request pending Board action, following action already taken by the BGC.
- Two Reconsideration Requests were pending at the conclusion of the 2014 calendar year.

Number of Reconsideration Requests the BGC Declined to Consider

- The BGC has thus far considered (or will consider) all Reconsideration Requests submitted between the Annual General Meeting in 2014 and the Annual General Meeting in 2015 that have not been, or are not later, withdrawn by the requester(s).

Other Accountability Mechanisms Available to Denied Requesters

- ICANN makes available the Ombudsman and the Independent Review Process as additional mechanisms to enhance ICANN accountability to persons materially affected by its decisions. The Ombudsman separately reports on his activities.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS (IRP) REQUESTS

A. General Information Regarding IRPs

In accordance with Article IV, section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws, ICANN has designated the International Centre for Dispute Resolution as the body to process requests for independent review of Board actions alleged by any affected party to be inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. Many parties invoke the voluntary Cooperative Engagement Process (CEP) prior to the filing of an IRP, for the purpose of narrowing the issues that are stated within the request for independent review.

B. Information on Specific IRPs

Number and Nature

- From 2 October 2014 thru 19 October 2015, seven IRPs were initiated, and three have been concluded.

Initiated:

- IRP: Donuts Inc. v ICANN, ICDR Case No. 01-14-0001-6263 – Donuts Inc. filed an IRP challenging the Expert Determinations upholding the community objections to Donuts Inc.’s applications for .SPORTS, .SKI, and .RUGBY. Subsequently, the .SKI applicant withdrew its request for IRP so it has been removed from this IRP proceeding, which is now limited to .RUGBY and .SPORTS. From July through September, Donuts served ICANN with document requests, ICANN produced documents responsive to those

requests and the parties submitted supplemental briefing. The IRP hearing took place on 8 October 2015.

- IRP: Gulf Cooperation Counsel (GCC) v. ICANN, ICDR Case No. 01-14-0002-1065 – The GCC filed an IRP challenging ICANN’s continued processing of the .PERSIANGULF application submitted by Asia Green IT System Ltd. The IRP provider, the International Centre for Dispute Resolution, is in the process of selecting the lead IRP Panelist.
- IRP: Despegar Online SRL, Donuts Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry, LLC, and Radix FZC v. ICANN (.HOTEL) and Little Birch, LLC and Minds + Machines Group Limited v. ICANN (.ECO), ICDR Case No. 01-15-0002-8061 – Despegar Online SRL, Donuts, Inc., Famous Four Media Limited, Fegistry, LLC, and Radix FZC (collectively, “.HOTEL Claimants”) filed an IRP challenging the CPE panel determination finding that HOTEL Top-Level-Domain S.a.r.l.’s community application for .HOTEL prevailed in CPE. Specifically, the .HOTEL Claimants challenge the BGC’s denial of Reconsideration Request 14-34 (seeking reconsideration of the CPE panel determination) and Reconsideration Request 14-39 (seeking reconsideration of ICANN’s DIDP Response relating to the CPE panel determination). The .HOTEL Claimants further challenge ICANN’s appointment of the third party provider to conduct CPEs and details of the CPE process set forth in the Guidebook. ICANN responded to the IRP Request on 17 April 2015.

Little Birch, LLC, together with Minds + Machines Group Limited, (ECO Claimants) filed an IRP challenging the CPE panel determination finding that Big Room Inc.’s community application for .ECO prevailed in CPE (.ECO IRP). The .ECO Claimants each submitted standard applications for the .ECO string. The .ECO Claimants allege that ICANN “has failed to act with due diligence and failed to exercise independent judgment” in “adopting” the CPE panel determination. ICANN responded to the IRP Request on 27 April 2015.

On 12 May 2015, the .HOTEL and the .ECO IRPs were consolidated into a single IRP proceeding. The Panel was fully selected on 14 July 2015. A telephonic Preliminary Hearing is scheduled for 23 November 2015.

- IRP: dot Sport Limited v. ICANN, ICDR Case No. 01-14-0001-5004 – dot Sport Limited (dSL) filed an IRP challenging the Expert Determination, and ICANN’s adoption of it, finding in favor of SportAccord in the Community Objection proceedings against dSL’s application for .SPORT,. dSL claims that the Expert Panelist “was not properly trained and [...] had created a reasonable appearance of bias.” dSL further alleges that ICANN “failed both to act with due diligence and to exercise independent judgment” in “adopting” the Expert Determination “without any review.” ICANN responded to the IRP Request on 8 May 2015. The Panel was fully selected on 26 August 2015. An Administrative Hearing was held on 28 September 2015.
- IRP: Corn Lake, LLC v. ICANN, ICDR Case No. 01-15-0002-9938 – Corn Lake filed an IRP challenging the Expert Determination granting the objection against Corn Lake’s application for .CHARITY and, more specifically, the differing outcomes of the two Expert Determinations related to .CHARITY. Corn Lake argues that ICANN’s Board violated its Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation, in accepting the Expert Determination.

ICANN responded to the IRP Request on 15 May 2015. The Panel was fully selected on 17 September 2015. A Preparatory Conference is scheduled for 3 November 2015.

- Afilias Limited, BRS Media, Inc., and Tin Dale, LLC v. ICANN, ICDR Case No. 01-15-0005-1738 – Afilias Limited, BRS Media, Inc., along with Tin Dale, LLC (Claimants) submitted Reconsideration Request 14-41 challenging the CPE panel’s report finding that the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) had prevailed in CPE, and challenging ICANN’s acceptance of that report. Claimants also seek independent review of the BGC’s denial of their Reconsideration Request related to this matter. The matter was commended on 5 October 2015.

Concluded:

- Booking.com v. ICANN – Booking.com challenged the String Similarity Panel’s Expert Determination, and ICANN’s “adoption” of the Determination, that Booking.com’s applied-for gTLD “.HOTELS” was visually confusingly similar to another applicant’s applied-for string “.HOTEIS.” On 3 March 2015, the Panel issued its Final Declaration. On 26 April 2015, the ICANN Board considered the IRP Panel’s Final Declaration and took the following decisions:

Resolved

- DotConnectAfrica Trust (DCA Trust) v. ICANN - DCA Trust challenged the New gTLD Program Committee’s (NGPC’s) acceptance of consensus advice from the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) that DCA Trust’s application for .AFRICA not proceed. The IRP Panel issued its Final Declaration on 9 July 2015. The ICANN Board considered the IRP Panel’s Final Declaration on 16 July 2015, and took the following decisions:

Resolved (2015.07.16.01), the Board has considered the entire Declaration, and has determined to take the following actions based on that consideration: (1) ICANN shall continue to refrain from delegating the .AFRICA gTLD; (2) ICANN shall permit DCA’s application to proceed through the remainder of the new gTLD application process as set out below; and (3) ICANN shall reimburse DCA for the costs of the IRP as set forth in paragraph 150 of the Declaration.

Resolved (2015.07.16.02), since the Board is not making a final determination at this time as to whether DCA’s application for .AFRICA should proceed to contracting or delegation, the Board does not consider that resuming evaluation of DCA’s application is an action that is inconsistent with GAC advice.

Resolved (2015.07.16.03), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to take all steps necessary to resume the evaluation of DCA’s application for .AFRICA and to ensure that such evaluation proceeds in accordance with the established process(es) as quickly as possible (see Applicant Guidebook at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb> for established processes).

Resolved (2015.07.16.04), with respect to the GAC’s consensus advice in the Beijing Communiqué that DCA’s application for .AFRICA should not proceed, which was confirmed in the London Communiqué, the Board will ask the GAC if it wishes to

refine that advice and/or provide the Board with further information regarding that advice and/or otherwise address the concerns raised in the Declaration.

Resolved (2015.07.16.05), in the event that DCA's application for .AFRICA successfully passes the remainder of the evaluation process, at that time or before, the Board will consider any further advice or information received from the GAC, and proceed as necessary, balancing all of the relevant material information and circumstances. Should the Board undertake any action that may be inconsistent with the GAC's advice, the Board will follow the established process set out in the Bylaws (see ICANN Bylaws, Article XI, Section 2.1).

DOCUMENTARY INFORMATION DISCLOSURE POLICY (DIDP) REQUESTS

A. General Information Regarding DIDP

- The DIDP was developed as a part of the Accountability and Transparency Frameworks and Principles to help enhance ICANN’s accountability and transparency.
- The DIDP provides that “information contained in documents concerning ICANN’s operational activities, and within ICANN’s possession, custody, or control” at the time the DIDP request is made, will be made available to the public unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality, such as the Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure.
- All DIDP requests and responses are posted at:
<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/transparency-en>.

B. Information on Specific DIDP Requests

Number and Nature

- From 2 October 2014 thru 19 October 2015, 34 DIDP Requests have been submitted and 33 were responded to, with one to be responded to on 21 October 2015.
- Request 20141021-1: Kevin Murphy (21 October 2014)
The DIDP Request sought the disclosure of the letter from Rod Beckstrom to Maria Del Rosario Guerra dated 1 December 2009 (or thereabouts) as referred to in Maria Del Rosario Guerra’s 3 December 2009 reply.
- Request 20141022-1: Reg Levy, Minds + Machines (22 October 2014)
The DIDP Request sought the disclosure of: (i) the agreement(s) between ICANN and the organizations and individuals involved in the Community Priority Evaluation (“CPE”); (ii) policies, guidelines, directives, instructions or guidance given by ICANN relating to the CPE process; (iii) internal reports, notes, meeting minutes drawn up by or on behalf of ICANN, the CPE panels, and other entities involved in the CPE in relation to the application for .ECO that prevailed in the CPE; (iv) input provided by Big Room Inc. (“Applicant”) or entities having supported the Applicant’s application for .ECO, or other communications reviewed and/or considered by the CPE Panel and ICANN; and (v) detailed information in relation to the information reviewed, criteria and standards used, arguments exchanged, information disregarded or considered irrelevant, and scores given by the CPE panel in the .ECO CPE.
- Request 20141022-2: dotgay LLC (22 October 2014)
The DIDP Request sought the disclosure of: (i) the agreement(s) between ICANN and the organizations and individuals involved in the Community Priority Evaluation (“CPE”); (ii) the connection, experience level and qualification in regard to the targeted community of each of the members of the CPE Panel that were involved in reviewing the Requester’s application for .GAY and preparing the CPE Report; (iii) policies, guidelines, directives, instructions or guidance given by ICANN relating to the CPE process; (iv) statements, documents, third-party input or similar information which has been disclosed to the CPE Panel in connection with the .GAY CPE; (v) internal reports, notes, meeting minutes drawn up by or on behalf of ICANN, the CPE panels, and

other entities involved in the CPE in relation to the application for .GAY that did not prevail in the CPE; and (vi) detailed information in relation to the information reviewed, criteria and standards used, arguments exchanged, information disregarded or considered irrelevant, and scores given by the CPE panel in the .GAY CPE.

- Request 20141218-1: The Centre for Internet & Society (18 December 2014)
The DIDP request sought the disclosure of detailed expenses under heading “Travel and Meetings” for the years 1999 to 2014 broken down by six categories of documents identified in the request.
- Request 20141222-1: The Centre for Internet & Society (22 December 2014)
The DIDP request sought the disclosure of detailed reports of ICANN’s income and revenue from domain names for the years 1999 to 2014, in a manner similar to the report for FY14 that was previously presented to CIS.
- Request 20141224-1: The Centre for Internet & Society (24 December 2014)
The DIDP request sought the disclosure of details of all cyber-attacks suffered or thought/suspected to have been suffered by ICANN from 1999 to the present, including seven categories of information specified in the Request.
- Request 20141228-1-NETmundial: The Centre for Internet & Society (28 December 2014)
The DIDP request sought the disclosure of information regarding ICANN’s internal measures to implement the NETmundial Initiative. The Request also asked for information relating to “mechanisms or any other changes afoot within ICANN, implemented internally in recognition of the NETmundial Principles.”
- Request 20141228-1-Ombudsman: The Centre for Internet & Society (28 December 2014)
The DIDP request sought the disclosure of information regarding details of the parties and the natures of all complaints that have been filed with the Ombudsmen in the history of the organization.
- Request 20150112-1-Auctions: The Centre for Internet & Society (12 January 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of information regarding the New gTLD Program auction process, winning bids, revenue received, and utilization of proceeds.
- Request 20150112-1-Globalization Advisory Groups: The Centre for Internet & Society (12 January 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of information regarding the creation, meeting schedule, dissolution, and reports/recommendations of the President’s Globalization Advisory Group.
- Request 20150112-1-Organogram: The Centre for Internet & Society (12 January 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of an organogram of ICANN that includes ICANN’s reporting hierarchy, including positions held in all departments; the names of ICANN staff holding positions of middle and senior management wherever possible; and a count by department of ICANN staff employed in all departments to date.
- Request 20150113-1: The Centre for Internet & Society (13 January 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of information regarding the expenses and costs

incurred by ICANN towards the NETmundial Initiative as well as the number of ICANN staff and Board personnel and hours involved in their engagement of the NETmundial Initiative.

- Request 20150120-1: Guru Acharya (20 January 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of the plan for transition to successor contractor (and any other relevant documentation) prepared by ICANN as required under clause C.7.3 the IANA Functions Contract.
- Request 20150206-1: The Centre for Internet & Society (6 February 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of “current and historical data regarding details of contract fees paid by the 5 Regional Internet Registries, namely AfriNIC, ARIN, APNIC, LACNIC and RIPE NCC, to ICANN for each fiscal year [...] from 1999 till 2014.” In particular, the Request sought the disclosure of the “contributions made by each RIR,” instead of the “lump sum amount collected from all the RIRs jointly.”
- Request 20150211-1: Kin Sun (11 February 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of all documents regarding the domain name Yuetu.com since it was registered including “the contract, the authorized form and related documents with [the Requester’s] seal regarding the transfer of [the Requester’s] domain name YUETU.COM.” In particular, the Request sought documents relating to the transfer of the domain name from registrars Xin Net Technology Corporation to eNom, Inc. to Name.com.
- Request 20150312-1: James Gannon (12 March 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of the Root Zone KSK Operator Function Termination Plan specified in the Section C.7.3 Plan for Transition to Successor Contractor.
- Request 20150314-1: James Gannon (14 March 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of the Contingency and Continuity of Operations Plan as “specified in Section 1.7.2.1 of the ICANN Response to [the National Telecommunications and Information Administration] RFP Solicitation No: SA1301-12-RP-0043.”
- Request 20150407-1: Paul Kane (7 April 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of “all work-flow process documents with accompanying performance statistics for each stage of the IANA Root Zone Management function.”
- Request 20150427-1: James Bridle (27 April 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of “any and all documents available which relate to the delegation and operation of the .io domain, including correspondence between ICANN and the delegate, and any other information held.”
- Request 20150605-1: Flip Petillion on behalf of Travel Reservations SRL (formerly Despegar Online SRL), Donuts Inc. (and its subsidiary Spring McCook, LLC), Fegistry LLC, Minds + Machines Group Limited (formerly Top Level Domain Holdings Limited), and Radix FZC (and its subsidiary DotHotel Inc.) (5 June 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of various information regarding the data exposure issue in the New gTLD Applicant and GDD (Global Domains Division) portals

that was first reported on 1 March 2015. The Requesters also requested a copy of the terms and conditions to which D. Krischenowski agreed and the correspondence with D. Krischenowski and his legal counsel.

- Request 20150717-1: Edward Morris on behalf of himself as a GNSO Council member (17 July 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of the following three categories of information: (1) a copy of the contract between ICANN and Westlake Governance Limited retaining Westlake to conduct a review of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (“GNSO Review”); (2) all documentation regarding instructions by ICANN to Westlake and responses thereto concerning the performance and duties of Westlake under the contract, including those pertaining to the scope and methodology of the GNSO Review; and (3) all documentation relating to remedies ICANN may have should the performance of Westlake in the GNSO Review not be considered satisfactory.
- Request 20150722-1: The Centre for Internet & Society (22 July 2015)
The DIDP Request references the Requester’s prior DIDP Request No. 20141228-1- NETmundial and now requests the disclosure of “all existing documents within ICANN which represent its efforts to implement the NETmundial Principles within its working,” and “all the documents which were modified as the result of ICANN’s support of the NETmundial Initiative, highlighting the modification so made.”
- Request 20150722-2: The Centre for Internet & Society (22 July 2015)
The DIDP Request references the Requester’s prior DIDP Request No. 20141222-1 and now requests the disclosure of the “raw data with respect to granular income/revenue statements of ICANN from 1999-2011.”
- Request 20150727-1: Kevin Murphy (27 July 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of unredacted copies of every document and exhibit that was filed in the DotConnectAfrica Trust (DCA Trust) v. ICANN IRP as well as transcripts and/or audio/video recordings of all in-person, online or telephonic hearings that took place in that IRP.
- Request 20150901-1: Padmini Baruah on behalf of The Centre for Internet & Society (1 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of documentary information relating to ICANN Contractual Compliance’s Audit Program, specifically regarding registry audits.
- Request 20150901-2: Padmini Baruah on behalf of The Centre for Internet & Society (1 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of documentary information relating to ICANN Contractual Compliance’s Audit Program, specifically regarding registrar audits.
- Request 20150901-3: Padmini Baruah on behalf of The Centre for Internet & Society (1 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of “copies of documents showing action taken by ICANN stemming from discrepancies in contractual compliance [b]y Verisign, as revealed from the aforementioned audits.”
- Request 20150901-4: Padmini Baruah on behalf of The Centre for Internet & Society (1 September 2015)

The DIDP Request referenced a registrar's obligation, under the 2013 Registration Accreditation Agreement, "to maintain an abuse contact to receive reports of abuse, and to take prompt action to investigate and respond to reports of such abuse," and requested disclosure of: (1) "Reports of illegal activity submitted to these contacts in the past year (2014-2015)"; and (2) "Records relating to the action taken by the registrars that have been submitted to ICANN over the past year."

- Request 20150901-5: Padmini Baruah on behalf of The Centre for Internet & Society (1 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of the following documents and information relating to ICANN's Contractual Compliance Department Audit Program: (1) "the names of the 25 people working on contractual compliance as specified by Mr. Chehad[e] in the briefing"; (2) "a copy of the document that calls for appointments to the post of the contractual compliance auditor"; and (3) "the contracts that appoint said individuals as compliance auditors."
- Request 20150901-6: Padmini Baruah on behalf of The Centre for Internet & Society (1 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of "a document containing the contents of the internal website," "accessible to the employees and staff of ICANN."
- Request 20150910-1: Mark Seiden (10 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of "all information on security incidents reported to ICANN during 2013, 2014, 2015 to date under section 3.20 (iii) of the RAA."
- Request 20150918-1: CPA Australia (18 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of documentary information relating to the Community Priority Evaluation Expert Determination of the Requester's community application for .CPA.
- Request 20150919-1: American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) (18 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of documentary information relating to the Community Priority Evaluation Expert Determination of the Requester's community application for .CPA.
- Request 20150921-1: Foggy Sunset, LLC (21 September 2015)
The DIDP Request sought disclosure of documentary information relating to the Community Priority Evaluation Expert Determination of the Requester's (a subsidiary of Donuts, Inc.) community application for .SPA.