

To: Arif Ali on behalf of DotMusic Limited

Date: 4 June 2017

Re: Request No. 20170505-1

Thank you for your request for documentary information dated 5 May 2017 (Request), which was submitted through the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) on behalf of DotMusic Limited (DotMusic). For reference, a copy of your Request is attached to the email transmitting this Response.

Items Requested

Your Request seeks the disclosure of the following documentary information relating to the Board initiated review of the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process:

1. The identity of the individual or firm undertaking the Review;
2. The selection process, disclosures, and conflict checks undertaken in relation to the appointment;
3. The date of appointment of the evaluator;
4. The terms of instructions provided to the evaluator;
5. The materials provided to the evaluator by the EIU;
6. The materials provided to the evaluator by ICANN staff/legal, outside counsel or ICANN's Board or any subcommittee of the Board;
7. The materials submitted by affected parties provided to the evaluator;
8. Any further information, instructions or suggestions provided by ICANN and/or its staff or counsel to the evaluator;
9. The most recent estimates provided by the evaluator for the completion of the investigation; and
10. All materials provided to ICANN by the evaluator concerning the Review

Response

Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) is a method to resolve string contention for new gTLD applications. CPE occurs if a community application is both in contention and elects to pursue CPE. The evaluation is an independent analysis conducted by a panel from the CPE provider. The CPE panel's role is to determine whether a community-based application fulfills the community priority criteria. (See Applicant Guidebook, § 4.2; *see also*, CPE webpage at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.) As part of its process, the CPE provider reviews and scores a community applicant that has elected CPE against the following four criteria: Community Establishment; Nexus between Proposed String and

Community; Registration Policies, and Community Endorsement. An application must score at least 14 out of 16 points to prevail in a community priority evaluation; a high bar because awarding priority eliminates all non-community applicants in the contention set as well as any other non-prevailing community applicants. (*See id.*)

At various times in the implementation of the New gTLD Program, the ICANN Board has considered aspects of the CPE process. Recently, the Board discussed certain concerns that some applicants have raised with the CPE process, including issues that were identified in the Final Declaration from the Independent Review Process (IRP) proceeding initiated by Dot Registry, LLC. (*See* Dot Registry IRP Final Declaration at <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/irp-dot-registry-final-declaration-redacted-29jul16-en.pdf>.) The Board decided it would like to have some additional information related to how the ICANN organization interacts with the CPE provider, and in particular with respect to the CPE provider's CPE reports. On 17 September 2016, the Board directed the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to undertake a review of the process by which the ICANN organization has interacted with the CPE provider. (*See* <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-09-17-en>.)

Further, as Chris Disspain, the Chair of the Board Governance Committee, stated in his [letter of 26 April 2017 to concerned parties](#), during its 18 October 2016 meeting, the BGC discussed potential next steps regarding the review of pending Reconsideration Requests pursuant to which some applicants are seeking reconsideration of CPE results. Among other things, the BGC noted that certain complainants have requested access to the documents that the CPE panels used to form their decisions and, in particular, the independent research that the panels conducted. The BGC decided, as part of the President and CEO's review, to request from the CPE provider the materials and research relied upon by the CPE panels in making determinations with respect to certain pending CPEs to help inform the BGC's determinations regarding certain recommendations or pending Reconsideration Requests related to CPE.

As described in the [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update](#), dated 2 June 2017, in November 2017, FTI Consulting, Inc.'s (FTI) Global Risk and Investigations Practice (GRIP) and Technology Practice was chosen to assist in the CPE review following consultation with various candidates. FTI was selected because it has the requisite skills and expertise to undertake this investigation. FTI's GRIP and Technology Practice teams provide a multidisciplinary approach to business-critical investigations, combining the skill and experience of former prosecutors, law enforcement officials and regulators with forensic accountants, professional researchers, anti-corruption investigators, computer forensic, electronic evidence and enterprise data analytic specialists. On 13 January 2017, FTI signed an engagement letter to perform the review.

As described in the [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update](#), dated 2 June 2017, the scope of the review consists of: (1) review of the process by which the

ICANN organization interacted with the CPE provider related to the CPE reports issued by the CPE provider; (2) review of the consistency in which the CPE criteria were applied; and (3) review of the research process undertaken by the CPE panels to form their decisions and compilation of the reference materials relied upon by the CPE panels to the extent such reference materials exist for the evaluations which are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests.

The review is being conducted in two parallel tracks. The first track focuses on gathering information and materials from the ICANN organization, including interviews and document collection. This work was completed in early March 2017. The second track focuses on gathering information and materials from the CPE provider. This work is still ongoing. FTI is currently waiting on responses from the CPE provider related to the requests for information and documents. The CPE provider is seeking to provide its responses to the information requests by the end of the week and is currently evaluating the document requests. Once the underlying information and data collection is complete, FTI anticipates that it will be able to inform ICANN of its findings within two weeks. (See [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update](#), dated 2 June 2017.)

Items 1 – 4

Items 1 through 4 seek the disclosure of the identity of the individual or firm undertaking the Review (Item 1), “[t]he selection process, disclosures, and conflict checks undertaken in relation to the appointment” (Item 2), the date of appointment (Item 3), and the terms of instructions provided to the evaluator (Item 4). The information responsive to these items were provided in the [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update and above](#). With respect to the disclosures and conflicts checks undertaken in relation to the selection of the evaluator, FTI conducted an extensive conflicts check related to the ICANN organization, the CPE provider, ICANN’s outside counsel, and all the parties that underwent CPE.

Items 5-6

Items 5 and 6 seeks the disclosure of the materials provided to the evaluator by the CPE provider (Item 5) and materials provided to the evaluator by ICANN staff/legal, outside counsel or ICANN’s Board or any subcommittee of the Board (Item 6). As detailed in the [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update](#), the review is being conducted in two parallel tracks. The first track focuses on gathering information and materials from the ICANN Organization, including interviews and document collection. This work was completed in early March 2017. As part of the first track, ICANN provided FTI with the following materials:

- New gTLD Applicant Guidebook, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb>
- CPE reports, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#invitations>
- CPE Panel Process Document, <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/panel-process-07aug14-en.pdf>

- EIU Contract and SOW Information, <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/eiu-contract-sow-information-08apr15-en.zip>
- CPE Guidelines, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/guidelines-27sep13-en.pdf>
- Updated CPE FAQs, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/faqs-10sep14-en.pdf>
- CPE Processing Timeline, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/timeline-10sep14-en.pdf>
- CPE webpage and all materials referenced on the CPE webpage, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>
- Reconsideration Requests related to CPEs and all related materials, including BGC recommendations or determinations, Board determinations, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en>, and the applicable BGC and Board minutes and Board briefing materials, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/2017-board-meetings>
- Independent Review Process (IRP) related to CPEs and all related materials, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/irp-en>, Board decisions related to the IRP and the corresponding Board minutes and Board briefing materials, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/2017-board-meetings>
- Board Resolution 2016.09.17.01, <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-09-17-en>
- Minutes of 17 September 2016 Board meeting, <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2016-09-17-en>
- Briefing materials related to Board Resolution 2016.09.17.01, <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/bm/briefing-materials-1-redacted-17sep16-en.pdf>
- Minutes of 18 October 2016 BGC meeting, <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-bgc-2016-10-18-en>
- New gTLD Program Implementation Review regarding CPE, <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/program-review-29jan16-en.pdf> at section 4.1
- Correspondence between the ICANN organization and the CPE provider regarding the evaluations, including any document and draft CPE reports that were exchanged.

With the exception of the correspondence between the ICANN organization and the CPE provider regarding the evaluations, all materials provided to the evaluator are publicly available. Regarding the internal correspondence between the ICANN organization and the CPE provider, these documents are not appropriate for disclosure for the same reasons identified in ICANN's response to the DIDP previously submitted by DotMusic Limited. Rather than repeating those here, see Response to DIDP Request No. 20160429-1, <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/didp-20160429-1-dotmusic->

[response-supporting-docs-15may16-en.pdf](#). The second track of the review focuses on gathering information and materials from the CPE provider. As noted [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update](#) of 2 June 2017, this work is still ongoing. FTI is currently waiting on responses from the CPE provider related to the requests for information and documents.

Item 7

Item 7 seeks “[t]he materials submitted by affected parties provided to the evaluator.” It is unclear what the term “affected parties” is intended to cover. To the extent that the term is intended to reference the applicants that underwent CPE, FTI was provided with the following materials submitted by community applicants:

- All CPE reports, <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#invitations>
- Reconsideration Requests related to CPEs and all related materials, including BGC recommendations or determinations, Board determinations, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/reconsideration-en>, and the applicable BGC and Board minutes and Board briefing materials, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/2017-board-meetings>
- Independent Review Process (IRP) related to CPEs and all related materials, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/accountability/irp-en>, Board decisions related to the IRP and the corresponding Board minutes and Board briefing materials, available at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/2017-board-meetings>
- All public comments received on the applications that underwent evaluation, which are publicly available at <https://gtldresult.icann.org/application-result/applicationstatus> for each respective application

Items 8

Item 8 seeks the disclosure of “[a]ny further information, instructions or suggestions provided by ICANN and/or its staff or counsel to the evaluator.” This item overlaps with Items 4 and 5. The information responsive to the overlapping items has been provided in response to Items 4 and 5 above.

Item 9

Item 9 asks for an estimate of completion of the review. The information responsive to this item has been provided [Community Priority Evaluation Process Review Update](#) of 2 June 2017. ICANN anticipates on publishing further updates as appropriate.

Item 10

Item 10 requests the disclosure of “[a]ll materials provided to ICANN by the evaluator concerning the Review.” As noted, the review is still in process. To date, FTI has provided ICANN with requests for documents and information to ICANN and the CPE provider. These documents are not appropriate for disclosure based on the following applicable DIDP Defined Conditions of Non-Disclosure:

- Internal information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications, including internal documents, memoranda, and other similar communications to or from ICANN Directors, ICANN Directors' Advisors, ICANN staff, ICANN consultants, ICANN contractors, and ICANN agents.
- Information exchanged, prepared for, or derived from the deliberative and decision-making process between ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to compromise the integrity of the deliberative and decision-making process between and among ICANN, its constituents, and/or other entities with which ICANN cooperates by inhibiting the candid exchange of ideas and communications.
- Information subject to the attorney– client, attorney work product privilege, or any other applicable privilege, or disclosure of which might prejudice any internal, governmental, or legal investigation.
- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

Notwithstanding the applicable Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure identified in this Response, ICANN also evaluated the documents subject to these conditions to determine if the public interest in disclosing them outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure. ICANN has determined that there are no circumstances for which the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the harm that may be caused by the requested disclosure.

About DIDP

ICANN's DIDP is limited to requests for documentary information already in existence within ICANN that is not publicly available. In addition, the DIDP sets forth Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure. To review a copy of the DIDP, please see <http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency/didp>. ICANN makes every effort to be as responsive as possible to the entirety of your Request. As part of its accountability and transparency commitments, ICANN continually strives to provide as much information to the community as is reasonable. We encourage you to sign up for an account at ICANN.org, through which you can receive daily updates regarding postings to the portions of ICANN's website that are of interest. We hope this information is helpful. If you have any further inquiries, please forward them to didp@icann.org.