

To: Arif Ali on behalf of dotgay LLC

Date: 14 February 2018

Re: Request No. 20180115-1

Thank you for your request for documentary information dated 15 January 2018 (Request), which was submitted through the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers' (ICANN) Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) on behalf of dotgay LLC (dotgay). 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 (the CPE Process Review or the Review):

1. All “[i]nternal e-mails among relevant ICANN organization personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations (including e-mail attachments)” that were provided to FTI by ICANN as part of its independent review;
2. All “[e]xternal e-mails between relevant ICANN organization personnel and relevant CPE Provider personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations (including e-mail attachments)” that were provided to FTI by ICANN as part of its independent review;
3. The “list of search terms” provided to ICANN by FTI “to ensure the comprehensive collection of relevant materials;”
4. All “100,701 emails, including attachments, in native format” provided to FTI by ICANN in response to FTI’s request;
5. All emails provided to FTI that (1) are “largely administrative in nature,” (2) discuss[] the substan[ce] of the CPE process and specific evaluations,” and (3) are “from the CPE Provider inquiring as to the scope of Clarifying Questions and specifically whether a proposed Clarifying Question was permissible under applicable guidelines;”
6. All draft CPE Reports concerning .GAY, both with and without comments;
7. All draft CPE Reports concerning .GAY in redline form, and/or feedback or suggestions given by ICANN to the CPE Provider;

8. All draft CPE Reports reflecting an exchange between ICANN and the CPE Provider in response to ICANN's questions "regarding the meaning the CPE Provider intended to convey;"
9. All documents provided to FTI by Chris Bare, Steve Chan, Jared Erwin, Christina Flores, Russell Weinstein, and Christine Willett;
10. The 13 January 2017 engagement letter between FTI and ICANN;
11. The original Request for Proposal (RFP) pertaining to the FTI's review of the CPE process;
12. All of the "CPE Provider's working papers associated with" dotgay's CPE;
13. "The CPE Provider's internal documents pertaining to the CPE process and evaluations, including working papers, draft reports, notes, and spreadsheets;"
14. All notes, transcripts, recordings, and documents created in response to FTI's interviews of the "relevant ICANN organization personnel;"
15. All notes, transcripts, recordings, and documents created in response to FTI's interviews of the "relevant CPE Provider personnel;"
16. FTI's investigative plan used during its independent review;
17. FTI's "follow-up communications with CPE Provider personnel in order to clarify details discussed in the earlier interviews and in the materials provided;"
18. All communications between ICANN and FTI regarding FTI's independent review;
19. All communications between ICANN and the CPE Provider regarding FTI's independent review; and
20. All communications between FTI and the CPE Provider regarding FTI's independent review.
21. All documents and communications regarding the scope of FTI's independent review.

Response

The CPE Process Review

CPE is a contention resolution mechanism available to applicants that self-designated their applications as community applications. ([Applicant Guidebook](#), Module 4.2 at Pg.

4-7; see also <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.) CPE is defined in Module 4.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, and allows a community-based application to undergo an evaluation against the criteria as defined in section 4.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook, to determine if the application warrants the minimum score of 14 points (out of a maximum of 16 points) to earn priority and thus prevail over other applications in the contention set. ([Applicant Guidebook](#) at Module 4.2 at Pg. 4-7.) CPE will occur only if a community-based applicant selects to undergo CPE for its relevant application and after all applications in the contention set have completed all previous stages of the new gTLD evaluation process.

CPE is performed by an independent provider (CPE Provider). As part of the evaluation process, the CPE panels review and score a community application submitted to CPE against four criteria: (i) Community Establishment; (ii) Nexus between Proposed String and Community; (iii) Registration Policies; and (iv) Community Endorsement.

Consistent with ICANN organization's Mission, Commitments, and Core Values set forth in the Bylaws, and specifically in an effort to operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner, ICANN organization provided added transparency into the CPE process by establishing a CPE webpage on the New gTLD microsite, at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>, which provides detailed information about CPEs. In particular, the following information can be accessed through the CPE webpage:

- CPE results, including information regarding to the Application ID, string, contention set number, applicant name, CPE invitation date, whether the applicant elected to participate in CPE, and the CPE status.
(<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#invitations>)
- CPE Panel Process Document
(<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/panel-process-07aug14-en.pdf>)
- CPE Provider Contract and Statement of Work Information (SOW)
(<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/eiu-contract-sow-information-08apr15-en.zip>)
- CPE Guidelines (<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/guidelines-27sep13-en.pdf>)
- Draft CPE Guidelines (<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/guidelines-16aug13-en.pdf>)
- Community Feedback on Draft CPE Guidelines
(<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#invitations>)
- Updated CPE Frequently Asked Questions
(<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/faqs-10sep14-en.pdf>)

- CPE Processing Timeline (<http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/timeline-10sep14-en.pdf>)

On 17 September 2016, the Board directed the President and CEO, or his designees, to undertake a review of the “process by which ICANN [organization] interacted with the [Community Priority Evaluation] CPE Provider, both generally and specifically with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider” as part of the Board’s oversight of the New gTLD Program (Scope 1). (<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2016-09-17-en#1.a>.) The Board’s action was part of the ongoing discussions regarding various aspects of the CPE process.

Thereafter, the Board Governance Committee (BGC) determined that the review should also include: (i) an evaluation of whether the CPE criteria were applied consistently throughout each CPE report (Scope 2); and (ii) a compilation of the research relied upon by the CPE Provider to the extent such research exists for the evaluations that are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests relating to the CPE process (Scope 3). (<https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-bgc-2016-10-18-en>.) Scopes 1, 2, and 3 are collectively referred to as the CPE Process Review. The BGC determined that the following pending Reconsideration Requests would be on hold until the CPE Process Review was completed: 14-30 (.LLC),¹ 14-32 (.INC),² 14-33 (.LLP), 16-3 (.GAY), 16-5 (.MUSIC), 16-8 (.CPA), 16-11 (.HOTEL), and 16-12 (.MERCK). ([Letter from Chris Disspain, 26 April 2017](#).)

In November 2016, FTI Consulting Inc.’s (FTI) Global Risk and Investigations Practice (GRIP) and Technology Practice was chosen to assist in the CPE Process Review following consultation with various candidates. On 13 January 2017, FTI was retained by ICANN’s outside counsel, Jones Day, to perform the review. ([CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017](#).)

On 2 June 2017, in furtherance of its effort to operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner, and to provide additional transparency on the progress of the CPE Process Review, ICANN organization issued a status update. ([CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017](#).) Among other things, ICANN organization informed the community that 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. (See [CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017](#).)

¹ Reconsideration Request 14-30 was withdrawn on 7 December 2017. See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-14-30-dotregistry-request-redacted-07dec17-en.pdf>.

² Reconsideration Request 14-32 was withdrawn on 11 December 2017. See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/reconsideration-14-32-dotregistry-request-redacted-11dec17-en.pdf>.

The [2 June 2017 update](#) also provided the community with additional information regarding the CPE Process Review, including that it was being conducted on two parallel tracks by FTI. The first track focused on gathering information and materials from ICANN organization, including interviewing relevant ICANN organization personnel and document collection. This work was completed in early March 2017. The second track focused on gathering information and materials from the CPE Provider, including interviewing relevant personnel. This work was still ongoing at the time ICANN organization issued the 2 June 2017 status update. (See [CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017.](#))

On 1 September 2017, ICANN organization issued a second update on the CPE Process Review. ICANN organization advised that the interview process of the CPE Provider's personnel that were involved in CPEs had been completed. ([CPE Process Review Update, 1 September 2017.](#)) The update further informed that FTI was working with the CPE Provider to obtain the CPE Provider's communications and working papers, including the reference material cited in the CPE reports prepared by the CPE Provider for the evaluations that are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests. (See [CPE Process Review Update, 1 September 2017.](#)) On 4 October 2017, FTI completed its investigative process relating to the second track. (See [Minutes of BGC Meeting, 27 Oct. 2017.](#))

On 13 December 2017, consistent with its commitment to transparency, ICANN organization published FTI's three reports on the CPE Process Review (CPE Process Review Reports or the Reports) on the CPE webpage, and issued an announcement advising the community that the Reports were available. (<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe#process-review>; <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2017-12-13-en>.)

For Scope 1, "FTI conclude[d] that there is no evidence that ICANN organization had any undue influence on the CPE Provider with respect to the CPE reports issued by the CPE Provider or engaged in any impropriety in the CPE process....While FTI understands that many communications between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider were verbal and not memorialized in writing, and thus FTI was not able to evaluate them, FTI observed nothing during its investigation and analysis that would indicate that any verbal communications amounted to undue influence or impropriety by ICANN organization." ([Scope 1 Report](#), Pg. 4.)

For Scope 2, "FTI conclude[d] that the CPE Provider consistently applied the criteria set forth in the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the CPE Guidelines throughout each CPE." ([Scope 2 Report](#), Pg. 3.)

For Scope 3, "[o]f the eight relevant CPE reports, FTI observed two reports (.CPA, .MERCK) where the CPE Provider included a citation in the report for each reference to research. For all eight evaluations (.LLC, .INC, .LLP, .GAY, .MUSIC, .CPA, .HOTEL, and .MERCK), FTI observed instances where the CPE Provider cited reference material in the CPE Provider's working papers that was not otherwise cited in the final CPE report. In addition, in six CPE reports (.LLC, .INC, .LLP, .GAY, .MUSIC, and .HOTEL),

FTI observed instances where the CPE Provider referenced research but did not include citations to such research in the reports. In each instance, FTI reviewed the working papers associated with the relevant evaluation to determine if the citation supporting referenced research was reflected in the working papers. For all but one report, FTI observed that the working papers did reflect the citation supporting referenced research not otherwise cited in the corresponding final CPE report. In one instance—the second .GAY final CPE report—FTI observed that while the final report referenced research, the citation to such research was not included in the final report or the working papers for the second .GAY evaluation. However, because the CPE Provider performed two evaluations for the .GAY application, FTI also reviewed the CPE Provider’s working papers associated with the first .GAY evaluation to determine if the citation supporting research referenced in the second .GAY final CPE report was reflected in those materials. Based upon FTI’s investigation, FTI found that the citation supporting the research referenced in the second .GAY final CPE report may have been recorded in the CPE Provider’s working papers associated with the first .GAY evaluation.” ([Scope 3 Report](#), Pg. 4.)

dotgay’s DIDP Request

dotgay’s DIDP Request seeks the disclosure of documentary information concerning the CPE Process Review. First, as a preliminary matter, the Request seeks many of the same categories of documents that it previously requested in prior DIDPs, to which ICANN has responded, and 17 of the 21 categories of documents requested are identical to categories of documents requested by Mr. Ali on behalf of DotMusic Limited on 10 January 2018.³ (See Requests [20141022-1](#), [20151022-1](#), [20170518-1](#) (all on behalf of dotgay), [20170610-1](#) (on behalf of dotgay and DotMusic Limited), and [20180110-1](#) (on behalf of DotMusic Limited).) Further, the Request seeks documentary information which ICANN organization has already made publicly available. As ICANN organization explained in its responses to dotgay’s previous Requests, and as further discussed below, ICANN organization has provided extensive updates concerning the CPE Process Review on the CPE webpage. ([CPE Webpage, New gTLD microsite](#).) ICANN organization provided updates concerning the CPE Process Review in April 2017, June 2017, and September 2017, and published all three of FTI’s Reports in December 2017. ([CPE Webpage, New gTLD microsite](#).) Additionally, a September 2016 Board resolution and October 2016 BGC minutes, both available on ICANN organization’s website ([Board Resolution 2016.09.17.01](#), [BGC Minutes dated 18 October 2016](#)) reflect more information about the status and direction of the CPE Process Review. Many of the Items sought in the Request were addressed in these publications.

Second, in addition to having been previously requested, many of the Items within the instant Request are overlapping and seek the same information. For example, and as discussed below, Item 1, which seeks emails among relevant ICANN organization

³ Items 1 through 5 of Request 20180110-1 and the instant Request are identical. Items 6 and 7 seek “draft CPE Reports concerning” .GAY in the instant Request and .MUSIC in Request 20180110-1. Items 8 through 10 and 12 through 20 of the instant Request are identical to Items 8 through 19 of Request 20180110-1. Items 11 and 21 of the instant Request were not included in Request 20180110-1.

personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations, Item 2, which seeks emails between relevant ICANN organization personnel and relevant CPE Provider personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations, and Item 5, which seeks three categories of emails provided to FTI, are all encompassed by Item 4, which requests all emails provided to FTI by ICANN organization. Thus, in responding to the Requests, ICANN organization grouped the Items that are overlapping.

Third, dotgay's blanket assertion that none of the DIDP Defined Conditions of Nondisclosure (Nondisclosure Conditions) apply because ICANN's commitment to transparency under the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws requires the disclosure of the materials used by FTI in the CPE Process Review misstates the DIDP Process and misapplies ICANN organization's Mission, Commitments, and Core Values, and adopting it would render the Nondisclosure Conditions meaningless. (See Request at Pgs.1-2.)

The DIDP exemplifies ICANN organization's Commitments and Core Values supporting transparency and accountability by setting forth a procedure through which documents concerning ICANN organization's operations and within ICANN organization's possession, custody, or control that are not already publicly available are made available unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality. ([DIDP](#).) Consistent with its commitment to operating to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner, ICANN organization has published process guidelines for responding to requests for documents submitted pursuant to DIDP (DIDP Response Process). (See [DIDP Response Process](#).) The DIDP Response Process provides that following the collection of potentially responsive documents, "[a] review is conducted as to whether any of the documents identified as responsive to the Request are subject to any of the [Nondisclosure Conditions] identified [on ICANN organization's website]." ([DIDP Response Process](#); see also [Nondisclosure Conditions](#).) Thereafter, if ICANN organization concludes that a document falls within a Nondisclosure Condition, "a review is conducted as to whether, under the particular circumstances, the public interest in disclosing the documentary information outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure." ([DIDP Response Process](#).) "Information that falls within any of the [Nondisclosure Conditions] may still be made public if ICANN determines, under the particular circumstances, that the public interest in disclosing the information outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure." ([DIDP](#).)

Moreover, the Nondisclosure Conditions, and the entire DIDP, were developed through an open and transparent process involving the broader community. The DIDP was developed as the result of an independent review of standards of accountability and transparency within ICANN organization, which included extensive public comment and community input. (See <https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-4-2007-03-29-en>; <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/draft-mop-2007-2007-10-17-en>.) Following the completion of the independent review of standards of accountability and transparency in 2007, ICANN organization sought public comment on the resulting recommendations, and summarized and posted publicly the community feedback. (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/draft-mop-2007-2007-10-17-en>.) Based on the community's feedback, ICANN organization proposed changes to its frameworks and

principles to “outline, define and expand upon the organisation’s accountability and transparency,” (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/acct-trans-frameworks-principles-17oct07-en.pdf>), and sought additional community input on the proposed changes before implementing them. (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/draft-mop-2007-2007-10-17-en>.)

However, neither the DIDP nor ICANN organization’s Commitments and Core Values supporting transparency and accountability obligates ICANN organization to make public every document in ICANN organization’s possession. The DIDP sets forth circumstances (Nondisclosure Conditions) for which those other commitments or core values may compete or conflict with the transparency commitment. These Nondisclosure Conditions represent areas, vetted through public consultation, that the community has agreed are presumed not to be appropriate for public disclosure (and the *Amazon EU S.A.R.L.* Independent Review Process Panel confirmed are consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws). The public interest balancing test in turn allows ICANN organization to determine whether or not, under the specific circumstances, its commitment to transparency outweighs its other commitments and core values. Accordingly, ICANN organization may appropriately exercise its discretion, pursuant to the DIDP, in determining that certain documents are not appropriate for disclosure, without contravening its commitment to transparency.

As the Amazon EU S.A.R.L. Independent Review Process Panel noted in June of 2017:

[N]otwithstanding ICANN’s transparency commitment, both ICANN’s By-Laws and its Publication Practices recognize that there are situations where non-public information, e.g., internal staff communications relevant to the deliberative processes of ICANN . . . may contain information that is appropriately protected against disclosure.

([Amazon EU S.A.R.L. v. ICANN, ICDR Case No. 01-16-000-7056, Procedural Order](#) (7 June 2017), at Pg. 3.) ICANN organization’s Bylaws address this need to balance competing interests such as transparency and confidentiality, noting that “in any situation where one Core Value must be balanced with another, potentially competing Core Value, the result of the balancing test must serve a policy developed through the bottom-up multistakeholder process or otherwise best serve ICANN’s Mission.” (ICANN Bylaws, 22 July 2017, [Art. 1, Section 1.2\(c\)](#).)

Indeed, a critical competing Core Value here is ICANN organization’s Core Value of operating with efficiency and excellence (ICANN Bylaws, at [Art. 1, Section 1.2\(b\)\(v\)](#))) by complying with its contractual obligation to the CPE Provider to maintain the confidentiality of the CPE Provider’s Confidential Information. ICANN organization’s contract with the CPE Provider includes a nondisclosure provision, pursuant to which ICANN organization is required to “maintain [the CPE Provider’s Confidential Information] in confidence,” and “use at least the same degree of care in maintaining its secrecy as it uses in maintaining the secrecy of its own Confidential Information, but in no event less than a reasonable degree of care.” (New gTLD Program Consulting

Agreement between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, Exhibit A § 5, at Pg. 6, 21 November 2011, available at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.) Confidential Information includes “all proprietary, secret or confidential information or data relating to either of the parties and its operations, employees, products or services, and any Personal Information.” (<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.) The materials that the CPE Provider shared with ICANN organization, ICANN organization’s counsel, and FTI reflect the CPE Provider’s Confidential Information, including confidential information relating to its operations, products, and services (i.e. its methods and procedures for conducting CPE analyses), and Personal Information (i.e., its employees’ personally identifying information).

As part of ICANN’s commitment to transparency and information disclosure, when it encounters information that might otherwise be proper for release but is subject to a contractual obligation, ICANN seeks consent from the contractor to release information.⁴ (See, e.g., [Response to Request 20150312-1](#) at Pg. 2.) Here, ICANN organization endeavored to obtain consent from the CPE Provider to disclose certain information relating to the CPE Process Review, but the CPE Provider has not agreed to ICANN organization’s request, and has threatened litigation should ICANN organization breach its contractual confidentiality obligations. ICANN organization’s contractual commitments must be weighed against its other commitments, including transparency. The commitment to transparency does not outweigh all other commitments to require ICANN organization to breach its contract with the CPE Provider. The community-developed Nondisclosure Conditions specifically contemplate nondisclosure obligations like the one in ICANN organization’s contract with the CPE Provider: there is a Nondisclosure Condition for “[i]nformation . . . provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.” ([DIDP](#).)

Items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9

Items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9 seek either the same or overlapping documentary information. Items 1, 2, 4, and 5 seek email correspondence among ICANN organization personnel (Item 1), between ICANN organization personnel and CPE Provider personnel (Item 2), and that ICANN organization provided to FTI (Items 4 and 5). Item 9 seeks documents provided to FTI by ICANN organization personnel Chris Bare, Steve Chan, Jared Erwin, Christina Flores, Russell Weinstein, and Christine Willett. dotgay previously requested these materials in Requests 20141022-1 and 20151022-1, both of which sought disclosure of, among other things, policies, guidelines, directives, instructions or guidance from ICANN organization to the CPE Provider, and Request 20170518-1, which sought disclosure of, among other things, “materials provided to the evaluator [FTI] by” the CPE Provider and by ICANN organization. (See [Response to Request 20170518-1](#), at Pgs. 3-6; [Response to Request 20151022-1](#), at Pgs. 5-6; [Response to Request 20140122-1](#), at Pgs. 3-5.)

⁴ Of note, and as discussed within the Transparency Subgroup of the Work Stream 2 effort for the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability, ICANN’s contracting practice has evolved such that nondisclosure agreements are not entered into as a matter of course, but instead require a showing of business need.

As set forth in the Scope 1 Report, FTI requested that ICANN provide “[i]nternal emails among relevant ICANN organization personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations,” and “[e]xternal emails between relevant ICANN organization personnel and relevant CPE Provider personnel relating to the CPE process and evaluations.” ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 6). FTI’s request encompassed the documents that dotgay now requests in Items 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9. In response to FTI’s request, ICANN organization provided FTI with 100,701 emails, including attachments. The time period covered by the emails received dated from 2012 to March 2017. The 100,701 emails (including attachments) produced to FTI include the documents responsive to Items 1, 2, 5, and 9 that are in ICANN’s possession, custody or control, subject to the applicable Nondisclosure Conditions below.

As noted in the Scope 1 Report, a large number of the emails were not relevant to FTI’s investigation, because the search terms were designed to be over-inclusive. ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pgs. 10-11.) The terms included the names of ICANN organization and CPE Provider personnel who were involved in the CPE process, and other key words that are commonly used in the CPE process, as identified by a review of the Applicant Guidebook and other materials on the ICANN website. After confirming that the initial search terms were overbroad and returned a large number of emails that were not relevant to FTI’s investigation, FTI performed a targeted key word search to identify emails relevant to the CPE process and reduce the time and cost of examining irrelevant or repetitive documents. ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pgs. 10-12.)

The Scope 1 Report states that the relevant emails “generally fell into three categories. First, ICANN organization’s emails with the CPE Provider reflected questions or suggestions made to clarify certain language reflected in the CPE Provider’s draft reports.” “Second, ICANN organization posed questions to the CPE Provider that reflected ICANN organization’s efforts to understand how the CPE Provider came to its conclusions on a specific evaluation.” Third, ICANN organization’s emails included “emails from the CPE Provider inquiring as to the scope of Clarifying Questions and specifically whether a proposed Clarifying Question was permissible under applicable guidelines.” ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pgs. 11-12).

The vast majority of the non-relevant emails related to the CPE process were administrative in nature, such as communications to schedule meetings and conference calls. The emails also concerned correspondence between ICANN organization and its counsel, Jones Day, internal discussions regarding the standards applied to new gTLD applications, correspondence concerning invoices, correspondence with new gTLD and CPE applicants, and correspondence concerning public comments.

ICANN organization’s internal communications relating to the CPE process and evaluations (Items 1, 4, 5 and 9) described in the foregoing paragraphs are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

- 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.

Indeed, dotgay acknowledges in the instant Request that the materials it seeks reflect "ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process."⁵

- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.
- 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.

dotgay asserts that "the attorney-client privilege does not bar disclosure of any requested document" because all requested documents were provided to FTI, which dotgay describes as a third party. (Request at Pg. 2.) dotgay cites California's Evidence Code and *McKesson HBOC, Inc. v. Superior Court*, 115 Cal. App. 4th 1229 (2004) for support of its argument. (*Id.*) However, under California's Evidence Code, "[a] disclosure that is itself privileged is not a waiver of any privilege." (Cal. Evid. Code § 912(c).) And *McKesson HBOC* explains that

where a confidential communication from a client is related by his attorney to a physician, appraiser, or other expert in order to obtain that person's assistance so that the attorney will better be able to advise his client, the disclosure is not a waiver of the privilege.

(115 Cal. App. 4th 1229, 1236-37 (2004).) Here, ICANN organization's outside counsel, Jones Day—not ICANN organization—retained FTI.⁶ Counsel retained FTI as its agent to assist it with its internal investigation of the CPE process, and to provide legal advice to ICANN organization.⁷ Therefore, FTI's draft and working materials are protected by the attorney-client privilege under California law.

⁵ Request at Pg. 3 ("Full disclosure of the documents FTI used during that review will serve the global public interest, further ICANN's transparency obligations, and ensure the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process concerning the CPE process.").

⁶ See FTI's CPE Process Review Reports, each of which indicate they were "Prepared for Jones Day", <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-1-communications-between-icann-cpe-provider-13dec17-en.pdf>, <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-2-cpe-criteria-analysis-13dec17-en.pdf>, <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cpe-process-review-scope-3-cpe-provider-reference-material-compilation-redacted-13dec17-en.pdf>.

⁷ See also *DeLuca v. State Fish Co., Inc.*, 217 Cal. App. 4th 671, 774 (2013) (application of attorney-client privilege to communications to third parties "to whom disclosure is reasonably necessary for the transmission of the information or the accomplishment of the purpose for which the lawyer is consulted . . . clearly includes communications to a consulting expert" (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)).

Further, even if the attorney-client privilege did not apply to documents shared with FTI (which it does), disclosing the content and choice of documents that ICANN organization and the CPE Provider provided to FTI pursuant to ICANN organization's outside counsel's direction, and FTI's draft and working materials, "might prejudice an[] internal . . . investigation"—that is, the CPE Process Review. ([DIDP](#).) Accordingly, such documentary information is subject to a Nondisclosure Condition.

ICANN organization's communications with the CPE Provider relating to the CPE process and evaluations (Items 2, 4, 5 and 9) described above are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- 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.

Again, dotguy acknowledges that the materials it seeks reflect "ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process."⁸

- Personnel, medical, contractual, remuneration, and similar records relating to an individual's personal information, when the disclosure of such information would or likely would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, as well as proceedings of internal appeal mechanisms and investigations.

The CPE Provider's correspondence with ICANN organization contains the Personal Information of CPE Provider personnel. The CPE Provider has expressed concern about revealing the Personal Information of its personnel, and has required that that information not be disclosed pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in ICANN organization's contract with the CPE Provider. ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of that information, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or

⁸ Request at Pg. 3 ("Full disclosure of the documents FTI used during that review will serve the global public interest, further ICANN's transparency obligations, and ensure the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process concerning the CPE process.").

competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.⁹

ICANN organization notes that the correspondence between the CPE Provider and ICANN organization reflects the CPE Provider's Confidential Information, including its processes and methods for completing CPE reports. Therefore, pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in its contract with the CPE Provider, ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of those communications, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency. As noted, ICANN sought the CPE Provider's consent to waive the confidentiality, but this was not granted.

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.
- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

Item 5 seeks

[a]ll emails provided to FTI that (1) are "largely administrative in nature," (2) discuss[] the substan[ce] of the CPE process and specific evaluations," and (3) are "from the CPE Provider inquiring as to the scope of Clarifying Questions and specifically whether a proposed Clarifying Question was permissible under applicable guidelines

To the extent that this Item includes internal email correspondence among the CPE Provider personnel, as noted in the Scope 1 Report, FTI did not receive such documents. ([Scope 1 Report](#) at Pg. 6.) As such, ICANN organization is not in possession, custody, or control of those documents.

Items 3, 14, 15, and 16

Items 3, 14, 15, and 16 seek FTI's list of search terms (Item 3), notes, transcripts, recordings, and documents created in response to FTI's interviews of ICANN organization personnel (Item 14) and of CPE Provider personnel (Item 14), and FTI's investigative plan (Item 16). dotgay previously requested certain of these materials in Request 20170518-1 Item 13, which sought "materials provided to ICANN by [FTI] concerning the [CPE Process] Review." (See [Response to Request 20170518-1](#), at Pgs. 3-4.)

The CPE Process Review Reports includes the information responsive to these Items. Specifically, concerning Item 3, the Scope 1 Report states, "[i]n an effort to ensure the comprehensive collection of relevant emails, FTI provided ICANN organization with a

⁹ New gTLD Program Consulting Agreement between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, Exhibit A § 5, at Pg. 6, 21 November 2011, available at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.

list of search terms and requested that ICANN organization deliver to FTI all email (including attachments) from relevant ICANN organization personnel that ‘hit’ on a search term. The search terms were designated to be over-inclusive, meaning that FTI anticipated that many of the documents that resulted from the search would not be pertinent to FTI’s investigation...the search terms were quite broad and included the names of ICANN organization and CPE Provider personnel who were involved in the CPE process. The search terms also included other key words that are commonly used in the CPE process, as identified by a review of the Applicant Guidebook and other materials on the ICANN website.” ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 10.)

With regard to Item 16, all three CPE Process Review Reports contain detailed descriptions of FTI’s investigative plan. ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pgs. 3-7; [Scope 2 Report](#), at Pgs. 3-9; and [Scope 3 Report](#), at Pgs. 5-8.)

With respect to documents responsive to Items 3, 14, 15, and 16, these documents are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- 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.

As noted above, dotgay acknowledges in the instant Request that the materials it seeks reflect “ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process.”¹⁰

- Personnel, medical, contractual, remuneration, and similar records relating to an individual’s personal information, when the disclosure of such information would or likely would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, as well as proceedings of internal appeal mechanisms and investigations.

FTI’s interviews of CPE Provider personnel referenced the Personal Information of CPE Provider personnel. The CPE Provider has expressed concern about revealing the Personal Information of its personnel, and has required that that information not be disclosed pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in ICANN organization’s contract with the CPE Provider. ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of that information, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

¹⁰ Request at Pg. 3 (“Full disclosure of the documents FTI used during that review will serve the global public interest, further ICANN’s transparency obligations, and ensure the integrity of ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process concerning the CPE process.”).

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.¹¹

ICANN organization notes that FTI's notes of interviews of CPE Provider personnel reflect the CPE Provider's Confidential Information, including its processes and methods for completing CPE reports. Therefore, pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in its contract with the CPE Provider, ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of those materials, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency. ICANN organization does not have possession, custody, or control over any transcripts, recordings, or other documents created in response to these interviews.

- 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.

Items 6, 7, and 8

Items 6, 7, and 8 seek draft CPE reports concerning .GAY (Items 6 and 7) and draft CPE reports reflecting communications between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider concerning ICANN's questions about "the meaning the CPE Provider intended to convey" (Item 8).

The CPE Provider provided to FTI, at FTI's request, "all draft CPE reports, including any drafts that reflected feedback from ICANN organization." ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 15.) Also, as noted above, ICANN organization provided FTI with emails between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider reflecting questions or suggestions made to clarify how the CPE Provider came to its conclusions on a specific evaluation. As discussed above, the CPE provider has objected to disclosure of its work product, including working papers and draft CPE reports, some of which were attached to emails between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, and ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of the draft CPE reports, because they are subject to the nondisclosure provision of ICANN organization's contract with the CPE Provider, which the CPE Provider has not waived.

Although the draft CPE reports may not be disclosed pursuant to the nondisclosure provision, FTI endeavored to describe the relevant aspects of the draft CPE reports in the Reports without violating the nondisclosure provision of ICANN organization's

¹¹ New gTLD Program Consulting Agreement between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, Exhibit A § 5, at Pg. 6, 21 November 2011, available at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.

contract with the CPE Provider. As noted in the Scope 1 Report, ICANN organization's feedback on draft CPE reports was in redline form. All of the comments that FTI was able to attribute to ICANN organization "related to word choice, style and grammar, or requests to provide examples to further explain the CPE Provider's conclusions." ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 16.) ICANN organization's feedback included "an exchange between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider in response to ICANN organization's questions regarding the meaning the CPE Provider intended to convey." ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 16.) It was "clear" to FTI "that ICANN organization was not advocating for a particular score or conclusion, but rather commenting on the clarity of reasoning behind assigning one score or another."

FTI concluded in the Scope 1 Report that "ICANN organization had no role in the [CPE] evaluation process and no role in the writing of the initial draft CPE report." ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 9.) Further, based on its interviews of ICANN organization and CPE Provider personnel, and its review of relevant email communications, FTI concluded that "ICANN organization was not involved in the CPE Provider's research process." ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 9.) Only after the CPE Provider "completed an initial draft CPE report, the CPE Provider would send the draft report to ICANN organization," which "provided feedback to the CPE Provider in the form of comments exchanged via email or written on draft CPE reports as well as verbal comments during conference calls." ([Scope 1 Report](#), at Pg. 9.) "FTI observed that when ICANN organization commented on a draft report, it was only to suggest amplifying rationale based on materials already reviewed and analyzed by the CPE Provider." ([Scope 3 Report](#), at Pg. 10.)

dotgay previously requested these materials in Requests 20151022-1 and 20141022-1, both of which sought disclosure of, among other things, policies, guidelines, directives, instructions or guidance from ICANN organization to the CPE Provider, and Request 20170518-1, which sought disclosure of, among other things, "materials provided to the evaluator [FTI] by" the CPE Provider and by ICANN organization. (See [Response to Request 20170518-1](#), at Pgs. 3-4; [Response to Request 20151022-1](#), at Pgs.5-6; [Response to Request 20141022-1](#), at Pgs. 3-5.)

With respect to documents responsive to Items 6, 7, and 8 as described above, these documents are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- 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.

dotgay acknowledges that the materials it seeks reflect “ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process.”¹²

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.¹³

ICANN organization notes that draft CPE reports reflect the CPE Provider’s Confidential Information, including its processes and methods for completing CPE reports. Therefore, pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in its contract with the CPE Provider, ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of those documents, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

- 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.

Item 10

Item 10 seeks the 13 January 2017 engagement letter between FTI and ICANN. FTI signed an engagement letter with Jones Day, not ICANN organization. ICANN organization was not a party to the engagement. As such, the requested documentary information does not exist.

ICANN organization described the scope of FTI’s review (i.e. the terms of its engagement) and provided links to ICANN organization’s CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017, in response to Item 7 of dotgay’s Request 20170518-1. ([Response to Request 20170518-1](#), at Pgs. 4-5; [CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017](#).)

As described in the CPE Process Review Update, dated 2 June 2017, the scope of the Review consisted 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

¹² Request at Pg. 3 (“Full disclosure of the documents FTI used during that review will serve the global public interest, further ICANN’s transparency obligations, and ensure the integrity of ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process concerning the CPE process.”).

¹³ New gTLD Program Consulting Agreement between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, Exhibit A § 5, at Pg. 6, 21 November 2011, available at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.

reference materials exist for the evaluations which are the subject of pending Reconsideration Requests. (See [CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017.](#))

The 2 June 2017 Update further explained that the Review was being conducted in two parallel tracks by FTI Consulting Inc.'s (FTI) Global Risk and Investigations Practice (GRIP) and Technology Practice. The first track focused on gathering information and materials from ICANN organization, including interviews and document collection. This work was completed in early March 2017. The second track focused on gathering information and materials from the CPE provider. (See [CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017.](#))

Further, even if documents responsive to Item 10 existed, this request is subject to the following Nondisclosure Condition:

- 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.

Item 11

Item 11 seeks the original Request for Proposal (RFP) pertaining to FTI's review of the CPE [P]rocess. ICANN did not issue an RFP concerning the CPE Process Review. As such, the requested documentary information does not exist.

ICANN organization informed the community in the 2 June 2017 CPE Process Review Update that FTI was chosen following consultation with various candidates. FTI was selected because it had 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. (See [CPE Process Review Update, 2 June 2017.](#))

Items 12 and 13

Items 12 and 13 seek the CPE Provider's working papers associated with dotgay's CPE (Item 12) and the CPE Provider's internal documents relating to the CPE process and evaluations, including working papers, draft reports, notes, and spreadsheets (Item 13). dotgay previously requested these materials in Request 20170518-1, which sought disclosure of, among other things, "materials provided to the evaluator [FTI] by" the CPE Provider and by ICANN organization. (See [Response to Request 20170518-1](#), at Pgs. 3-6.)

As discussed above, the CPE provider has objected to disclosure of its work product, including working papers, and ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of the working papers, because they are subject to the nondisclosure provision of ICANN organization's contract with the CPE Provider, which the CPE

Provider has not waived. Although FTI was unable to disclose the contents of the working papers in its Reports, FTI endeavored to describe the relevant aspects of the working papers in the Reports without violating the nondisclosure provision of ICANN organization's contract with the CPE Provider, although ICANN organization was required to redact some of the information that FTI originally included in the Scope 3 Report before publishing it, pursuant to ICANN organization's contractual obligations. (See, e.g., [Scope 3 Report](#), at Pgs. 18-19.)

As noted in the Scope 3 Report, FTI learned in its investigation "that the CPE Provider's evaluators primarily relied upon a database to capture their work (i.e., all notes, research, and conclusions) pertaining to each evaluation. The database was structured with the following fields for each criterion: Question, Answer, Evidence, Sources. The Question section mirrored the questions pertaining to each sub-criterion set forth in the CPE Guidelines. For example, section 1.1.1. in the database was populated with the question, 'Is the community clearly delineated?'; the same question appears in the CPE Guidelines. The 'Answer' field had space for the evaluator to input his/her answer to the question; FTI observed that the answer generally took the form of a 'yes' or 'no' response. In the 'Evidence' field, the evaluator provided his/her reasoning for his/her answer. In the 'Source' field, the evaluator could list the source(s) he/she used to formulate an answer to a particular question, including, but not limited to, the application (or sections thereof), reference material, or letters of support or opposition." ([Scope 3 Report](#), at Pg. 9.)

As explained in the Scope 2 Report, FTI also learned that after two CPE Provider evaluators assessed and scored a CPE application in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook and CPE Guidelines, a "Project Coordinator created a spreadsheet that included sections detailing the evaluators' conclusions on each criterion and sub-criterion. The core team [evaluating the CPE application] then met to review and discuss the evaluators' work and scores. Following internal deliberations among the core team, the initial evaluation results were documented in the spreadsheet." ([Scope 2 Report](#), at Pg. 8.)

With respect to documents responsive to Items 12 and 13 described in the foregoing paragraphs, these documents are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- 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.

dotgay acknowledges in that the materials it seeks reflect “ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process.”¹⁴

- Personnel, medical, contractual, remuneration, and similar records relating to an individual's personal information, when the disclosure of such information would or likely would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, as well as proceedings of internal appeal mechanisms and investigations.

The CPE Provider’s working papers include references to the Personal Information of CPE Provider personnel. The CPE Provider has expressed concern about revealing the Personal Information of its personnel, and has required that that information not be disclosed pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in ICANN organization’s contract with the CPE Provider. ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of that information, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.¹⁵

ICANN organization notes that the CPE Provider’s working papers reflect the CPE Provider’s Confidential Information, including its processes and methods for completing CPE reports. Therefore, pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in its contract with the CPE Provider, ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of those documents, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

- Drafts of all correspondence, reports, documents, agreements, contracts, emails, or any other forms of communication.

Item 17

Item 17 seeks FTI’s follow-up communications with CPE Provider personnel to clarify details discussed in earlier interviews and in materials provided. There is no written follow up communications from FTI to the CPE Provider. As such, ICANN organization is not in possession, custody, or control of any documents responsive to Item 17 because no such documents exist.

¹⁴ Request at Pg. 3 (“Full disclosure of the documents FTI used during that review will serve the global public interest, further ICANN’s transparency obligations, and ensure the integrity of ICANN’s deliberative and decision-making process concerning the CPE process.”).

¹⁵ New gTLD Program Consulting Agreement between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, Exhibit A § 5, at Pg. 6, 21 November 2011, available at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.

Items 18, 19, 20, and 21

Items 18, 19, 20, and 21 seek communications between ICANN organization and FTI (Item 18), ICANN organization and the CPE Provider (Item 19), the CPE Provider and FTI (Item 20) regarding FTI's review, and documents and communications regarding the scope of FTI's review (Item 21).

dotgay previously requested some of these materials in Requests 20141022-1 and 20151022-1, both of which sought disclosure of, among other things, policies, guidelines, directives, instructions or guidance from ICANN organization to the CPE Provider, and Request 20170518-1, which sought disclosure of, among other things, "materials provided to the evaluator [FTI] by" the CPE Provider and by ICANN organization. (See [Response to Request 20170518-1](#), at Pgs. 3-6; [Response to Request 20151022-1](#), at Pgs. 5-6; [Response to Request 20140122-1](#), at Pgs. 3-5.)

With respect to documents responsive to Items 18, 19, 20, and 21, these documents are subject to the following Nondisclosure Conditions:

- 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.

dotgay acknowledges that the materials it seeks reflect "ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process."¹⁶

- Personnel, medical, contractual, remuneration, and similar records relating to an individual's personal information, when the disclosure of such information would or likely would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, as well as proceedings of internal appeal mechanisms and investigations.

The CPE Provider's correspondence with ICANN organization and FTI contains the Personal Information of CPE Provider personnel. The CPE Provider has expressed concern about revealing the Personal Information of its personnel, and has required that that information not be disclosed pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in ICANN organization's contract with the CPE Provider. ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of that information, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the

¹⁶ Request at Pg. 3 ("Full disclosure of the documents FTI used during that review will serve the global public interest, further ICANN's transparency obligations, and ensure the integrity of ICANN's deliberative and decision-making process concerning the CPE process.").

nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

- Information provided to ICANN by a party that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to materially prejudice the commercial interests, financial interests, and/or competitive position of such party or was provided to ICANN pursuant to a nondisclosure agreement or nondisclosure provision within an agreement.¹⁷

ICANN organization notes that the CPE Provider's correspondence reflects the CPE Provider's Confidential Information, including its processes and methods for completing CPE reports. Therefore, pursuant to the nondisclosure clause in its contract with the CPE Provider, ICANN organization is contractually obligated to maintain the confidentiality of that correspondence, and the CPE Provider has not agreed to waive the nondisclosure provision. The DIDP does not require ICANN organization to breach its contractual duties in support of its commitment to transparency.

- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.

Additionally, documents responsive to Item 18 and 21 are subject to the following Nondisclosure Condition:

- 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.

Public Interest in Disclosure of Information Subject to Nondisclosure Conditions

Notwithstanding the applicable Nondisclosure Conditions identified in this Response, ICANN organization has considered whether the public interest in disclosure of the information subject to these conditions at this point in time outweighs the harm that may be caused by such disclosure. ICANN organization has determined that there are no circumstances at this point in time 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 organization makes every effort to be as responsive as possible to the entirety of your Request. As part of its accountability and transparency commitments, ICANN organization continually strives to provide as much information to the community as is reasonable. We encourage you to

¹⁷ New gTLD Program Consulting Agreement between ICANN organization and the CPE Provider, Exhibit A § 5, at Pg. 6, 21 November 2011, available at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe>.

sign up for an account at ICANN.org, through which you can receive daily updates regarding postings to the portions of ICANN organization'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.