

INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION
CASE NO. 01-14-0001-5004

DESPEGAR ONLINE SRL et al.
(Claimants)

And

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED
NAMES AND NUMBERS
(Respondent)

**INDEX TO DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED WITH ICANN'S RESPONSE TO
CLAIMANTS' REQUEST FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW PROCESS**

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
Resp. Ex. 1	<i>Booking.com v. ICANN</i> , ICDR Case No. 50-20-1400-0247, Final Declaration
Resp. Ex. 2	ICANN's Documentary Information Disclosure Policy
Resp. Ex. 3	Process for Responding to ICANN's Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) Requests
Resp. Ex. 4	Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process
Resp. Ex. 5	10 September 2014 Community Priority Evaluation Report for .RADIO

Resp. Ex. 1

INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Independent Review Process Panel

In the Matter of an Independent Review Process

Between:

Booking.com B.V.

Applicant

-and-

ICDR Case No: 50-20-1400-0247

**Internet Corporation for Assigned Names
and Numbers (ICANN)**

Respondent

FINAL DECLARATION

The Panel:

Hon. A. Howard Matz

David H. Bernstein, Esq.

Stephen L. Drymer (Chair)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 2

II. THE PARTIES 3

 A. The Applicant: Booking.com 3

 B. The Respondent: ICANN..... 3

III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND – IN BRIEF 3

 A. ICANN’s Adoption of the New gTLD Program and the Applicant Guidebook 3

 B. Booking.com’s Application for .hotels, and the Outcome 5

 C. DIDP Request and Request for Reconsideration 6

 D. The Cooperative Engagement Process 9

 E. The IRP Proceedings 10

 F. The Hearing 11

IV. ICANN ARTICLES, BYLAWS AND POLICIES – KEY ELEMENTS 11

 A. Articles of Association 11

 B. Bylaws 11

 C. The gTLD Applicant Guidebook 16

 (i) *Initial Evaluation* 16

 (ii) *String Review, including String Similarity Review* 16

V. SUMMARY OF THE PARTIES’ POSITIONS 21

 A. Booking.com’s position 21

 (i) *The Panel’s Authority* 21

 (ii) *Booking.com’s Claims* 22

 a. *The string similarity review process* 22

 b. *The case of .hotels* 24

 B. ICANN’s position 26

 (i) *The Panel’s Authority* 26

 (ii) *ICANN’s Response to Booking.com’s Claims* 27

 a. *The string similarity review process* 27

 b. *The case of .hotels* 29

VI. ANALYSIS 29

 A. The Panel’s Authority 29

 B. The String Similarity Review Process 33

 C. The Case of .hotels 37

 D. Conclusion 42

VII. THE PREVAILING PARTY; COSTS 43

DECLARATION

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED PANELISTS, members of the Independent Review Process Panel (“**IRP Panel**” or “**Panel**”), having been designated in accordance with ICANN Bylaws dated 11 April 2013, hereby issue the following Final Declaration (“**Declaration**”):¹

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This Declaration is issued in the context of an Independent Review Process (“**IRP**”) as provided for in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“**ICANN**”; “**ICANN Bylaws**” or “**Bylaws**”). In accordance with those Bylaws, the conduct of this IRP is governed by the International Arbitration Rules of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution as amended and in effect June 1, 2009 (“**ICDR**”; “**ICDR Rules**”) as supplemented by the Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process (“**Supplementary Procedures**”).
2. The subject matter of the dispute here concerns alleged conduct by the ICANN Board in relation to one particular facet of the process by which new generic top-level domains (“**gTLDs**”, also known as gTLD “**strings**”) are applied for, reviewed and delegated into the Internet’s domain name system (“**DNS**”) root zone.
3. As explained in this Declaration, the Applicant, Booking.com, alleges that, in establishing and overseeing the process by which so-called *string similarity reviews* are conducted, and in refusing to reconsider and overturn a decision to place Booking.com’s applied-for gTLD string .hotels in a so-called *string contention set*, the Board acted in a manner inconsistent with applicable policies, procedures and rules as set out in ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and gTLD Applicant Guidebook (“**Guidebook**”).
4. Reading between the lines of the parties’ submissions, the Panel senses that both sides would welcome the opportunity to contribute to an exchange that might result in enabling disputants in future cases to avoid having to resort to an IRP to resolve issues such as have arisen here. Certainly the Panel considers that the present matter would ideally have been resolved amicably by the parties. This is particularly true given that the matter here concerns two of ICANN’s guiding principles – transparency and fairness – as applied to one of ICANN’s most essential activities – the delegation of new gTLDs² – in circumstances in which various members of the Internet community, including certain members of the ICANN Board’s New gTLD Program Committee, have expressed their own concerns regarding the string similarity review process. That being the case, though, the Panel does not shy away from the duty imposed by the Bylaws to address the questions before it and to render the

¹ As requested by the ICDR, the Declaration was provided to the ICDR in draft form on 26 January 2015 for non-substantive comments on the text (if any). It was returned to the Panel on 2 March 2015.

² As stated in the very first sentence of the Guidebook: “New gTLDs have been in the forefront of ICANN’s agenda since its creation.”

present Declaration, in accordance with, and within the constraints of the Bylaws, the ICDR Rules and the Supplementary Procedures.

II. THE PARTIES

A. The Applicant: Booking.com

5. The Applicant, Booking.com, is a limited liability company established under the law of the Netherlands. Booking.com describes itself as “the number one online hotel reservation service in the world, offering over 435,605 hotels and accommodations.”³ Booking.com’s primary focus is on the U.S. and other English-language markets.
6. Booking.com is represented in this IRP by Mr. Flip Petillion and Mr. Jan Janssen of the law firm *Crowell & Moring* in Brussels, Belgium.

B. The Respondent: ICANN

7. The Respondent, ICANN, is a California not-for-profit public benefit corporation, formed in 1998. As set forth in Article I, Section 1 of its Bylaws, ICANN’s mission is “to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet’s system of unique identifiers, and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet’s unique identifier systems.” ICANN describes itself as “a complex organization that facilitates input from a wide variety of Internet stakeholders. ICANN has a Board of Directors and staff members from around the globe, as well as an Ombudsman. ICANN, however, is much more than just the corporation—it is a community of participants.”⁴
8. ICANN is represented in this IRP by Mr. Jeffrey A. LeVee, Esq. and Ms. Kate Wallace, Esq. of the law firm *Jones Day* in Los Angeles, California, USA.

III. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND – IN BRIEF

9. We recount here certain uncontested elements of the factual and procedural background to the present IRP. Other facts are addressed in subsequent parts of the Declaration, where the parties’ respective claims and the Panel’s analysis are discussed.

A. ICANN’s Adoption of the New gTLD Program and the Applicant Guidebook

10. Even before the introduction of ICANN’s New gTLD Program (“**Program**”), in 2011, ICANN had, over time, gradually expanded the DNS from the original six gTLDs (.com; .edu; .gov; .mil; .net; .org) to 22 gTLDs and over 250 two-letter country-code TLDs.⁵ Indeed, as noted above, the introduction of new gTLDs has been “in the forefront of ICANN’s agenda” for as long as ICANN has existed.

³ Request, ¶ 10.

⁴ Response, ¶ 11-12.

⁵ Request, ¶ 12; see also Guidebook, *Preamble*.

11. The Program has its origins in what the Guidebook refers to as “carefully deliberated policy development work” by the ICANN community.⁶
12. In 2005, ICANN’s Generic Names Supporting Organization (“GNSO”), one of the groups that coordinates global Internet policy at ICANN, commenced a policy development process to consider the introduction of new gTLDs.⁷ As noted in the Guidebook:

Representatives from a wide variety of stakeholder groups – governments, individuals, civil society, business and intellectual property constituencies, and the technology community – were engaged in discussions for more than 18 months on such questions as the demand, benefits and risks of new gTLDs, the selection criteria that should be applied, how gTLDs should be allocated, and the contractual conditions that should be required for new gTLD registries going forward.
13. In October 2007, the GNSO formally completed its policy development work on new gTLDs and approved a set of 19 policy recommendations.
14. In June 2008, the ICANN Board decided to adopt the policies recommended by the GNSO.⁸ As explained in the Guidebook, ICANN’s work next focused on implementation of these recommendations, which it saw as “creating an application and evaluation process for new gTLDs that is aligned with the policy recommendations and provides a clear roadmap for applicants to reach delegation, including Board approval.”⁹
15. This process concluded with the decision by the ICANN Board in June 2011 to implement the New gTLD Program and its foundational instrument, the Guidebook.¹⁰
16. As described by ICANN in these proceedings, the Program “constitutes by far ICANN’s most ambitious expansion of the Internet’s naming system. The Program’s goals include

⁶ Guidebook, *Preamble*

⁷ Request, ¶ 13, Reference Material 7, “Public Comment Forum for Terms of Reference for New gTLDs (6 December 2005), <http://www.icann.org/en/news/announcements/announcement-06dec05-en.htm#TOR>; Reference Material 8, “GNSO Issues Report, Introduction of New Top-Level Domains (5 December 2005) at pp. 3-4. See also Guidebook, *Preamble*. Booking.com refers to the GNSO as “ICANN’s main policy-making body for generic top-level domains”. Article X of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation provides: “There shall be a policy-development body known as the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO), which shall be responsible for developing and recommending to the ICANN Board substantive policies relating to generic top-level domains” (Section 1); the GNSO shall consist of “a number of Constituencies” and “four Stakeholder Groups” (Section 2).

⁸ Guidebook, *Preamble*. A review of this policy process can be found at <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds> (last accessed on January 15, 2015).

⁹ Guidebook, *Preamble*: “This implementation work is reflected in the drafts of the applicant guidebook that were released for public comment, and in the explanatory papers giving insight into rationale behind some of the conclusions reached on specific topics. Meaningful community input has led to revisions of the draft applicant guidebook.”

¹⁰ RM 10 (ICANN resolution). The Guidebook (in its 30 May 2011 version) is one of seven “elements” of the Program implemented in 2011. The other elements were: a draft communications plan; “operational readiness activities”; a program to ensure support for applicants from developing countries; “a process for handling requests for removal of cross-ownership restrictions on operators of existing gTLDs who want to participate in the [Program]”; budgeted expenditures; and a timetable.

enhancing competition and consumer choice, and enabling the benefits of innovation via the introduction of new gTLDs ...”¹¹

17. The Guidebook is “continuously iterated and revised”, and “provides details to gTLD applicants and forms the basis for ICANN’s evaluation of new gTLD applications.”¹² As noted by Booking.com, the Guidebook “is the crystallization of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.”¹³

B. Booking.com’s Application for .hotels, and the Outcome

18. In accordance with the process set out in the Guidebook, Booking.com filed an application (Application ID 1-1016-75482) for the gTLD string .hotels.
19. At the same time, Despegar Online SRL (“Despegar”), a corporation established under the law of Uruguay, applied (Application ID 1-1249-87712) for the string .hoteis.
20. “Hoteis” is the Portuguese word for “hotels”.
21. According to Booking.com, Despegar is “a competitor of Booking.com”.¹⁴ Booking.com claims that it intends “to operate .hotels as a secure Internet environment providing hotel reservation services for consumers, hotels, and other stakeholders,”¹⁵ while Despegar similarly intends .hoteis to be dedicated primarily to “individuals that are interested in, and businesses that offer, hotel- and travel-related content.”¹⁶ That being said, a key difference between the two applications, as Booking.com acknowledges, is that Booking.com intends to focus the services it will offer under its proposed gTLD “on the U.S. (with its strongly Anglo-Saxon traditions) and other English-language markets,”¹⁷ whereas Despegar intends to target “Portuguese-speaking” markets.”¹⁸
22. As part of the Initial Evaluation to which all applied-for gTLDs were subject, .hotels and .hoteis were each required to undergo so-called *string review* in accordance with the Guidebook, the first component of which is a process known as *string similarity review*. As provided by the Guidebook, the string similarity review was conducted by an independent

¹¹ Response, ¶ 14.

¹² Response, ¶ 14. The resolution (RM 10) adopting the Guidebook explicitly “authorizes staff to make further updates and changes to the Applicant Guidebook as necessary and appropriate, including as the possible result of new technical standards, reference documents, or policies that might be adopted during the course of the application process, and to prominently publish notice of such changes.”

¹³ Request, ¶ 13. See also Guidebook, Module 1-2: “This Applicant Guidebook is the implementation of Board approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs, and has been revised extensively via public comment and consultation over a two-year period.”

¹⁴ Request, ¶ 17.

¹⁵ Request, ¶ 5.

¹⁶ Request, ¶ 17. See also Despegar Application for .hoteis (Request, Annex 2), § 18(a).

¹⁷ Request, ¶ 16.

¹⁸ Request, ¶ 17. See also Despegar Application for .hoteis (Request, Annex 2), § 18(a).

String Similarity Panel (“**SSP**”) selected and engaged by ICANN for this purpose. (Extracts of the relevant provisions of the Guidebook can be found below, at Part IV of this Declaration.) ICANN engaged InterConnect Communications Ltd. (“**ICC**”), a company registered under the law of England and Wales, specializing in communications sector strategy, policy and associated regulatory frameworks,¹⁹ in cooperation with University College London, to act as the SSP.

23. On 26 February 2013 ICANN published the results of all of the string similarity reviews for all of the applications for new gTLDs submitted as part of the Program. The announcement revealed, among other things, that two “non-exact match” contention sets had been created: .hotels & .hoteis; and .unicorn & .unicom.²⁰ Booking.com’s applied for string .hotels (as well as the .hoteis, .uncorn and .unicom strings) had thus failed the string similarity review.
24. The results of the string similarity review were notified to Booking.com by ICANN that same day. In its letter of 26 February 2013 ICANN wrote:

After careful consideration and extensive review performed against the criteria in Section 2.2.1.1 of the Applicant Guidebook, the String Similarity Panel has found that the applied-for string (.hotels) is visually similar to another applied-for string (.hoteis), creating a probability of user confusion.

*Due to this finding, the ... two strings have been placed in a contention set.*²¹

25. The impact of being put into a contention set is that the proposed strings in the set will not be delegated in the root zone unless and until the applicants reach agreement on which single string should proceed (with the other proposed string therefore rejected), or until after an auction is conducted, with the highest bidder being given the right to proceed to the next step in the review process.

C. DIDP Request and Request for Reconsideration

26. On 28 March 2013 Booking.com submitted a request for information under ICANN’s Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (“**DIDP Request**”) asking for “all documents directly and indirectly relating to (1) the standard used to determine whether gTLD strings are confusingly similar, and (2) the specific determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar.”²²
27. On the same date, Booking.com also filed a formal Request for Reconsideration (“**Request for Reconsideration**”). The “specific action(s)” that Booking.com asked to be reconsidered were: the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set; and the decision not to

¹⁹ See <http://www.icc-uk.com/>

²⁰ Request, Annex 3. ICANN published document dated 26 February 2013. As its name suggests, a “non-exact match” connotes a determination that two different (non-identical) strings are visually similar within the meaning of the Guidebook. Another 752 applied-for gTLDs were put into 230 identical contention sets.

²¹ Request, Annex 3, ICANN letter dated 26 February 2013.

²² Request, ¶ 30 and Annex 3.

provide a “detailed analysis or a reasoned basis” for the decision to place .hotels in contention.²³

28. ICANN responded to the DIDP Request on 27 April 2013. Although ICANN provided certain information regarding the review process, in its response to the DIDP Request, ICANN also noted:

The SSP is responsible for the development of its own process documentation and methodology for performing the string similarity review, and is also responsible for the maintenance of its own work papers. Many of the items that are sought from ICANN within the [DIDP] Request are therefore not in existence within ICANN and cannot be provided in response to the DIDP Request. ICANN will, however, shortly be posting the SSP's String Similarity Process and Workflow on the New gTLD microsite ...²⁴

29. By letter dated 9 May 2013 Booking.com replied to ICANN, writing that “ICANN’s response fails to provide any additional information or address any of Booking.com’s concerns as conveyed in its DIDP Request or Request for Reconsideration.”²⁵ On 14 May 2013, ICANN answered that it “intends to post the string similarity process documentation on or before ... 17 May 2013.”²⁶ ICANN further informed Booking.com that “ICANN will afford you 30 days from the posting of the process document for the submission of a revised Request for Reconsideration.”²⁷
30. On 7 June 2013, ICANN published the “String Similarity New gTLD Evaluation Panel [i.e., the SSP] – Process Description” (“**SSP Process Description**”).²⁸
31. On 26 June 2013 Booking.com wrote to ICANN regarding both its DIDP Request and its 28 March 2013 Request for Reconsideration. In its letter, Booking.com noted among other things that “the generalized information ICANN thus far has provided does not explain a rationale for or analysis for the decision to put .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set and therefore does not allow Booking.com to appropriately amend its Request for Reconsideration.” The letter concluded by stating: “Considering ICANN’s obligations of transparency and accountability, there cannot be any ‘compelling reason for confidentiality’.

²³ Request, Annex 12, §3. The Request for Reconsideration (which appears to be in the form of a template) expressly states at §2 that it is a “Request for Reconsideration of ... Staff [vs. Board] action/inaction.” The cover letter attaching the Request states that, “[d]espite the fact that the origin of the decisions is unclear, this Reconsideration Request is being submitted as a reconsideration of a ‘Staff action’. In the event that the decisions referenced above are determined to be a ‘Board action’, this request may be amended.” As explained below, the Request for Reconsideration was amended on 7 July 2013. That amendment did not alter the stated nature of the request in §2 or the description of the specific actions that Booking.com sought to have reconsidered (§3). Unless otherwise indicated, all further references in this Declaration to the Request for Reconsideration are understood to be the *amended* Request for Reconsideration.

²⁴ Request, Annex 5.

²⁵ Request, Annex 6.

²⁶ Request, Annex 7.

²⁷ Request, Annex 7.

²⁸ Request, Annex 8.

And ... there are numerous compelling reasons for publication of [the information requested by Booking.com].”²⁹

32. ICANN responded on 25 July 2013, explaining among other things that “the evaluation of the .hotels string by the SSP panel was performed according to the [SSP Process Description] ...” and “[t]he SSP’s work was subjected to quality review, as has been publicly discussed.”³⁰ Approximately six months later, on 9 January 2014, ICANN posted a letter dated 18 December 2013 addressed to ICANN by the SSP Manager at ICC (Mr. Mark McFadden) providing a further “summary of the process, quality control mechanisms and some considerations surrounding the non-exact contention sets for the string similarity evaluation ...” (“**SSP Manager’s Letter**”).³¹ According to that Letter:

When ALL of the following features of a pairwise comparison [of non-exact match strings] are evident the evaluators found the string pair to be confusingly similar:

- *Strings of similar visual length on the page;*
- *Strings within +/- 1 character of each other;*
- *Strings where the majority of characters are the same and in the same position in each string; and*
- *The two strings possess letter combinations that visually appear similar to other letters in the same position in each string*

o For example m~m & l~i

33. Meanwhile, on 7 July 2013 Booking.com had submitted its amended Request for Reconsideration. In its letter attaching the amended Request for Reconsideration, Booking.com stated: “Booking.com reserves the right to further amend its Request for Reconsideration upon receipt of the information it previously requested and urges ICANN to publish the requested information as specified in our letter of 26 June 2013.”³²
34. By virtue of Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws, ICANN’s Board Governance Committee (“**BGC**”) is charged with evaluating and making recommendation to the Board with respect to requests for reconsideration. The Board’s New gTLD Program Committee (“**NGPC**”) receives and acts on such recommendations on behalf of the ICANN Board. In accordance with this procedure, Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was evaluated by the BGC. In a detailed analysis dated 1 August 2013, the BGC “conclude[d] that Booking.com has not

²⁹ Request, Annex 9.

³⁰ Request, Annex 10.

³¹ Request, Annex 11.

³² Request, Annex 13.

stated proper grounds for reconsideration and we therefor recommend that Booking.com's request be denied" ("**BGC Recommendation**").³³

35. At a telephone meeting held on 10 September 2013 the NGPC, "bestowed with the powers of the Board", considered, discussed and accepted the BGC Recommendation. Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration was denied.³⁴

D. The Cooperative Engagement Process

36. Booking.com thereafter filed a request for a Cooperative Engagement Process ("**CEP**") on 25 September 2013, with a view to attempting to reach an amicable resolution of its dispute with ICANN. In its CEP request, Booking.com wrote:

*Booking.com is of the opinion that Resolution 2013.09.10.NG02 [the Board resolution denying its Request for Reconsideration] violates various provisions of ICANN's Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation. In particular Booking.com considers that ICANN's adoption of [the Resolution] is in violation of Articles I, II(3), II and IV of the ICANN Bylaws as well as Article 4 of ICANN's Articles of Incorporation. In addition, Booking.com considers that ICANN has acted in violation of Articles 3, 5, 7 and 9 of ICANN's Affirmation of Commitment ...*³⁵

37. The CEP ultimately did not result in a resolution, and Booking.com duly commenced the present IRP.
38. One further point should be made, here, prior to describing the commencement and conduct of the present IRP proceedings: The determination by the SSP that .hotels and .hoteis are so visually similar as to give rise to the probability of user confusion, and the resulting placement of those applied-for strings into a contention set, does *not* mean that Booking.com's application for .hotels has been denied or that .hotels will not proceed to delegation to the root zone. Rather, as noted above and explained in the extracts from the Guidebook reproduced below, the Guidebook establishes a process for resolving such contention, under which the applicants for the contending strings in the set – here, Booking.com and Despegar – may resolve the contention by negotiation, failing which the matter will proceed to auction. Ultimately, no matter the outcome of these IRP proceedings, Booking.com may yet be successful and .hotels may yet be delegated into the Internet root zone. However, the fact that .hotels has been put into a contention set does raise the risk that .hotels may never be delegated into the root zone, or that it may be more costly for Booking.com to obtain approval of its proposed string. It also has caused a significant delay in the potential delegation of the string into the root zone (which could prove to be detrimental to the ultimate success of Booking.com's proposed string if other applicants

³³ Request, Annex 14, BGC Recommendation dated 1 August 2013, p.9. See also Request, Annex 15, NGPC Resolution dated 10 September 2013. As noted in footnote 1 to the BGC Recommendation, the Recommendation was ultimately finalized and submitted for posting on 21 August 2013.

³⁴ Request, Annex 15, NGPC Resolution dated 10 September 2013.

³⁵ Request, Annex 17.

whose strings were not put into a contention set are able to establish themselves as pioneer providers of hotel- and travel-related services under a different new gTLD).

E. The IRP Proceedings

39. On 19 March 2014, Booking.com submitted a Notice of Independent Review, dated 18 March 2014, as well as a Request for Independent Review Process (“**Request**”) accompanied by numerous supporting documents and reference materials.
40. In accordance with Article IV, Section 3(9) of the ICANN Bylaws, Booking.com requested that a three-member IRP panel be constituted to consider and determine the Request. As the omnibus standing panel referred to in Article IV, Section 3(6) of the ICANN Bylaws had yet to be established, Booking.com further proposed, in accordance with Article 6 of the ICDR Rules, that each party appoint one panelist, with the third (the Chair of the panel) to be appointed by the two party-appointed panelists.
41. On 25 April 2014, ICANN submitted a Response to ICANN’s Request with supporting documents (“**Response**”).
42. The parties having thereafter agreed on the number of panelists and the method of their appointment, David H. Bernstein, Esq. was duly appointed as panelist by Booking.com on 1 May 2014, and the Hon. A Howard Matz was duly appointed as panelist by ICANN on 30 May 2014.
43. On 17 July 2014, the ICDR notified the parties that Mr. Stephen L. Drymer had been duly nominated by the two party-appointed panelists as Chair of the Panel. Mr. Drymer’s appointment became effective and the Panel was duly constituted as of 1 August 2014.
44. On 21 August 2014, further to consultations among the panelists and between the Panel and the parties, the Panel convened a preparatory conference with the parties (by telephone) for the purpose of discussing organizational matters, including a timetable for any further written statements or oral argument. Both parties requested the opportunity to make supplemental submissions and to present oral argument.
45. On 22 August 2014 the Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 in which, among other things, it established a Procedural Timetable for the IRP. As specifically requested by the parties, the Procedural Order and Timetable provided for the submission of additional written statements by the parties as well as for a brief oral hearing to take place by telephone, all on dates proposed by and agreed between the parties.³⁶
46. In accordance with the Procedural Timetable, on 6 October 2014 Booking.com submitted its Reply to ICANN’s Response, accompanied by additional documents (“**Reply**”).

³⁶ Paragraph 6 of Procedural Order No. 1 provided that, in its forthcoming Reply to ICANN’s Response, “Booking.com shall only address two issues raised in Respondent’s Response: (1) the nature and scope of the IRP requested; (2) the nature of the relief sought by Claimant.” Paragraph 7 of Procedural Order No. 1 provided that “Respondent’s Sur-Reply ... shall address only the issues raised in the Reply.”

47. In accordance with the Procedural Timetable, ICANN submitted a Sur-Reply on 20 November 2014 (“**Sur-Reply**”).

F. The Hearing

48. As provided by Procedural Order No. 1 and the Procedural Timetable, a hearing was held (by telephone) on 10 December 2011, commencing at 9:00 PST/18:00 CET.
49. In the light of the significance of the issues raised by the parties, and given the many questions prompted by those issues and by the parties’ extensive written submissions and supporting materials, the Panel indicated that it would allow the hearing to continue beyond the approximately one hour originally envisaged. The hearing ultimately lasted two and one-half hours. Counsel for each party made extensive oral submissions, including rebuttal and sur-rebuttal submissions, and responded to the panelists’ questions.
50. Prior to the close of the hearing each party declared that it had no objection concerning the conduct of the proceedings, that it had no further oral submissions that it wished to make, and that it considered that it had had a full opportunity to present its case and to be heard.
51. As agreed and ordered prior to the close of the hearing, the parties were provided the opportunity to file limited additional materials post-hearing, in relation to a certain question asked of them by the Panel. This was done, and, on 13 December 2014, the proceedings were declared closed.

IV. ICANN ARTICLES, BYLAWS AND POLICIES – KEY ELEMENTS

52. We set out here the key elements of ICANN’s Articles of Association, Bylaws and policies on which the parties rely in their submissions and to which the Panel will refer later in this Declaration.

A. Articles of Association

4. The Corporation shall operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law and, to the extent appropriate and consistent with these Articles and its Bylaws, through open and transparent processes that enable competition and open entry in Internet-related markets. To this effect, the Corporation shall cooperate as appropriate with relevant international organizations.

[Underlining added]

B. Bylaws

ARTICLE I: MISSION AND CORE VALUES

Section 1. MISSION

The mission of The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”) is to coordinate, at the overall level, the global Internet’s systems of unique identifiers,

and in particular to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems.

[...]

Section 2. CORE VALUES

In performing its mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN:

- 1. Preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.*
- 2. Respecting the creativity, innovation, and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination.*
- 3. To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties.*
- 4. Seeking and supporting broad, informed participation reflecting the functional, geographic, and cultural diversity of the Internet at all levels of policy development and decision-making.*
- 5. Where feasible and appropriate, depending on market mechanisms to promote and sustain a competitive environment.*
- 6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.*
- 7. Employing open and transparent policy development mechanisms that (i) promote well-informed decisions based on expert advice, and (ii) ensure that those entities most affected can assist in the policy development process.*
- 8. Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.*
- 9. Acting with a speed that is responsive to the needs of the Internet while, as part of the decision-making process, obtaining informed input from those entities most affected.*
- 10. Remaining accountable to the Internet community through mechanisms that enhance ICANN's effectiveness.*
- 11. While remaining rooted in the private sector, recognizing that governments and public authorities are responsible for public policy and duly taking into account governments' or public authorities' recommendations.*

These core values are deliberately expressed in very general terms, so that they may provide useful and relevant guidance in the broadest possible range of circumstances. Because they are not narrowly prescriptive, the specific way in which they apply, individually and collectively, to each new situation will necessarily depend on many factors that cannot be fully anticipated or enumerated; and because they are statements of principle rather than practice, situations will inevitably arise in which perfect fidelity to all eleven core values simultaneously is not possible. Any ICANN

body making a recommendation or decision shall exercise its judgment to determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand, and to determine, if necessary, an appropriate and defensible balance among competing values.

[...]

ARTICLE III: TRANSPARENCY

Section 1. PURPOSE

ICANN and its constituent bodies shall operate to the maximum extent feasible in an open and transparent manner and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness.

[...]

ARTICLE IV: ACCOUNTABILITY AND REVIEW

Section 1. PURPOSE

In carrying out its mission as set out in these Bylaws, ICANN should be accountable to the community for operating in a manner that is consistent with these Bylaws, and with due regard for the core values set forth in Article I of these Bylaws. The provisions of this Article, creating processes for reconsideration and independent review of ICANN actions and periodic review of ICANN's structure and procedures, are intended to reinforce the various accountability mechanisms otherwise set forth in these Bylaws, including the transparency provisions of Article III and the Board and other selection mechanisms set forth throughout these Bylaws.

Section 2. RECONSIDERATION

1. ICANN shall have in place a process by which any person or entity materially affected by an action of ICANN may request review or reconsideration of that action by the Board.

2. Any person or entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction ("Reconsideration Request") to the extent that he, she, or it have been adversely affected by:

a. one or more staff actions or inactions that contradict established ICANN policy(ies); or

b. one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that have been taken or refused to be taken without consideration of material information, except where the party submitting the request could have submitted, but did not submit, the information for the Board's consideration at the time of action or refusal to act; or

c. one or more actions or inactions of the ICANN Board that are taken as a result of the Board's reliance on false or inaccurate material information.

3. The Board has designated the Board Governance Committee to review and consider any such Reconsideration Requests. The Board Governance Committee shall have the authority to:

a. evaluate requests for review or reconsideration;

- b. summarily dismiss insufficient requests;
- c. evaluate requests for urgent consideration;
- d. conduct whatever factual investigation is deemed appropriate;
- e. request additional written submissions from the affected party, or from other parties;
- f. make a final determination on Reconsideration Requests regarding staff action or inaction, without reference to the Board of Directors; and
- g. make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on the merits of the request, as necessary.

[...]

Section 3. INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF BOARD ACTIONS

1. In addition to the reconsideration process described in Section 2 of this Article, ICANN shall have in place a separate process for independent third-party review of Board actions alleged by an affected party to be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

2. Any person materially affected by a decision or action by the Board that he or she asserts is inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws may submit a request for independent review of that decision or action. In order to be materially affected, the person must suffer injury or harm that is directly and causally connected to the Board's alleged violation of the Bylaws or the Articles of Incorporation, and not as a result of third parties acting in line with the Board's action.

3. A request for independent review must be filed within thirty days of the posting of the minutes of the Board meeting (and the accompanying Board Briefing Materials, if available) that the requesting party contends demonstrates that ICANN violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation. Consolidated requests may be appropriate when the causal connection between the circumstances of the requests and the harm is the same for each of the requesting parties.

4. Requests for such independent review shall be referred to an Independent Review Process Panel ("IRP Panel"), which shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. The IRP Panel must apply a defined standard of review to the IRP request, focusing on:

- a. did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?;
- b. did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and
- c. did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?

[...]

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

- a. summarily dismiss requests brought without standing, lacking in substance, or that are frivolous or vexatious;
- b. request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations, or from other parties;
- c. declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; and
- d. recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP;
- e. consolidate requests for independent review if the facts and circumstances are sufficiently similar; and
- f. determine the timing for each proceeding.

[...]

14. Prior to initiating a request for independent review, the complainant is urged to enter into a period of cooperative engagement with ICANN for the purpose of resolving or narrowing the issues that are contemplated to be brought to the IRP. [...]

15. Upon the filing of a request for an independent review, the parties are urged to participate in a conciliation period for the purpose of narrowing the issues that are stated within the request for independent review. A conciliator will be appointed from the members of the omnibus standing panel by the Chair of that panel. [...]

16. Cooperative engagement and conciliation are both voluntary. However, if the party requesting the independent review does not participate in good faith in the cooperative engagement and the conciliation processes, if applicable, and ICANN is the prevailing party in the request for independent review, the IRP Panel must award to ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the proceeding, including legal fees.

[...]

18. The IRP Panel should strive to issue its written declaration no later than six months after the filing of the request for independent review. The IRP Panel shall make its declaration based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties, and in its declaration shall specifically designate the prevailing party. The party not prevailing shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the IRP Provider, but in an extraordinary case the IRP Panel may in its declaration allocate up to half of the costs of the IRP Provider to the prevailing party based upon the circumstances, including a consideration of the reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest. Each party to the IRP proceedings shall bear its own expenses.

[Underlining added]

53. Lest there be any misunderstanding as regards the proper subject matter of IRP proceedings or the role of the Panel, we note that, as was clearly established during the hearing, it is common ground between the parties that the term "action" (or "actions") as used in Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws is to be understood as action(s) or inaction(s) by the ICANN Board. The Panel observes that this understanding comports not only with the provisions of Article

IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws concerning “Reconsideration”, which expressly refer to “actions or inactions of the ICANN Board”, but with the clear intent of Section 3 itself, which stipulates at sub-section 11 that “[t]he IRP Panel shall have the authority to: ... (c) declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.”

C. The gTLD Applicant Guidebook

- 54. As noted above and as understood by all, the Guidebook is (to borrow Booking.com’s phrase) “the crystallization of Board-approved consensus policy concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.”³⁷
- 55. The Guidebook is divided into “Modules”, each of which contains various sections and sub-sections. The three Modules of primary relevance here are Modules 1, 2 and 4. Module 1, titled “Introduction to the gTLD Application Process,” provides an “overview of the process for applying for a new generic top-level domains.”³⁸ Module 2, titled “Evaluation Procedures,” describes the “evaluation procedures and criteria used to determine whether applied-for gTLDs are approved for delegation.”³⁹ Module 4, titled “String Contention Procedures,” concerns “situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.”

(i) Initial Evaluation

- 56. As explained in Module 1, “[i]mmediately following the close of the application submission period, ICANN will begin checking all applications for completeness.”⁴⁰ Initial Evaluation begins “immediately after the administrative completeness check concludes. All complete applications will be reviewed during Initial Evaluation.”⁴¹
- 57. Initial Evaluation is comprised of two main elements or types of review: *string review*, which concerns the applied-for gTLD string; and *applicant review*, which concerns the entity applying for the gTLD and its proposed registry services. It is the first of these – string review, including more specifically the component known as *string similarity review* – that is particularly relevant.

(ii) String Review, including String Similarity Review

- 58. String review is itself comprised of several components, each of which constitutes a separate assessment or review of the applied-for gTLD string, conducted by a separate reviewing body or panel. As explained in Module 2:

The following assessments are performed in the Initial Evaluation:

³⁷ Request, ¶ 13.

³⁸ Module 1-2. Each Module of the Guidebook is paginated separately. “Module 1-2” refers to Guidebook Module 1, page 2.

³⁹ Module 2-2.

⁴⁰ Guidebook, §1.1.2.2: “Administrative Completeness Check”, Module 1-5.

⁴¹ Guidebook, §1.1.2.5: “Initial Evaluation”, Module 1-8 (underlining added).

- *String Reviews*
 - *String similarity*
 - *Reserved names*
 - *DNS stability*
 - *Geographic names*

[..]

*An application must pass all these reviews to pass the Initial Evaluation. Failure to pass any one of these reviews will result in a failure to pass the Initial Evaluation.*⁴²

59. As indicated, all complete applications are subject to Initial Evaluation, which means that all applied-for gTLD strings are subject to string review. String review is further described in Module 2 as follows:

[String review] focuses on the applied-for gTLD string to test:

- *Whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion;*
- *Whether the applied-for gTLD string might adversely affect DNS security or stability; and*
- *Whether evidence of requisite government approval is provided in the case of certain geographic names.*⁴³

60. The various assessments or reviews (i.e., string similarity, reserved names, DNS stability, etc.) that comprise string review are elaborated at Section 2.2.1 of Module 2. As mentioned, the most relevant of these reviews for our purposes is *string similarity review*, which is described in detail at Section 2.2.1.1. Because of the central importance of the string similarity review process in the context of the present dispute, this section of the Guidebook is reproduced here at some length:

2.2.1.1 String Similarity Review

This review involves a preliminary comparison of each applied-for gTLD string against existing TLDs, Reserved Names (see subsection 2.2.1.2), and other applied-for strings. The objective of this review is to prevent user confusion and loss of confidence in the DNS resulting from delegation of many similar strings.

Note: In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.

⁴² Module 2-2. The same is true of applicant review, which is also comprised of various assessments concerning the applicant entity.

⁴³ Guidebook, §2.2: “Initial Evaluation”, Module 2-4 (underlining added). See also Module 1-9: “String reviews include a determination that the applied-for gTLD string is not likely to cause security or stability problems in the DNS ...”

The visual similarity check that occurs during Initial Evaluation is intended to augment the objection and dispute resolution process (see Module 3, Dispute Resolution Procedures) that addresses all types of similarity.

This similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel.

2.2.1.1.1 Reviews Performed

The String Similarity Panel's task is to identify visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion.

The panel performs this task of assessing similarities that would lead to user confusion in four sets of circumstances, when comparing:

[...]

- Applied-for gTLD strings against other applied-for gTLD strings;

[...]

Similarity to Other Applied-for gTLD Strings (String Contention Sets) – All applied-for gTLD strings will be reviewed against one another to identify any similar strings. In performing this review, the String Similarity Panel will create contention sets that may be used in later stages of evaluation.

A contention set contains at least two applied-for strings identical or similar to one another. Refer to Module 4, String Contention Procedures, for more information on contention sets and contention resolution.

[...]

2.2.1.1.2 Review Methodology

The String Similarity Panel is informed in part by an algorithmic score for the visual similarity between each applied-for string and each of other existing and applied-for TLDs and reserved names. The score will provide one objective measure for consideration by the panel, as part of the process of identifying strings likely to result in user confusion. In general, applicants should expect that a higher visual similarity score suggests a higher probability that the application will not pass the String Similarity review. However, it should be noted that the score is only indicative and that the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the Panel's judgment.

The algorithm, user guidelines, and additional background information are available to applicants for testing and informational purposes. [footnote in the original: See <http://icann.sword-group.com/algorithm/>] Applicants will have the ability to test their strings and obtain algorithmic results through the application system prior to submission of an application.

[...]

The panel will examine all the algorithm data and perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion. In cases of strings in scripts not yet supported by the algorithm, the panel's assessment process is entirely manual.

The panel will use a common standard to test for whether string confusion exists, as follows:

Standard for String Confusion – String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For the likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user. Mere association, in the sense that the string brings another string to mind, is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion.

2.2.1.1.3 Outcomes of the String Similarity Review

An application that fails the String Similarity review due to similarity to an existing TLD will not pass the Initial Evaluation, and no further reviews will be available. Where an application does not pass the String Similarity review, the applicant will be notified as soon as the review is completed.

An application for a string that is found too similar to another applied-for gTLD string will be placed in a contention set.⁴⁴

[Underlining added]

61. Module 4 of the Guidebook, as mentioned, concerns “situations in which contention over applied-for gTLD strings occurs, and the methods available to applicants for resolving such contention cases.” As explained in Module 4:

4.1 String Contention

String contention occurs when either:

1. Two or more applicants for an identical gTLD string successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes; or
2. Two or more applicants for similar gTLD strings successfully complete all previous stages of the evaluation and dispute resolution processes, and the similarity of the strings is identified as creating a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated.

ICANN will not approve applications for proposed gTLD strings that are identical or that would result in user confusion, called contending strings. If either situation above occurs, such applications will proceed to contention resolution through either community priority evaluation, in certain cases, or through an auction. Both processes are described in this module. A group of applications for contending strings is referred to as a contention set.

⁴⁴ Module 2-5 to 2-9. As regards the concept of string contention, see also Guidebook, §1.1.2.10: “String Contention”, Module 1-13: “String contention applies only when there is more than one qualified application for the same or similar gTLD strings. String contention refers to the scenario in which there is more than one qualified application for the identical gTLD string or for similar gTLD strings. In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.”

(In this Applicant Guidebook, “similar” means strings so similar that they create a probability of user confusion if more than one of the strings is delegated into the root zone.)

4.1.1 Identification of Contention Sets

Contention sets are groups of applications containing identical or similar applied-for gTLD strings. Contention sets are identified during Initial Evaluation, following review of all applied-for gTLD strings. ICANN will publish preliminary contention sets once the String Similarity review is completed, and will update the contention sets as necessary during the evaluation and dispute resolution stages.

Applications for identical gTLD strings will be automatically assigned to a contention set.

[...]

The String Similarity Panel will also review the entire pool of applied-for strings to determine whether the strings proposed in any two or more applications are so similar that they would create a probability of user confusion if allowed to coexist in the DNS. The panel will make such a determination for each pair of applied-for gTLD strings. The outcome of the String Similarity review described in Module 2 is the identification of contention sets ...

[...]

As described elsewhere in this guidebook, cases of contention might be resolved by community priority evaluation [NB: community priority evaluation applies only to so-called “community” applications; it is not relevant here] or an agreement among the parties. Absent that, the last-resort contention resolution mechanism will be an auction.

[...]

62. As provided in Module 4, the two methods relevant to resolving a contention such as between .hotels and .hoteis are *self-resolution* (i.e., an agreement between the two applicants for the contending strings) and *auction*:

4.1.3 Self-Resolution of String Contention

Applicants that are identified as being in contention are encouraged to reach a settlement or agreement among themselves that resolves the contention. This may occur at any stage of the process, once ICANN publicly posts the applications received and the preliminary contention sets on its website.

Applicants may resolve string contention in a manner whereby one or more applicants withdraw their applications.

[...]

4.3 Auction: Mechanism of Last Resort

It is expected that most cases of contention will be resolved by the community priority evaluation, or through voluntary agreement among the involved applicants. Auction is a tie-breaker method for resolving string contention among the applications within a contention set, if the contention has not been resolved by other means.

63. Module 5 of the Guidebook, titled *Transition to Delegation*, describes “the final steps required of an applicant for completion of the process, including execution of a registry agreement with ICANN and preparing for delegation of the new gTLD into the root zone.”⁴⁵ Section 5.1 states:

*ICANN's Board of Directors has ultimate responsibility for the New gTLD Program. The Board reserves the right to individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the Internet community. Under exceptional circumstances, the Board may individually consider a gTLD application. For example, the Board might individually consider an application as a result of GAC Advice on New gTLDs or of the use of an ICANN accountability mechanism.*⁴⁶

[Underlining added]

V. SUMMARY OF THE PARTIES' POSITIONS

64. The following brief summary of the parties' respective positions is provided with a view solely to assisting the reader to understand the present Declaration. It is *not* intended to recapitulate – and it does not recapitulate – the entirety of the parties' allegations and arguments. Additional references to the parties' positions, including submissions made by them in the course of the proceedings, are contained in the discussion at Part VI below.

A. Booking.com's position

(i) *The Panel's Authority*

65. Booking.com submits that the mandate of the Panel is “to determine whether the contested actions of the ICANN Board are consistent with applicable rules”.⁴⁷ According to Booking.com:

*The set of rules against which the actions of the ICANN Board must be assessed includes: (i) ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws – both of which must be interpreted in light of ICANN's Affirmation of Commitments, and both of which require compliance with inter alia International law and generally accepted good governance principles – and (ii) secondary rules created by ICANN, such as the Applicant Guidebook. In setting up, implementing and supervising its policies and processes, the Board must comply with the fundamental principles embodied in these rules. That obligation includes a duty to ensure compliance with its obligations to act in good faith, transparently, fairly, and in a manner that is non-discriminatory and ensures due process.*⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Module 5-2.

⁴⁶ Module 5-4.

⁴⁷ Reply, ¶ 3.

⁴⁸ Reply, ¶ 3.

66. Booking.com submits that IRP panels have broad authority to evaluate actions of the ICANN Board. An overly restrictive interpretation of the standard of review, such as proposed by ICANN in these proceedings, would, says Booking.com, “fail to ensure accountability on the part of ICANN and would be incompatible with ICANN’s commitment to maintain (and improve) robust mechanisms for accountability, as required by Article 9.1 of ICANN’s Affirmation of Commitments and ICANN’s core values.”⁴⁹

(ii) Booking.com’s Claims

67. The purpose of the IRP initiated by Booking.com is, in its own words, “to challenge the ICANN Board’s handling of Booking.com’s application for the new gTLD .hotels.”⁵⁰ This includes the determination of the SSP to place .hotels and .hoteis in contention and the refusal of the Board (and its committees) to revise that determination. Elsewhere in its submissions, Booking.com makes an even broader claim; it asserts that it challenges the conduct of the ICANN Board in relation to what Booking.com refers to as the *setting up, implementation, supervision and review* of the entire of string similarity review process, and the Board’s alleged failure “to ensure due process and to respect its fundamental obligations to ensure good faith, transparency, fairness and non-discrimination” throughout.⁵¹
68. In effect, Booking.com’s specific claims can be divided into two broad categories: claims related to the string similarity review process generally; and claims related to the particular case of .hotels.
69. Booking.com professes that this case “is not about challenging a decision on the merits [i.e., the decision to place .hotels in contention]”; it is about “ICANN’s failure to respect fundamental [procedural] rights and principles in handling New gTLD applications, in particular in the context of String Similarity Review.”⁵²
70. Booking.com also repeatedly emphasizes – and this is crucial – that *it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the process as set out in the Guidebook*. Rather, as indicated, it contests “the way in which that process was established, implemented and supervised by (or under the authority of) the ICANN Board.”⁵³ Equally crucial, as will be seen, is Booking.com’s acknowledgment that *the established process was followed* in the case of the review of .hotels.

a. The string similarity review process

71. According to Booking.com, the problem began when the ICANN Board failed to “provide transparency in the SSP selection process,” in particular by failing “to make clear how

⁴⁹ Reply, ¶ 6.

⁵⁰ Reply, ¶ 7.

⁵¹ Reply, ¶ 15.

⁵² Reply, ¶ 14.

⁵³ Reply, ¶ 17.

[ICANN] would evaluate candidate responses or how it ultimately did so.”⁵⁴ The problem was compounded by the selection of ICC/University College London to perform string similarity reviews as the independent SSP. In Booking.com’s words:

*[T]he identities of the unsuccessful candidates (if any) to perform the String Similarity Review remain unknown. Applicants have never been given any information in relation to the candidate responses that were submitted. ... There is no indication that any other candidate expressed an interest in performing the String Similarity Review. No information has been provided as to the steps (if any) taken by ICANN to reach out to other potential candidates. Numerous questions remain: How did ICANN deal with the situation if there was only one (or only a very few) respondent(s) wishing to perform the String Similarity Review? How did this impact on the discussions with InterConnect Communications? What are the terms of ICANN’s contract with InterConnect Communications?*⁵⁵

72. Booking.com also faults ICANN for “allowing the appointed SSP to develop and perform an unfair and arbitrary review process”, specifically, by allowing the SSP “to perform the String Similarity Review (i) without any (documented) plan or methodology ... (ii) without providing any transparency regarding the evaluators or the evaluation criteria ... and (iii) without informing applicants of its reasoning ...”.⁵⁶
73. Among other things, Booking.com takes ICANN to task for establishing and posting the SSP Process Description and the SSP Manager’s Letter (see Part III.C above) only long after the string similarity review process had ended.⁵⁷
74. It also alleges that the factors identified in the SSP Manager’s Letter are “arbitrary and baseless ... not supported by any methodology capable of producing compelling and defensible conclusions ... [which] has allowed applications with at least equally serious visual string similarity concerns – such as .parts/.paris, .maif/.mail, .srt/.srl, .vote/.voto and .date/.data ... – to proceed while singling out .hotels/.hoteis.”⁵⁸ According to Booking.com: “The failure to take actual human performance into account is at odds with the standard for assessment, *i.e.*, the likelihood of confusion on the part of the average Internet user. Hence, the approach is directly contrary to ICANN’s own policy.”⁵⁹
75. Booking.com further contends that the SSP process is unfair and non-transparent due to the fact that the identity of SSP members has never been publicly disclosed.⁶⁰
76. Further, Booking.com argues that the process is unfair, non-transparent and arbitrary – and thus violates ICANN policy – for failing to provide for a “well-documented rationale” for each

⁵⁴ Reply, ¶ 20.

⁵⁵ Reply, ¶ 20.

⁵⁶ Reply, ¶ 23.

⁵⁷ Reply, ¶ 24.

⁵⁸ Reply, ¶ 25.

⁵⁹ Reply, ¶ 25.

⁶⁰ Reply, ¶ 26-27.

SSP determination. In the absence of reasons for each string similarity determination, says Booking.com, “there is no basis on which decisions can be evaluated and, where appropriate, challenged.”⁶¹

77. Another ground for Booking.com’s challenge is the alleged failure by the ICANN Board to providing “effective supervision or quality control” of the SSP: “If nobody but the evaluator has any insight into how the evaluation was carried out, no effective quality control can be performed.”⁶² Nor, according to Booking.com, does the quality review of the SSP’s work supposedly performed by JAS Advisers (the independent consultant engaged by ICANN for this purpose) overcome the problem of a lack of transparency:

*Booking.com is not aware that any selection process was put in place in relation to the appointment of JAS Advisors to perform the String Similarity Review quality control. No criteria for performing the quality control were published. When ICANN was looking for evaluators, no call for expressions of interest or similar document was issued for the selection of quality controllers.*⁶³

78. In any case, says Booking.com, the “quality control review over a random sampling of applications to, among other things, test whether the process [set out in the Guidebook] was followed,” which ICANN claims was performed on the SSP’s work,⁶⁴ could not provide adequate quality control of the string similarity review process.⁶⁵ Finally, Booking.com argues that the arbitrary and unfair result of the string similarity review concerning .hotels – *i.e.*, the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in contention – demonstrates that, “whatever quality control review ICANN may have engaged in ... must therefore have been deficient.”⁶⁶

b. The case of .hotels

79. Booking.com argues, in part on the basis of expert evidence which it adduces in this IRP proceeding,⁶⁷ that “[t]here is no probability of user confusion if both .hotels and .hoteis were delegated as gTLD strings into the Internet root zone ... The SSP could not have reasonably found that the average reasonable Internet user is likely to be confused between the two strings.”⁶⁸ It continues:

⁶¹ Reply, ¶ 28-29.

⁶² Reply, ¶ 30.

⁶³ Reply, ¶ 31. Booking.com states that it “doubts” that any quality review was in fact performed, whether by JAS Advisers or any other entity.

⁶⁴ Response, ¶ 30.

⁶⁵ Reply, ¶ 34.

⁶⁶ Reply, ¶ 38.

⁶⁷ Request, Annex 20, Expert Report of Prof. Dr. Piet Desmet of the Faculty of Arts, Department of Linguistics of Leuven University, dated 10 March 2014. Portions of the work underlying Prof. Desmet’s report were performed by Dr. Emmanuel Keuleers, Research Fellow in the Department of Experimental Psychology at Ghent University.

⁶⁸ Request, ¶ 58.

Since .hotels and .hoteis are not confusingly similar, the determination that they are is contradictory to ICANN policy as established in the Applicant Guidebook. Acceptance of the determination, and repeated failure to remedy the wrongful determination, is a failure to act with due diligence and independent judgment, and a failure to neutrally and fairly apply established policies as required by Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation.⁶⁹

80. According to Booking.com, the Board should have acted to overturn the determination of the SSP either in the context of the Request for Reconsideration or under the authority accorded it by Module 5-4 of the Guidebook to “individually consider a gTLD application”.⁷⁰
81. Booking.com claims that its DIDP Request alerted the Board to the need to intervene to “correct the errors in the process” related to .hotels, and that its Request for Reconsideration of the SSP determination further informed the Board of the many errors in the SSP’s review of .hotels, “giving the Board ample opportunity to correct those errors.”⁷¹ Booking.com claims that the Board’s failure, when responding to the DIDP Request, “to offer any insight into the SSP’s reasoning”, its refusal to reconsider and overturn the SSP determination regarding .hotels on the sole ground (says Booking.com) that “the Reconsideration process ‘is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of evaluation panels’”, and its failure to investigate Booking.com’s complaints of a lack of fairness and transparency in the SSP process, constitute violations of ICANN’s governing rules regarding string similarity review.⁷²
82. According to Booking.com, among the most compelling evidence of ICANN’s failure in this regard are the statements made on the record by several members of the NGPC during its 10 September 2013 meeting at which Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration was denied.⁷³ Given the importance that the Panel attaches to these statements, they are addressed in some detail in the Analysis in Part VI, below.
83. In its written submissions Booking.com asks the Panel to grant the following relief:

Finding that ICANN breached its Articles of Incorporation, its Bylaws, and the gTLD Applicant Guidebook;

Requiring that ICANN reject the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar and disregard the resulting contention set;

Awarding Booking.com its costs in this proceeding; and

⁶⁹ Request, ¶ 59.

⁷⁰ Reply, ¶ 39.

⁷¹ Reply, ¶ 41.

⁷² Reply, ¶ 41. In the passage of Booking.com’s submissions referred to here (as elsewhere), Booking.com speaks of violations of ICANN’s obligations of “due process”, which, it says, comprise concepts such as the right to be heard, the right to receive reasons for decisions, publicity, etc. For reasons explained in Part VI, below, the Panel prefers to use the terms *fairness* and *transparency* to connote the essence of ICANN’s obligations under review in this IRP.

⁷³ See Part II.C, above.

Awarding such other relief as the Panel may find appropriate or Booking.com may request.

84. At the hearing Booking.com *further* requested that the Panel not only require ICANN to disregard the SSP determination regarding .hotels/.hoteis, but also order ICANN to “delegate both .hotels and .hoteis.”

B. ICANN’s position

85. ICANN’s position is best summed up by ICANN itself:

Booking.com’s IRP Request is really about Booking.com’s disagreement with the merits of the String Similarity Panel’s conclusion that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar. But the Panel’s determination does not constitute Board action, and the Independent Review Process is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of an independent evaluation panel. The IRP Panel is tasked only with comparing contested actions of the ICANN Board to ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles of Incorporation; it is not within the IRP Panel’s mandate to evaluate whether the String Similarity Panel’s conclusion that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar was wrong.⁷⁴

86. According to ICANN, the Board “did exactly what it was supposed to do under its Bylaws, its Articles of Incorporation, and the Guidebook.”⁷⁵

(i) *The Panel’s Authority*

87. Throughout its submissions ICANN repeatedly stresses what it says is the very limited authority enjoyed by IRP panels.
88. As provided in Article IV, Section 3(4) of ICANN’s Bylaws, ICANN observes that this Panel (as all IRP panels) is charged only with “comparing contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.”⁷⁶
89. ICANN notes that, in undertaking this *compare-and-declare* mission, the Panel is further constrained to apply the very specific “standard of review” set out in Bylaw Article IV, Section 3(4), which requires the Panel to focus on three particular questions: “did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?”; “did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?”; and “did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?”⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Response, ¶ 9.

⁷⁵ Response, ¶ 8. Both parties agree that, as submitted by Booking.com, the “rules” at issue, against which the conduct of the ICANN Board is to be assessed, include the relevant provisions of the Guidebook.

⁷⁶ See for example Response, ¶¶ 2, ¶ 9.

⁷⁷ Response, ¶ 2.

90. ICANN further asserts that the IRP process “is not available as a mechanism to challenge the actions or inactions of ICANN staff or third parties that may be involved in ICANN activities,”⁷⁸ such as the action of the SSP which resulted in .hotels and .hoteis being placed in contention. Nor, says ICANN, may the IRP process be used as an “appeal mechanism” by which to overturn substantive decisions – such as the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly visually similar – with which an applicant may disagree.⁷⁹
91. In this regard ICANN states that the affirmative relief sought by Booking.com – specifically, a declaration requiring that ICANN “reject the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are confusingly similar and disregard the resulting contention set” and (as requested at the hearing) that ICANN “delegate both .hotels and .hoteis” – exceeds the authority of the Panel.⁸⁰

(ii) ICANN’s Response to Booking.com’s Claims

a. The string similarity review process

92. According to ICANN, “[e]arly on in the iterations of the Guidebook, it was determined that, in the initial evaluation stage, the String Similarity Panel would only examine strings for visual confusion,” and “[i]f applied-for strings are determined to so nearly resemble each other visually that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion, the string will be placed in a contention set, which is then resolved pursuant to the contention set resolution processes in Module 4 of the Guidebook.”⁸¹
93. According to ICANN, it was also determined early on that, as stated in Section 2.2.1.1 of the Guidebook, “[t]his similarity review will be conducted by an independent String Similarity Panel,” not by ICANN itself. ICC was duly selected to perform the string similarity review further to “an open and public request for proposals,” pursuant to which, as the successful bidder, “ICC was responsible for the development of its own process documents and methodology for performing the String Similarity Review consistent with the provisions of the Guidebook.”⁸² ICANN emphasizes that “the Guidebook does not provide for any process by which ICANN (or anyone else) may conduct a substantive review of ICC’s results.”⁸³
94. In ICANN’s submission, the alternative proposed by Booking.com, that “the ICANN Board – and the ICANN Board alone – was obligated to perform the String Similarity Review for the more than 1,900 new gTLD applications submitted,” is “untenable and is not supported by ICANN’s Bylaws or Articles.”⁸⁴ As noted by ICANN, the Guidebook defines six distinct

⁷⁸ Response, ¶ 3.

⁷⁹ Response, ¶ 49.

⁸⁰ Response, ¶ 55.

⁸¹ Response, ¶ 15 (underlining in original).

⁸² Response, ¶ 16.

⁸³ Response, ¶ 17.

⁸⁴ Sur-Reply, ¶ 7.

review processes that every gTLD application is required to go through, including string similarity review; each of those review processes was conducted by independent experts specifically engaged by ICANN staff for the purpose.

95. ICANN submits that “there simply is no requirement – under ICANN’s governing documents or imposed by law – that would mandate that the ICANN Board inject itself into the day-to-day affairs of the evaluation process in the manner Booking.com proposes.”⁸⁵ It asserts that, consistent with well-settled legal principles, “neither ICANN’s Bylaws, nor the Articles, nor the Guidebook requires the ICANN Board to conduct any analysis of the decisions of third party experts retained to evaluate string similarity.”⁸⁶
96. Moreover, ICANN asserts that “[s]imply because the ICANN Board has the discretion [under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook] to consider individual applications does not mean it is required to do so or that it should do so, particularly at an initial evaluation stage.”⁸⁷
97. ICANN claims that that Booking.com’s repeated invocation of the Board’s so-called obligation to ensure “due process” in the administration of the New gTLD Program is misplaced. First, neither applicable California law nor any provision of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation or Guidebook “specifically affords any gTLD applicant a right to procedural ‘due process’ similar to that which is afforded in courts of law.”⁸⁸ Second, because ICANN conducts its activities in the public interest it nevertheless provides “more opportunity for parties to be heard and to dispute actions taken”⁸⁹ than most private corporate entities. Third, the “decision to proceed with the New gTLD Program followed many years of discussion, debate and deliberation within the ICANN community, including participation from end users, civil society, technical experts, business groups, governments and others.”⁹⁰ Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, “ICANN adhered to the policies and procedures articulated in its Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the Guidebook, the latter of which was adopted only after being publicly vetted with ICANN’s stakeholders and the broader Internet community.”⁹¹
98. ICANN’s response to Booking.com’s various allegations regarding particular elements of the string similarity review process – including for example the selection of the SSP, the publication of the SSP’s methodology, the anonymity of the individuals SSP members, the supposed lack of quality control – is essentially three-fold: first, the actions challenged by Booking.com are *not Board actions*, but actions of ICANN staff or third parties, which cannot

⁸⁵ Sur-Reply, ¶ 10.

⁸⁶ Sur-Reply, ¶ 10.

⁸⁷ Sur-Reply, ¶ 11. It was established during the hearing that the several references to this discretionary authority in ICANN’s written and oral submissions refer specifically to the authority conferred by Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook.

⁸⁸ Sur-Reply, ¶ 18.

⁸⁹ Sur-Reply, ¶ 18.

⁹⁰ Sur-Reply, ¶ 18, fn 18.

⁹¹ Sur-Reply, ¶ 18, fn 18.

be challenged by means of IRP proceedings; second, in any case, Booking.com's claims are *factually incorrect*, and there has been no violation of the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation or Guidebook; third, Booking.com's claims are *time-barred* given that Article IV, Section 3(3) of the Bylaws requires that IRP requests "must be filed within thirty days of the posting of the minutes of the Board meeting ... that the requesting party contends demonstrates that ICANN violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation."⁹²

b. The case of .hotels

99. ICANN's position as regards the determination to place .hotels and .hoteis in contention is similar in many respects to its position regarding the string similarity review process generally. ICANN argues that the Board played no role whatsoever in performing the review of .hotels; that the SSP's determination was in any event well supported and there was no violation of applicable rules; and that the Guidebook does not provide for any process by which ICANN (or any other body, including an IRP panel) may conduct a substantive review of a string similarity determination.
100. In any event, ICANN asserts that .hotels and .hoteis in fact meet every one of the visual similarity criteria applied by the SSP, as set out in the SSP Manager's Letter. Moreover, .hotels and .hoteis scored a stunning 99% for visual similarity under the publicly available SWORD algorithm which, as provided by Section 2.2.1.1.2 (Module 2-7) of the Guidebook, establishes "one objective measure for consideration by the [SSP]". According to ICANN (in response to a question posed by the Panel during the hearing), this was the highest algorithmic score among the comparison of all non-identical pairs within the 1917 new gTLD applications received by ICANN;⁹³ the only other pair of non-exact match strings found to be confusingly visually similar – .unicorn and .unicom – scored only 94%.⁹⁴
101. According to ICANN, "it was not clearly 'wrong,' as Booking.com argues, for the [SSP] to find that .hotels/.hoteis are confusingly similar."⁹⁵
102. In conclusion, ICANN states that its conduct with respect to Booking.com's application for .hotels, including in evaluating Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration, was fully consistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, its Bylaws and the procedures established in the Guidebook; and the fact that Booking.com disagrees with the SSP's determination to put .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set does not give rise to an IRP.
103. ICANN asks the Panel to deny Booking.com's IRP Request.

VI. ANALYSIS

A. The Panel's Authority

⁹² Sur-Reply, ¶ 20-42.

⁹³ A number of these applications were subsequently withdrawn.

⁹⁴ Identical pairs, of course, received a score of 100% for visual similarity under the SWORD algorithm.

⁹⁵ Response, ¶ 53.

104. The jurisdiction and authority of an IRP panel is expressly prescribed – and expressly limited – by the ICANN Bylaws. To recap, Article IV, Section 3 of the Bylaws provides:

4. [The IRP Panel] shall be charged with comparing contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. The IRP Panel must apply a defined standard of review to the IRP request, focusing on:

- a. did the Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision?;*
- b. did the Board exercise due diligence and care in having a reasonable amount of facts in front of them?; and*
- c. did the Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company [ICANN]?*

[...]

11. The IRP Panel shall have the authority to:

[...]

- c. declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; and*
- d. recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the opinion of the IRP;*

[...]

18. [...] The IRP Panel shall make its declaration based solely on the documentation, supporting materials, and arguments submitted by the parties [...]

[Underlining added]

105. Similarly, Article 8 of the Supplementary Procedures reads:

8. Standard of Review

The IRP is subject to the following standard of review: (i) did the ICANN Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision; (ii) did the ICANN Board exercise due diligence and care in having sufficient facts in front of them; (iii) did the ICANN Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company?

If a requestor demonstrates that the ICANN Board did not make a reasonable inquiry to determine it had sufficient facts available, ICANN Board members had a conflict of interest in participating in the decision, or the decision was not an exercise in independent judgment, believed by the ICANN Board to be in the best interests of the company, after taking account of the Internet community and the global public interest, the requestor will have established proper grounds for review.

106. There is no dispute as regards the Panel's duty to compare the actions of the Board to ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws (and, in this case, Guidebook) with a view to

declaring whether those actions are inconsistent with applicable policies. Where the parties disagree is with respect to the standard of review to be applied by the Panel in assessing Board conduct.

107. ICANN submits that its Bylaws “specify that a deferential standard of review be applied when evaluating the actions of the ICANN Board ... the rules are clear that the appointed IRP Panel is neither asked to, nor allowed to, substitute its judgment for that of the Board.”⁹⁶ Booking.com argues that this “is simply wrong. No such specification is made in ICANN’s Bylaws or elsewhere, and a restrictive interpretation of the standard of review would ... fail to ensure accountability on the part of ICANN and would be incompatible with ICANN’s commitment to maintain (and improve) robust mechanisms for accountability.”⁹⁷
108. In the opinion of the Panel, there can be no question but that the provisions of the ICANN Bylaws establishing the Independent Review Process and defining the role of an IRP panel specify that the ICANN Board enjoys a large degree of discretion in its decisions and actions. So long as the Board acts without conflict of interest and with due care, it is entitled – indeed, required – to exercise its independent judgment in acting in what it believes to be the best interests of ICANN. The only substantive check on the conduct of the ICANN Board is that such conduct may not be inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws – or, the parties agree, with the Guidebook. In that connection, the Panel notes that Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws also clearly states that in exercising its judgment, the Board (indeed “[a]ny ICANN body making a recommendation or decision”) shall itself “determine which core values are most relevant and how they apply to the specific circumstances of the case at hand.”
109. In other words, in making decisions the Board is required to conduct itself reasonably in what it considers to be ICANN’s best interests; where it does so, the only question is whether its actions are or are not consistent with the Articles, Bylaws and, in this case, with the policies and procedures established in the Guidebook.
110. There is also no question but that the authority of an IRP panel to compare contested actions of the Board to the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, and to declare whether the Board has acted consistently with the Articles and Bylaws, does not extend to opining on the nature of those instruments. Nor, in this case, does our authority extend to opining on the nature of the policies or procedures established in the Guidebook. In this regard it is recalled that Booking.com itself repeatedly stresses that it does not contest the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process as set out in the Guidebook, but merely whether ICANN’s actions were consistent with various elements of that process. Stated differently, our role in this IRP includes assessing whether the applicable rules – in this case, the rules regarding string similarity review – were followed, not whether such rules are appropriate or advisable.
111. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the IRP Panel may only review ICANN Board actions or inactions under the deferential standard advocated by ICANN in these proceedings. Rather, as explained below, the IRP Panel is charged with “objectively” determining whether

⁹⁶ Response, ¶ 24.

⁹⁷ Reply, ¶ 6.

or not the Board's actions are in fact consistent with the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook, which the Panel understands as requiring that the Board's conduct be appraised independently, and without any presumption of correctness.

112. In the only other IRP of which the Panel is aware in which such questions were addressed in a published decision, the distinguished members of the IRP panel had this to say about the role of an IRP panel, and the applicable standard of review, in appraising Board action:

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers is a not-for profit corporation established under the law of the State of California. That law embodies the 'business judgment rule'. Section 309 of the California Corporations Code provides that a director must act 'in good faith, in a manner such director believes to be in the best interests of the corporation and its shareholders...' and shields from liability directors who follow its provisions. However ICANN is no ordinary non-profit California corporation. The Government of the United States vested regulatory authority of vast dimension and pervasive global reach in ICANN. In 'recognition of the fact that the Internet is an international network of networks, owned by no single nation, individual or organization' – including ICANN -- ICANN is charged with 'promoting the global public interest in the operational stability of the Internet...' ICANN 'shall operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law...' Thus, while a California corporation, it is governed particularly by the terms of its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws, as the law of California allows. Those Articles and Bylaws, which require ICANN to carry out its activities in conformity with relevant principles of international law, do not specify or imply that the International [sic] Review Process provided for shall (or shall not) accord deference to the decisions of the ICANN Board. The fact that the Board is empowered to exercise its judgment in the application of ICANN's sometimes competing core values does not necessarily import that that judgment must be treated deferentially by the IRP. In the view of the Panel, the judgments of the ICANN Board are to be reviewed and appraised by the Panel objectively, not deferentially. The business judgment rule of the law of California, applicable to directors of California corporations, profit and nonprofit, in the case of ICANN is to be treated as a default rule that might be called upon in the absence of relevant provisions of ICANN's Articles and Bylaws and of specific representations of ICANN ... that bear on the propriety of its conduct. In the instant case, it is those Articles and Bylaws, and those representations, measured against the facts as the Panel finds them, which are determinative.⁹⁸

[Underlining added.]

113. While on no way bound by that decision, we agree with its conclusions in this respect.
114. At the end of the day we fail to see any significant difference between the parties' positions in this regard. The process is clear, and both parties acknowledge, that the Panel is tasked with determining whether or not the Board's actions are consistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws and the Guidebook. Such a determination calls for what the panel in

⁹⁸ ICDR Case No. 50 117 T 00224 08, *ICM Registry, LLC v. ICANN*, Declaration dated 19 February 2010 ("*ICM Registry*"), ¶ 136.

the *ICM Registry* matter called an “objective” appraisal of Board conduct as measured against the policies and rules set out in those instruments; all agree that it is the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook which are determinative.

115. That being said, we also agree with ICANN to the extent that, in determining the consistency of Board action with the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook, an “IRP Panel is neither asked to, nor allowed to, substitute its judgment for that of the Board.” In other words, it is not for the Panel to opine on whether the Board could have acted differently than it did; rather, our role is to assess whether the Board’s action was consistent with applicable rules found in the Articles, Bylaws and Guidebook. Nor, as stated, is it for us to purport to appraise the policies and procedures established by ICANN in the Guidebook (since, again, this IRP is not a challenge to those policies and procedures themselves⁹⁹), but merely to apply them to the facts.
116. With the foregoing firmly in mind, the Panel turns now to the issues to be determined in order to resolve the present dispute.

B. The String Similarity Review Process

117. The Panel is not unsympathetic to Booking.com’s complaints regarding the string similarity review process as established by the Guidebook. There is no question but that that process lacks certain elements of transparency and certain practices that are widely associated with requirements of fairness. For example, the Guidebook provides no means for applicants to provide evidence or make submissions to the SSP (or any other ICANN body) and so be fully “heard” on the substantive question of the similarity of their applied-for gTLD strings to others.
118. Indeed, as stated at the outset of this Declaration, these observations and the concerns that they engender were voiced by several members of the ICANN Board’s New gTLD Program Committee which voted to accept the BGC’s Recommendation to deny Booking.com’s Request for Reconsideration. The Panel can do no better than reproduce the statements made by the NGPC members in this respect, as recorded in the minutes of the NGPC’s 10 September 2013 meeting.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ As discussed in more detail in the following section (at para. 117 and following) and again at Part IV of this Declaration, the important questions that Booking.com highlights in its pleadings, as to whether the string similarity review process is consistent with ICANN’s guiding principles of transparency and fairness, and regarding the published views of various members of ICANN’s NGPC in this respect, are matters which the ICANN Board, in its discretion, may wish to consider on its own motion in the context of the present case, in accordance with its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook, or when it issues the Guidebook for round two of the New gTLD Program. Those questions include a lack of clarity surrounding the way in which the string similarity review is conducted by the SSP, and the absence of any means for applicants to be heard in the string similarity review process where they may have evidence to adduce or arguments to make (such as the evidence and arguments presented by Booking.com to this Panel), which could in fact be relevant to the SSP’s determination.

¹⁰⁰ Request, Annex 16.

- Mr. George Sadowski stated his intention to abstain from the vote because, although “he understood that the BGC did the right thing, [he] thought the end result that was contrary to ICANN’s ... and the user’s best interests.”
 - Ms. Olga Madruga-Forti also stated her intention to abstain from voting on the BGC recommendation “because there was not sufficient rationale provided for why the string similarity review panel made its determination.”
 - In response to a comment by the Chair that the Request for Reconsideration deserved to be denied “[b]ecause the process was followed,” Mr. Ray Plzak “agreed that the process was followed, but noted that the process needs to be reviewed to potentially add a mechanism that would allow persons who don’t agree with the outcome to make an objection, other than using a Reconsideration Request.”
 - Mr. Plzak “recommended the Committee send a strong signal to the BGC, or adopt a resolution recommending that the BGC consider development of a different mechanism to provide an avenue for the community to appeal the outcome of a decision based on the merits.”
 - Ms. Madruga-Forti agreed and “recommended that in the future, a remand or appeals mechanism may help alleviate the concerns noted.”
 - Mr. Bill Graham also agreed with Mr. Plzak’s suggestion, and noted that “generally, there is a considerable level of discomfort and dissatisfaction with the process as expressed by Committee members.”
 - The Chair “agreed with [Mr. Graham’s] sentiment.”
 - The General Counsel and Secretary noted that ICANN ... “has tried to encourage more use of the ombudsman, or other accountability mechanisms for these types of concerns.”
119. Ultimately, five members of the NGPC voted in favour of the resolution accepting the BGC’s Recommendation; two members were unavailable to vote; and four members abstained. The abstaining members offered the following voting statements:
- Mr. Plzak stated that he abstained from voting “because he is disappointed in what is being done to remedy the situation. [He] would like to see more resolve to fix the process.”
 - Ms. Madruga-Forti stated that:

[T]he BGC has done an appropriate job of applying a limited review standard to the application for reconsideration, but unfortunately, in this circumstance, to apply that limited review accompanied by a lack of information regarding the rationale of the string similarity review panel is not possible in a logical and fair manner. The public interest would not be served by applying the limited review standard without proper information on the basis and reasoning for the decision of the panel. In my opinion, the public interest would be better served by abstaining and continuing to explore ways to

establish a better record of the rationale of the string similarity review panel in circumstances such as this.

- Mr. Kuo-Wei Wu agreed with Ms. Madruga-Forti's and Mr. Plzak's voting statements.
- Mr. Sadowsky provided the following detailed statement:

I have a strong concern regarding the ratification of the BGC recommendation to deny the reconsideration request regarding string contention between .hoteis and .hotels, and I therefore have therefore abstained when the vote on this issue was taken.

The reconsideration process is a very narrowly focused instrument, relying solely upon investigating deviations from established and agreed upon process. As such, it can be useful, but it is limited in scope. In particular, it does not address situations where process has in fact been followed, but the results of such process have been regarded, sometimes quite widely, as being contrary to what might be best for significant or all segments of the ... community and/or Internet users in general.

The rationale underlying the rejection of the reconsideration claim is essentially that the string similarity process found that there was likely to be substantial confusion between the two, and that therefore they belonged in a contention set. Furthermore, no process has been identified as having been violated and therefore there is nothing to reconsider. As a Board member who is aware of ICANN's ... Bylaws, I cannot vote against the motion to deny reconsideration. The motion appears to be correct based upon the criteria in the Bylaws that define the reconsideration process and the facts in this particular case. However, I am increasingly disturbed by the growing sequence of decisions that are based upon a criterion for user confusion that, in my opinion, is not only both incomplete and flawed, but appears to work directly against the concept that users should not be confused. I am persuaded by the argument made by the proponents of reconsideration in this case that users will in fact not be confused by .hoteis and .hotels, since if they enter the wrong name, they are very likely to be immediately confronted by information in a language that they did not anticipate.

Confusion is a perceptual issue. String similarity is only one consideration in thinking about perceptual confusion and in fact it is not always an issue. In my opinion, much more perceptual confusion will arise between .hotel and .hotels than between .hotels and .hoteis. Yet if we adhere strictly to the Guidebook and whatever instructions have or have not been given to string similarity experts, it is my position that we work against implementing decisions that assist in avoiding user confusion, and we work in favor of decisions that are based upon an incorrect, incomplete and flawed ex ante analysis of the ICANN Network real issues with respect to user confusion.

The goal of the string similarity process is the minimization of user confusion and ensuring user trust in using the DNS ... The string similarity exercise is one of the means in the new gTLD ... process to minimize such confusion and to strengthen user trust. In placing our emphasis, and in fact our decisions, on string similarity only, we are unwittingly substituting the means for the goal, and making decisions regarding the goal on the basis of a means test. This is a disservice to the Internet user community.

I cannot and will not vote in favor of a motion that reflects, directly or indirectly, an unwillingness to depart from what I see as such a flawed position and which does not reflect in my opinion an understanding of the current reality of the situation.

120. These statements reflect to an important degree the Panel's own analysis.
121. The elements of the string similarity review process were established and widely published several years ago, after extensive consultation and debate among ICANN stakeholders and the Internet community. Booking.com correctly describes the process established (or "crystallized") in the Guidebook as a component of "a consensus policy" concerning the introduction of new gTLDs.¹⁰¹
122. The Guidebook makes clear that, as part of the initial evaluation to which all applied-for gTLDs are subject, each string would be reviewed for a number of factors, one of which is "string similarity", which involves a determination of "whether the applied-for gTLD string is so similar to other strings that it would create a probability of user confusion"¹⁰². The term "user" is elaborated elsewhere in the Guidebook, which speaks of confusion arising "in the mind of the average, reasonable Internet user."¹⁰³
123. The Guidebook explains that string similarity review comprises merely a "visual similarity check",¹⁰⁴ with a view to identifying only "visual string similarities that would create a probability of user confusion."¹⁰⁵
124. The Guidebook makes clear that string similarity reviews would be conducted by an independent third party – the SSP – that would have wide (though not complete) discretion both in formulating its methodology and in determining string similarity on the basis of that methodology.
125. Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Guidebook, titled "Review Methodology", provides that the SSP "is informed in part by an algorithmic score for ... visual similarity," which "will provide one objective measure for consideration by the [SSP]." Section 2.2.1.1.2 further states that, in addition to "examin[ing] all the algorithm data," the SSP will "perform its own review of similarities between strings and whether they rise to the level of string confusion." It is noted that the objective algorithmic score is to be treated as "only indicative". Crucially, "the final determination of similarity is entirely up to the [SSP's] judgment." (Underlining added)
126. In sum, the Guidebook calls for the SSP to determine whether two strings are so "visually similar" as to create a "probability of confusion" in the mind of an "average, reasonable Internet user." In making this determination, the SSP is informed by an "algorithmic score", to ensure that the process comprises at least one "objective measure". However, the algorithmic score is not determinative. The SSP also develops and performs "its own review". At the end of the day, the determination is entirely a matter of "the [SSP's] judgment."

¹⁰¹ Request, ¶ 13.

¹⁰² Guidebook, §2.2 (Module 2-4).

¹⁰³ Guidebook, §2.2.1.1.2. (Underlining added)

¹⁰⁴ Guidebook, §2.2.1.1. (Underlining added)

¹⁰⁵ Guidebook, §2.2.1.1.1. (Underlining added)

127. By its very nature this process is highly discretionary. It is also, to an important degree, subjective. The Guidebook provides no definition of “visual similarity”, nor any indication of how such similarity is to be objectively measured other than by means of the SWORD algorithm. The Guidebook provides no definition of “confusion,” nor any definition or description of an “average, reasonable Internet user.” As Mr. Sadowski of the NGPC put it: “Confusion is a perceptual issue.” (Mr. Sadowski further noted: “String similarity is only one consideration in thinking about perceptual confusion, and in fact it is not always an issue.) The Guidebook mandates the SSP to develop and apply “its own review” of visual similarity and “whether similarities rise to the level of user confusion”, in addition to SWORD algorithm, which is intended to be merely “indicative”, yet provides no substantive guidelines in this respect.
128. Nor does the process as it exists provide for gTLD applicants to benefit from the sort of procedural mechanisms – for example, to inform the SSP’s review, to receive reasoned determinations from the SSP, or to appeal the merits of those determinations – which Booking.com claims are required under the applicable rules. Clearly, certain ICANN NGPC members themselves consider that such input would be desirable and that changes to the process are required in order for the string similarity review process to attain its true goal, which Mr. Sadowski referred to as “the minimization of user confusion and ensuring user trust in using the DNS”. However, as even the abstaining members of the NGPC conceded, the fact is that the sort of mechanisms that Booking.com asserts are required (and which those NGPC members believe should be required) are simply not part of the string similarity review process as currently established. As to whether they *should* be, it is not our place to express an opinion, though we note that such additional mechanisms surely would be consistent with the principles of transparency and fairness.
129. We add that we agree with ICANN that the time has long since passed for Booking.com or any other interested party to ask an IRP panel to review the actions of the ICANN Board in relation to the establishment of the string similarity review process, including Booking.com’s claims that specific elements of the process and the Board decisions to implement those elements are inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws. Any such claims, even if they had any merit, are long since time-barred by the 30-day limitation period set out in Article IV, Section 3(3) of the Bylaws. As ICANN expressed during the hearing, if Booking.com believed that there were problems with the Guidebook, it should have objected at the time the Guidebook was first implemented.
130. When asked during the hearing about its failure to object timely, Booking.com argued that it could not have known how the Board’s actions – that is, how the process established in the Guidebook – would affect it prior to the submission of its application for .hotels. However, that is not a persuasive or meritorious answer. As did all stakeholders, Booking.com had the opportunity to challenge the Board’s adoption of the Guidebook, at the time, if it considered any of its elements to be inconsistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.

C. The Case of .hotels

131. In the light of the preceding analysis of Booking.com’s challenge concerning the ICANN Board’s actions in relation to the string similarity review process generally, the Panel is not

persuaded by its challenge concerning the Board's conduct in relation to the review of .hotels specifically.

132. There are two principal elements to this part of Booking.com's case: a challenge in relation to the process followed by the SSP; and a challenge in relation to the Board's handling of Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration of the SSP's determination. However, the fundamental obstacle to Booking.com's case is that *the established process was followed in all respects*.
133. Booking.com itself acknowledges that "the process was followed" by the SSP, which determined that .hotels and .hoteis were so visually similar as to warrant being placed in a contention set. So too did all of the NGPC members who commented on the matter recognize that "the process was followed" – for all their stated misgivings concerning the outcome of the process.
134. The same is true of the Request for Reconsideration. The Panel is struck by the extent and thoughtfulness not only of the NGPC's consideration of the issue, certain aspects of which are discussed above, but of the BGC's detailed analysis and its Recommendation to the NGPC, on the basis of which Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration was denied. Contrary to Booking.com's allegations, in neither instance was this merely a blind acceptance of a decision of a subordinate body. In fact, the reconsideration process itself, however limited and perhaps imperfect it may be, is inconsistent with Booking.com's claims of lack of "due process".
135. Although not addressed in great detail by the parties, the Panel considers several observations made by the BGC in its 1 August 2013 Recommendation to be particularly apposite:

▪ *These standing requirements [for Requests for Reconsideration] are intended to protect the reconsideration process from abuse and to ensure that it is not used as a mechanism simply to challenge an action with which someone disagrees, but that it is limited to situations where the staff [or the Board] acted in contravention of established policies.*¹⁰⁶

▪ *Although the String Similarity Review was performed by a third party, ICANN has determined that the Reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges of the third party's decisions where it can be stated that either the vendor failed to follow its process in reaching the decision, or that ICANN staff failed to follow its process in accepting that decision.*¹⁰⁷

▪ *Booking.com does not suggest that the process for String Similarity Review set out in the Applicant Guidebook was not followed, or that ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in accepting the [SSP] decision on placing .hotels and .hoteis in contention sets. Instead, Booking.com is supplanting what it believes the review*

¹⁰⁶ BGC Recommendation, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷ BGC Recommendation, p. 4. The BGC explains that "Because the basis for the Request is not Board conduct, regardless of whether the 20 December 2012 version, or the 11 April 2013 version, of the Reconsideration Bylaws is operative, the BGC's analysis and recommendation below would not change."

methodology for assessing visual similarity should have been, as opposed to the methodology set out at Section 2.2.1.1.2 of the Applicant Guidebook. In asserting a new review methodology, Booking.com is asking the BGC (and the Board through the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC)) to make a substantive evaluation of the confusability of the strings and to reverse the decision. In the context of the New gTLD Program, the Reconsideration process is not however intended for the Board to perform a substantive review of [SSP] decisions. While Booking.com may have multiple reasons as to why it believes that its application for .hotels should not be in contention set with .hoteis, Reconsideration is not available as a mechanism to re-try the decisions of the evaluation panels.¹⁰⁸

▪ *Booking.com also claims that its assertions regarding the non-confusability of the .hotels and .hoteis strings demonstrate that “it is contrary to ICANN policy to put them in a contention set.” (Request, pages 6-7.) This is just a differently worded attempt to reverse the decision of the [SSP]. No actual policy or process is cited by Booking.com, only the suggestion that – according to Booking.com – the standards within the Applicant Guidebook on visual similarity should have resulted in a different outcome for the .hotels string. This is not enough for Reconsideration.¹⁰⁹*

▪ *Booking.com argues that the contention set decision was taken without material information, including Booking.com’s linguistic expert’s opinion, or other “information that would refute the mistaken contention that there is likely to be consumer confusion between ‘.hotels’ and ‘.hoteis.’” (Request, page 7.) However, there is no process point in the String Similarity Review for applicants to submit additional information. This is in stark contrast to the reviews set out in Section 2.2.2 of the Applicant Guidebook, including the Technical/Operational review and the Financial Review, which allow for the evaluators to seek clarification or additional information through the issuance of clarifying questions. (AGB, Section 2.2.2.3 (Evaluation Methodology).)¹¹⁰*

▪ *Just as the process does not call for additional applicant inputs into the visual similarity review, Booking.com’s call for further information on the decision to place .hotels and .hoteis in a contention set ... is similarly not rooted in any established ICANN process at issue.[...] While applicants may avail themselves of accountability mechanism to challenge decisions, the use of an accountability mechanism when there is no proper ground to bring a request for review under the selected mechanism does not then provide opportunity for additional substantive review of decisions already taken.¹¹¹*

▪ *[W]hile we understand the impact that Booking.com faces by being put in a contention set, and that it wishes for more narrative information regarding the [SSP’s] decision, no such narrative is called for in the process.¹¹²*

▪ *The Applicant Guidebook sets out the methodology used when evaluating visual similarity of strings. The process documentation provided by the String Similarity Review Panel describes the steps followed by the [SSP] in applying the methodology*

¹⁰⁸ BGC Recommendation, p. 5.

¹⁰⁹ BGC Recommendation, p. 6.

¹¹⁰ BGC Recommendation, p. 6.

¹¹¹ BGC Recommendation, pp. 6-7.

¹¹² BGC Recommendation, p. 7.

set out in the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN then coordinates a quality assurance review over a random selection of [SSP's] reviews to gain confidence that the methodology and process were followed. That is the process used for a making and assessing a determination of visual similarity. Booking.com's disagreement as to whether the methodology should have resulted in a finding of visual similarity does not mean that ICANN (including the third party vendors performing String Similarity Review) violated any policy in reaching the decision (nor does it support a conclusion that the decision was actually wrong).¹¹³

▪ The [SSP] reviewed all applied for strings according to the standards and methodology of the visual string similarity review set out in the Applicant Guidebook. The Guidebook clarifies that once contention sets are formed by the [SSP], ICANN will notify the applicants and will publish results on its website. (AGB, Section 2.2.1.1.1.) That the [SSP] considered its output as "advice" to ICANN (as stated in its process documentation) is not the end of the story. Whether the results are transmitted as "advice" or "outcomes" or "reports", the important query is what ICANN was expected to do with that advice once it was received. ICANN had always made clear that it would rely on the advice of its evaluators in the initial evaluation stage of the New gTLD Program, subject to quality assurance measures. Therefore, Booking.com is actually proposing a new and different process when it suggests that ICANN should perform substantive review (instead of process testing) over the results of the String Similarity Review Panel's outcomes prior to the finalization of contention sets.¹¹⁴

▪ As there is no indication that either the [SSP] or ICANN staff violated any established ICANN policy in reaching or accepting the decision on the placement of .hotels and .hoteis in a non-exact contention set, this Request should not proceed.¹¹⁵

136. These excerpts of the BGC Recommendation not only illustrate the seriousness with which Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration was heard, they mirror considerations to which we fully subscribe and which we find apply as well, with equal force and effect, in the context of Booking.com's IRP Request.
137. It simply cannot be said – indeed, it is not even alleged by Booking.com – that the established process was not followed by the ICANN Board or any third party either in the initial string similarity review of .hotels or in the reconsideration process.
138. Booking.com was asked at the hearing to identify *with particularity* the ICANN Board's actions (including inactions) in this case that it claims are inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws or the Guidebook and regarding which it asks the Panel to render a declaration. It identified four:
- The Board's adoption of certain provisions of the Guidebook, including the allegedly ill-defined, unfair and non-transparent procedures for selecting the SSP and supervising the SSP's performance of the string similarity review process. As discussed, any claims in this regard are time-barred.

¹¹³ BGC Recommendation, p. 7.

¹¹⁴ BGC Recommendation, p. 8.

¹¹⁵ BGC Recommendation, p. 10.

- The Board's acceptance of the SSP determination. As ICANN argues, there was no action (or inaction) by the Board here, no decision made (or not made) by the Board or any other body to accept the SSP's determination. The Guidebook provides that applied-for strings "will be placed in contention set" where the SSP determines the existence of visual similarity likely to give rise to user confusion. Simply put, under the Guidebook the Board is neither required nor entitled to intervene at this stage to accept or not accept the SSP's determination. Booking.com is correct that the Board could nevertheless have stepped in and reversed the SSP determination under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook, but did not do so; that inaction is addressed below.
 - The Board's denial of Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration. As discussed above, there is nothing in the evidence that even remotely suggests that ICANN's conduct in this regard was inconsistent with its Articles, Bylaws or the Guidebook. On the contrary, we have already stated that the detailed analysis performed by the BGC and the extensive consideration of the BGC Recommendation by the NGCP undermine any claim that ICANN failed to exercise due care and independent judgment, or that its handling of the Request for Reconsideration was inconsistent with applicable rules or policy. As discussed above, just as in the present IRP, the question in the reconsideration process is whether the established process was followed. This was the question that the BGC and NGPC asked themselves in considering Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration, and which they properly answered in the affirmative in denying Booking.com's request.
 - The Board's refusal to "step in" and exercise its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook to "individually consider an application for a new gTLD to determine whether approval would be in the best interest of the Internet community." As pointed out by ICANN during the hearing, the fact that the ICANN Board enjoys such discretion and may choose to exercise it any time does not mean that it is bound to exercise it, let alone at the time and in the manner demanded by Booking.com. In any case, the Panel does not believe that the Board's inaction in this respect was inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws or indeed with ICANN's guiding principles of transparency and fairness, given (1) Booking.com's concession that the string similarity review process was followed; (2) the indisputable conclusion that any challenge to the adoption of the SSP process itself is time-barred; (3) the manifestly thoughtful consideration given to Booking.com's Request for Reconsideration by the BGC; and (4), the fact that, notwithstanding its protestations to the contrary, Booking.com's real dispute seems to be with the process itself rather than how the process was applied in this case (given that, as noted, Booking.com concedes that the process was indeed followed).
139. The Panel further considers that these – in addition to any and all other potential (and allegedly reviewable) actions identified by Booking.com during the course of these proceedings – fail on the basis of Booking.com's dual acknowledgement that it does not challenge the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process, and that that process was duly followed in this case.

140. Finally, the panel notes that Booking.com's claim – largely muted during the hearing – regarding alleged “discrimination” as regards the treatment of its application for .hotels also founders on the same ground. Booking.com acknowledges that the established string similarity review process was followed; and there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that .hotels was treated any differently than any other applied-for gTLD string in this respect. The mere fact that the *result* of the string similarity review of .hotels differed from the results of the reviews of the vast majority of other applied-for strings does not suggest discriminatory treatment. In any event, the Panel cannot but note the obvious, which is that .hotels is not alone in having been placed in contention by the SSP. So too was .hoteis; and so too were .unicom and .unicorn. Moreover, and once again, it is recalled that Booking.com does not claim to challenge the merits of the string similarity review, that is, the determination that .hotels and .hoteis are so visually similar as to warrant placement in a contention set.

D. Conclusion

141. In launching this IRP, Booking.com no doubt realized that it faced an uphill battle. The very limited nature of IRP proceedings is such that any IRP applicant will face significant obstacles in establishing that the ICANN Board acted inconsistently with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws. In fact, Booking.com acknowledges those obstacles, albeit inconsistently and at times indirectly.
142. Booking.com purports to challenge “the way in which the [string similarity review] process was established, implemented and supervised by (or under the authority of) the ICANN Board”; yet it also claims that it *does not challenge the validity or fairness of the string similarity review process as set out in the Guidebook*. It asks the Panel to overturn the SSP's determination in this case and to substitute an alternate result, in part on the basis of its own “expert evidence” regarding similarity and the probability of user confusion as between .hotels and .hoteis; yet it claims that it *does not challenge the merits of the SSP determination and it acknowledges that the process set out in the Guidebook was duly followed* in the case of its application for .hotels.
143. In sum, Booking.com has failed to overcome the very obstacles that it recognizes exist.
144. The Panel finds that Booking.com has failed to identify any instance of Board action or inaction, including any action or inaction of ICANN staff or a third party (such as ICC, acting as the SSP), that could be considered to be inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws or with the policies and procedures established in the Guidebook. This includes the challenged actions of the Board (or any staff or third party) in relation to what Booking.com calls the implementation and supervision of the string similarity review process generally, as well as the challenged actions of the Board (or any staff or third party) in relation to the string similarity review of .hotels in particular.
145. More particularly, the Panel finds that the string similarity review performed in the case of .hotels was not inconsistent with the Articles or Bylaws or with what Booking.com refers to as the “applicable rules” as set out in the Guidebook.
146. To the extent that the Board's adoption and implementation of specific elements of the new gTLD Program and Guidebook, including the string similarity review process, could

potentially be said to be inconsistent with the principles of transparency or fairness that underlie ICANN's Articles and Incorporation and Bylaws (which the Panel does not say is the case), the time to challenge such action has long since passed.

147. Booking.com's IRP Request must be denied.

VII. THE PREVAILING PARTY; COSTS

148. Article IV, Section 3(18) of the Bylaws requires that the Panel "specifically designate the prevailing party." This designation is germane to the allocation of costs, given that Article IV, Section 3(18) provides that the "party not prevailing shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the IRP Provider."
149. The same provision of the Bylaws also states that "in an extraordinary case the IRP Panel may in its declaration allocate up to half of the costs of the IRP Provider to the prevailing party based upon the circumstances, including a consideration of the reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest. Each party to the IRP proceedings shall bear its own expenses."
150. Similarly, the Supplementary Procedures state, at Article 11:

The IRP PANEL shall fix costs in its DECLARATION. The party not prevailing in an IRP shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the proceedings, but under extraordinary circumstances the IRP PANEL may allocate up to half of the costs to the prevailing party, taking into account the circumstances of the case, including the reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest.

In the event the Requestor has not availed itself, in good faith, of the cooperative engagement or conciliation process, and the requestor is not successful in the Independent Review, the IRP PANEL must award ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the IRP, including legal fees.


151. The "IRP Provider" is the ICDR, and, in accordance with the ICDR Rules, the costs to be allocated between the parties – what the Bylaws call the "costs of the IRP Provider", and the Supplementary Procedures call the "costs of the proceedings" – include the fees and expenses of the Panel members and of the ICDR (we refer to all of these costs as "IRP costs").
152. ICANN is undoubtedly the prevailing party in this case. That being said, the Panel considers that the nature and significance of the issues raised by Booking.com, and the contribution to the "public interest" of its submissions, are such that it is appropriate and reasonable that the IRP costs be shared equally by the parties. We consider that the extraordinary circumstances of case – in which some members of ICANN's New gTLD Program Committee have publicly declared that, in their view, the rules on the basis of which Booking.com's claims fail should be reconsidered by ICANN – warrants such a holding.
153. The Panel cannot grant Booking.com the relief that it seeks. A panel such as ours can only declare whether, on the facts as we find them, the challenged actions of ICANN are

or are not inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. We have found that the actions in question are not inconsistent with those instruments. The process established by ICANN under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and set out in the Guidebook was followed, and the time to challenge that process (which Booking.com asserts is not its intention in these proceedings in any event) has long passed.

154. However, we can – and we do – acknowledge certain legitimate concerns regarding the string similarity review process raised by Booking.com, discussed above, which are evidently shared by a number of prominent and experienced ICANN NGPC members. And we can, and do, encourage ICANN to consider whether it wishes to address these issues in an appropriate manner and forum, for example, when drafting the Guidebook for round two of the New gTLD Program or, more immediately, in the exercise of its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook (which it may choose to exercise at any time, in its discretion) to consider whether, notwithstanding the result of the string similarity review of .hotels and .hoteis, approval of both of Booking.com's and Despegar's proposed strings would be in the best interest of the Internet community.

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, the Panel hereby declares:

- (1) Booking.com's IRP Request is denied;
- (2) ICANN is the prevailing party;
- (3) In view of the circumstances, each party shall bear one-half of the costs of the IRP Provider, including the fees and expenses of the Panel members and the fees and expenses of the ICDR. As a result, the administrative fees and expenses of the ICDR, totaling US\$4,600.00, as well as the compensation and expenses of the Panelists totaling US\$163,010.05 are to be borne equally. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Booking.com the amount of US\$2,300.00 representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of the apportioned costs previously incurred by Booking.com
- (4) This Final Declaration may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute the Final Declaration of this IRP Panel.



Hon. A. Howard Matz
Date: March 2, 2015

David H. Bernstein
Date:

Stephen L. Drymer,
Chair of the IRP Panel
Date:

I, Hon. A. Howard Matz, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

March 2, 2015
Date


Hon. A. Howard Matz

I, David H, Bernstein, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

Date

David H, Bernstein

I, Stephen L. Drymer, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

Date

Stephen L. Drymer

or are not inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. We have found that the actions in question are not inconsistent with those instruments. The process established by ICANN under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and set out in the Guidebook was followed, and the time to challenge that process (which Booking.com asserts is not its intention in these proceedings in any event) has long passed.

154. However, we can – and we do – acknowledge certain legitimate concerns regarding the string similarity review process raised by Booking.com, discussed above, which are evidently shared by a number of prominent and experienced ICANN NGPC members. And we can, and do, encourage ICANN to consider whether it wishes to address these issues in an appropriate manner and forum, for example, when drafting the Guidebook for round two of the New gTLD Program or, more immediately, in the exercise of its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook (which it may choose to exercise at any time, in its discretion) to consider whether, notwithstanding the result of the string similarity review of .hotels and .hoteis, approval of both of Booking.com's and Despegar's proposed strings would be in the best interest of the Internet community.

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, the Panel hereby declares:

- (1) Booking.com's IRP Request is denied;
- (2) ICANN is the prevailing party;
- (3) In view of the circumstances, each party shall bear one-half of the costs of the IRP Provider, including the fees and expenses of the Panel members and the fees and expenses of the ICDR. As a result, the administrative fees and expenses of the ICDR, totaling US\$4,600.00, as well as the compensation and expenses of the Panelists totaling US\$163,010.05 are to be borne equally. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Booking.com the amount of US\$2,300.00 representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of the apportioned costs previously incurred by Booking.com
- (4) This Final Declaration may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute the Final Declaration of this IRP Panel.

Hon. A. Howard Matz
Date:



David H. Bernstein
Date: March 2, 2015

Stephen L. Drymer,
Chair of the IRP Panel
Date:

I, Hon. A. Howard Matz, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

Date

Hon. A. Howard Matz

I, David H. Bernstein, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

March 2, 2015
Date



David H. Bernstein

I, Stephen L. Drymer, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

Date

Stephen L. Drymer

or are not inconsistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. We have found that the actions in question are not inconsistent with those instruments. The process established by ICANN under its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws and set out in the Guidebook was followed, and the time to challenge that process (which Booking.com asserts is not its intention in these proceedings in any event) has long passed.

154. However, we can – and we do – acknowledge certain legitimate concerns regarding the string similarity review process raised by Booking.com, discussed above, which are evidently shared by a number of prominent and experienced ICANN NGPC members. And we can, and do, encourage ICANN to consider whether it wishes to address these issues in an appropriate manner and forum, for example, when drafting the Guidebook for round two of the New gTLD Program or, more immediately, in the exercise of its authority under Section 5.1 (Module 5-4) of the Guidebook (which it may choose to exercise at any time, in its discretion) to consider whether, notwithstanding the result of the string similarity review of .hotels and .hotéis, approval of both of Booking.com's and Despegar's proposed strings would be in the best interest of the Internet community.

FOR THE FOREGOING REASONS, the Panel hereby declares:

- (1) Booking.com's IRP Request is denied;
- (2) ICANN is the prevailing party;
- (3) In view of the circumstances, each party shall bear one-half of the costs of the IRP Provider, including the fees and expenses of the Panel members and the fees and expenses of the ICDR. As a result, the administrative fees and expenses of the ICDR, totaling US\$4,600.00, as well as the compensation and expenses of the Panelists totaling US\$163,010.05 are to be borne equally. Therefore, ICANN shall pay to Booking.com the amount of US\$2,300.00 representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of the apportioned costs previously incurred by Booking.com
- (4) This Final Declaration may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, and all of which together shall constitute the Final Declaration of this IRP Panel.

Hon. A. Howard Matz

Date:

David H. Bernstein

Date:



Stephen L. Drymer,
Chair of the IRP Panel

Date: 3 March 2015

I, Hon. A. Howard Matz, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

Date

Hon. A. Howard Matz


I, David H. Bernstein, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

Date

David H. Bernstein

I, Stephen L. Drymer, do hereby affirm upon my oath as Arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is the Final Declaration of the IRP Panel.

3 March 2015
Date



Stephen L. Drymer

Resp. Ex. 2



ICANN Documentary Information Disclosure Policy

NOTE: With the exception of personal email addresses, phone numbers and mailing addresses, DIDP Requests are otherwise posted in full on ICANN's website, unless there are exceptional circumstances requiring further redaction.

ICANN's Documentary Information Disclosure Policy (DIDP) is intended to ensure that information contained in documents concerning ICANN's operational activities, and within ICANN's possession, custody, or control, is made available to the public unless there is a compelling reason for confidentiality.

A principal element of ICANN's approach to transparency and information disclosure is the identification of a comprehensive set of materials that ICANN makes available on its website as a matter of course.

Specifically, ICANN has:

- Identified many of the categories of documents that are already made public as a matter of due course
- Developed a time frame for responding to requests for information not already publicly available
- Identified specific conditions for nondisclosure of information
- Described the mechanism under which requestors may appeal a denial of disclosure

Public Documents

ICANN posts on its website at www.icann.org, numerous categories of documents in due course. A list of those categories follows:

- Annual Reports – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/annual-report>

Articles of Incorporation – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/annual-report>

A note about tracking cookies:

This site is using "tracking cookies" on your computer to deliver the best experience possible. [Read more to see how they are being used.](#)

This notice is intended to appear only the first time you visit the site on any computer. Dismiss

- Bylaws (archives) – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws/archive>
- Correspondence – <http://www.icann.org/correspondence/>
- Financial Information – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/financials>
- Litigation documents – <http://www.icann.org/en/news/litigation>
- Major agreements – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/agreements>
- Monthly Registry reports – <http://www.icann.org/en/resources/registries/reports>
- Operating Plan – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/planning>
- Policy documents – <http://www.icann.org/en/general/policy.html>
- Speeches, Presentations & Publications – <http://www.icann.org/presentations>
- Strategic Plan – <http://www.icann.org/en/about/planning>
- Material information relating to the Address Supporting Organization (ASO) – <http://aso.icann.org/docs> including ASO policy documents, Regional Internet Registry (RIR) policy documents, guidelines and procedures, meeting agendas and minutes, presentations, routing statistics, and information regarding the RIRs
- Material information relating to the Generic Supporting Organization (GNSO) – <http://gnso.icann.org> – including correspondence and presentations, council resolutions, requests for comments, draft documents, policies, reference documents (see <http://gnso.icann.org/reference-documents.htm>), and council administration documents (see <http://gnso.icann.org/council/docs.shtml>).
- Material information relating to the country code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) – <http://ccnso.icann.org> – including meeting agendas, minutes, reports, and presentations
- Material information relating to the At Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) – <http://atlarge.icann.org> – including correspondence, statements, and meeting minutes
- Material information relating to the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) – <http://gac.icann.org/web/index.shtml> – including operating principles, gTLD principles, ccTLD principles, principles regarding gTLD Whois issues, communiqués, and meeting transcripts, and agendas
- Material information relating to the Root Server Advisory Committee (RSSAC) – <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/rssac> – including meeting minutes and information surrounding ongoing projects
- Material information relating to the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) – <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac> – including its charter, various presentations, work plans, reports, and advisories

Responding to Information Requests

If a member of the public requests information not already publicly available, ICANN will respond, to the extent feasible, to reasonable requests within 30 calendar days of receipt of the request. If that time frame will not be met, ICANN will inform the requester in writing as to when a response will be provided, setting

forth the reasons necessary for the extension of time to respond. If ICANN denies the information request, it will provide a written statement to the requestor identifying the reasons for the denial.

Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure

ICANN has identified the following set of conditions for the nondisclosure of information:

- Information provided by or to a government or international organization, or any form of recitation of such information, in the expectation that the information will be kept confidential and/or would or likely would materially prejudice ICANN's relationship with that party.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Confidential business information and/or internal policies and procedures.
- Information that, if disclosed, would or would be likely to endanger the life, health, or safety of any individual or materially prejudice the administration of justice.
- 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.
- Information that relates in any way to the security and stability of the Internet, including the operation of the L Root or any changes, modifications, or additions to the root zone.
- Trade secrets and commercial and financial information not publicly disclosed by ICANN.
- Information requests: (i) which are not reasonable; (ii) which are excessive or overly burdensome; (iii) complying with which is not feasible; or (iv) are made with an abusive or vexatious purpose or by a vexatious or querulous individual.

Information that falls within any of the conditions set forth above 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. Further, ICANN reserves the right to deny disclosure of information under conditions not designated above if ICANN determines that the harm in disclosing the information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

ICANN shall not be required to create or compile summaries of any documented information, and shall not be required to respond to requests seeking information that is already publicly available.

Appeal of Denials

To the extent a requestor chooses to appeal a denial of information from ICANN, the requestor may follow the Reconsideration Request procedures or Independent Review procedures, to the extent either is applicable, as set forth in Article IV, Sections 2 and 3 of the ICANN Bylaws, which can be found at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/governance/bylaws>.

DIDP Requests and Responses

Request submitted under the DIDP and ICANN responses are available here: <http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency>

Guidelines for the Posting of Board Briefing Materials

The posting of Board Briefing Materials on the Board Meeting Minutes page (at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/meetings>) is guided by the application of the DIDP. The Guidelines for the Posting of Board Briefing Materials are available at <http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/documents/briefing-materials-guidelines-21mar11-en.htm>.

To submit a request, send an email to didp@icann.org

[You Tube](#)

[Twitter](#)

[LinkedIn](#)

[Flickr](#)

[Facebook](#)

[RSS Feeds](#)

[Community Wiki](#)

[ICANN Blog](#)

[Who We Are](#)

[Contact Us](#)

[Accountability & Transparency](#)

[Governance](#)

[Help](#)

© 2014 Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers.
Cookie Policy

[Privacy Policy](#)

[Terms of Service](#)

Resp. Ex. 3

**PROCESS FOR RESPONDING TO ICANN'S DOCUMENTARY
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE POLICY (DIDP) REQUESTS**

The following sets forth the process guidelines for responding to a DIDP Request.

1. Upon receipt of a DIDP Request, ICANN staff performs a review of the Request and identifies what documentary information is requested and the staff members who may be in possession of or have knowledge regarding information responsive to the Request.
2. Staff conducts interviews of the relevant staff member(s) and performs a thorough search for documents responsive to the DIDP Request.
3. Documents collected are reviewed for responsiveness.
4. A review is conducted as to whether the documents identified as responsive to the Request are subject to any of the Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure identified at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency/didp>.
5. To the extent that any responsive documents fall within any Defined Conditions for Nondisclosure, 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.
6. Documents that have been determined as responsive and appropriate for public disclosure are posted in the appropriate locations on ICANN's website. To the extent that the publication of any documents is appropriate but premature at the time the Response is due, ICANN will so indicate in its Response to the DIDP Request and notify the Requester upon publication.
7. Staff prepares a Response to the DIDP Request within thirty calendar days from receipt of the Request. The Response will be sent to the Requester by email. The Response and Request will also be posted on the DIDP page at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency> in accordance with the posting guidelines set forth at <http://www.icann.org/en/about/transparency/didp>.

Resp. Ex. 4

Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process

Table of Contents

Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process.....	1
Table of Contents.....	1
1. Definitions.....	1
2. Scope.....	2
3. Number of Independent Review Panelists.....	2
4. Conduct of the Independent Review.....	2
5. Written Statements.....	2
6. Summary Dismissal.....	3
7. Interim Measures of Protection.....	3
8. Standard of Review.....	3
9. Declarations.....	3
10. Form and Effect of an IRP Declaration.....	4
11. Costs.....	4
12. Emergency Measures of Protection.....	4

These procedures supplement the International Centre for Dispute Resolution's International Arbitration Rules in accordance with the independent review procedures set forth in Article IV, Section 3 of the ICANN Bylaws.

1. Definitions

In these Supplementary Procedures:

DECLARATION refers to the decisions/opinions of the IRP PANEL.

ICANN refers to the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers.

ICDR refers to the International Centre for Dispute Resolution, which has been designated and approved by ICANN's Board of Directors as the Independent Review Panel Provider (IRPP) under Article IV, Section 3 of ICANN's Bylaws.

INDEPENDENT REVIEW or IRP refers to the procedure that takes place upon the filing of a request to review ICANN Board actions or inactions alleged to be inconsistent with ICANN's Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation

INTERNATIONAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES OR RULES refer to the ICDR's International Arbitration Rules that will govern the process in combination with these Supplementary Procedures.

IRP PANEL refers to the neutral(s) appointed to decide the issue(s) presented. The IRP will be comprised of members of a standing panel identified in coordination with the ICDR. Certain decisions of the IRP are subject to review or input of the Chair of the standing panel. In the event that an omnibus standing panel: (i) is not in place when an IRP PANEL must be convened for a given proceeding, the IRP proceeding will be considered by a one- or three-member panel comprised in accordance with the rules of the ICDR; or (ii) is in place but does not have the requisite diversity of skill and experience needed for a particular proceeding, the ICDR shall identify and appoint one or more panelists, as required, from outside the omnibus standing panel to augment the panel members for that proceeding.

2. Scope

The ICDR will apply these Supplementary Procedures, in addition to the INTERNATIONAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES, in all cases submitted to the ICDR in connection with the Article IV, Section 3(4) of the ICANN Bylaws. In the event there is any inconsistency between these Supplementary Procedures and the RULES, these Supplementary Procedures will govern. These Supplementary Procedures and any amendment of them shall apply in the form in effect at the time the request for an INDEPENDENT REVIEW is received by the ICDR.

3. Number of Independent Review Panelists

Either party may elect that the request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW be considered by a three-member panel: the parties' election will be

taken into consideration by the Chair of the standing panel convened for the IRP, who will make a final determination whether the matter is better suited for a one- or three-member panel.

4. Conduct of the Independent Review

The IRP Panel should conduct its proceedings by electronic means to the extent feasible. Where necessary, the IRP Panel may conduct telephone conferences. In the extraordinary event that an in-person hearing is deemed necessary by the panel presiding over the IRP proceeding (in coordination with the Chair of the standing panel convened for the IRP, or the ICDR in the event the standing panel is not yet convened), the in-person hearing shall be limited to argument only; all evidence, including witness statements, must be submitted in writing in advance. Telephonic hearings are subject to the same limitation.

The IRP PANEL retains responsibility for determining the timetable for the IRP proceeding. Any violation of the IRP PANEL's timetable may result in the assessment of costs pursuant to Section 10 of these Procedures.

5. Written Statements

The initial written submissions of the parties shall not exceed 25 pages each in argument, double-spaced and in 12-point font. All necessary evidence to demonstrate the requestor's claims that ICANN violated its Bylaws or Articles of Incorporation should be part of the submission. Evidence will not be included when calculating the page limit. The parties may submit expert evidence in writing, and there shall be one right of reply to that expert evidence. The IRP PANEL may request additional written submissions from the party seeking review, the Board, the Supporting Organizations, or from other parties.

6. Summary Dismissal

An IRP PANEL may summarily dismiss any request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW where the requestor has not demonstrated that it meets the standing requirements for initiating the INDEPENDENT REVIEW.

Summary dismissal of a request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW is also appropriate where a prior IRP on the same issue has concluded through DECLARATION.

An IRP PANEL may also dismiss a querulous, frivolous or vexatious request for INDEPENDENT REVIEW.

7. Interim Measures of Protection

An IRP PANEL may recommend that the Board stay any action or decision, or that the Board take any interim action, until such time as the Board reviews and acts upon the IRP declaration. Where the IRP PANEL is not yet comprised, the Chair of the standing panel may provide a recommendation on the stay of any action or decision.

8. Standard of Review

The IRP is subject to the following standard of review: (i) did the ICANN Board act without conflict of interest in taking its decision; (ii) did the ICANN Board exercise due diligence and care in having sufficient facts in front of them; (iii) did the ICANN Board members exercise independent judgment in taking the decision, believed to be in the best interests of the company?

If a requestor demonstrates that the ICANN Board did not make a reasonable inquiry to determine it had sufficient facts available, ICANN Board members had a conflict of interest in participating in the decision, or the decision was not an exercise in independent judgment, believed by the ICANN Board to be in the best interests of the company, after taking account of the Internet community and the global public interest, the requestor will have established proper grounds for review.

9. Declarations

Where there is a three-member IRP PANEL, any DECLARATION of the IRP PANEL shall be made by a majority of the IRP PANEL members. If any IRP PANEL member fails to sign the DECLARATION, it shall be accompanied by a statement of the reason for the absence of such signature.

10. Form and Effect of an IRP Declaration

- a. DECLARATIONS shall be made in writing, promptly by the IRP PANEL, based on the documentation, supporting materials and arguments submitted by the parties.
- b. The DECLARATION shall specifically designate the prevailing

party.

- c. A DECLARATION may be made public only with the consent of all parties or as required by law. Subject to the redaction of Confidential information, or unforeseen circumstances, ICANN will consent to publication of a DECLARATION if the other party so request.
- d. Copies of the DECLARATION shall be communicated to the parties by the ICDR.

11. Costs

The IRP PANEL shall fix costs in its DECLARATION. The party not prevailing in an IRP shall ordinarily be responsible for bearing all costs of the proceedings, but under extraordinary circumstances the IRP PANEL may allocate up to half of the costs to the prevailing party, taking into account the circumstances of the case, including the reasonableness of the parties' positions and their contribution to the public interest.

In the event the Requestor has not availed itself, in good faith, of the cooperative engagement or conciliation process, and the requestor is not successful in the Independent Review, the IRPPANEL must award ICANN all reasonable fees and costs incurred by ICANN in the IRP, including legal fees.

12. Emergency Measures of Protection

Article 37 of the RULES will not apply.

©2011 American Arbitration Association, Inc. All rights reserved. These rules are the copyrighted property of the American Arbitration Association (AAA) and are intended to be used in conjunction with the AAA's administrative services. Any unauthorized use or modification of these rules may violate copyright laws and other applicable laws. Please contact 800.778.7879 or websitemail@adr.org for additional information.

Resp. Ex. 5



New gTLD Program
Community Priority Evaluation Report
Report Date: 10 September 2014

Application ID:	1-1083-39123
Applied-for String:	RADIO
Applicant Name:	European Broadcasting Union

Overall Community Priority Evaluation Summary

Community Priority Evaluation Result	Prevailed
<p>Thank you for your participation in the New gTLD Program. After careful consideration and extensive review of the information provided in your application, including documents of support, the Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the requirements specified in the Applicant Guidebook. Your application prevailed in Community Priority Evaluation.</p>	

Panel Summary

Overall Scoring	14 Point(s)																	
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criteria</th> <th>Earned</th> <th>Achievable</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>#1: Community Establishment</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#3: Registration Policies</td> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>#4: Community Endorsement</td> <td align="center">4</td> <td align="center">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td align="center">14</td> <td align="center">16</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Minimum Required Total Score to Pass <u>14</u></p>	Criteria	Earned	Achievable	#1: Community Establishment	3	4	#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community	3	4	#3: Registration Policies	4	4	#4: Community Endorsement	4	4	Total	14	16
Criteria	Earned	Achievable																
#1: Community Establishment	3	4																
#2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community	3	4																
#3: Registration Policies	4	4																
#4: Community Endorsement	4	4																
Total	14	16																

Criterion #1: Community Establishment	3/4 Point(s)
1-A Delineation	1/2 Point(s)
<p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application partially met the criterion for Delineation as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as it is clearly delineated and pre-existing, but, as defined, is not sufficiently organized. The application received a score of 1 out of 2 points under criterion 1-A: Delineation.</p> <p><u>Delineation</u> Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for delineation: there must be a clear, straightforward membership definition and there must be awareness and recognition of a community (as defined by the applicant) among its members.</p> <p>The community defined in the application (“RADIO”) is, as follows:</p> <p align="center">The Radio industry is composed of a huge number of very diverse radio broadcasters: public and private; international and local; commercial or community-oriented; general purpose, or sector-</p>	

specific; talk or music; big and small. All licensed radio broadcasters are part of the .radio community, and so are the associations, federations and unions they have created (such as the EBU, applicant for the .radio TLD with the support of its sister Unions; see below for more details on Radio industry representativeness). Also included are the radio professionals, those making radio the fundamental communications tool that it is.

However, the Radio industry keeps evolving and today, many stations are not only broadcasting in the traditional sense, but also webcasting and streaming their audio content via the Internet. Some are not broadcasters in the traditional sense: Internet radios are also part of the Radio community, and as such will be acknowledged by .radio TLD, as will podcasters. In all cases certain minimum standards on streaming or updating schedules will apply.

The .radio community also comprises the often overlooked amateur radio, which uses radio frequencies for communications to small circles of the public. Licensed radio amateurs and their clubs will also be part of the .radio community.

Finally, the community includes a variety of companies providing specific services or products to the Radio industry.

This community definition shows a clear and straightforward membership and is therefore well defined. Association with, and membership in, the radio community can be verified through licenses held by professional and amateur radio broadcasters; membership in radio-related associations, clubs and unions; internet radios that meet certain minimum standards; radio-related service providers that can be identified through trademarks; and radio industry partners and providers.

In addition, the community as defined in the application has awareness and recognition among its members. This is because the community as defined consists of entities and individuals that are in the radio industry¹, and as participants in this clearly defined industry, they have an awareness and recognition of their inclusion in the industry community. In addition, membership in the (industry) community is sufficiently structured, as the requirements listed in the community definition above show.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application satisfies both of the conditions to fulfill the requirements for Delineation.

Organization

Two conditions need to be met to fulfill the requirements for organization: there must be at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, and there must be documented evidence of community activities.

The community as defined in the application does not have one entity mainly dedicated to the community. There are several entities that represent parts of the radio community, such as the World Broadcasting Unions (WBU), the Association for International Broadcasting, the Association of European Radios, the Association Mondiale des Radiodiffuseurs Communautaires, the European Association of Television and Radio Sales Houses, the Union Radiophonique et Télévisuelle Internationale, and the Internet Media Device Alliance. Based on the Panel's research, these entities only represent certain segments of the community as defined by the applicant. For example, the WBU is the umbrella organization for eight regional broadcasting unions, but does not represent amateur radio. There is no entity that represents all of the radio member categories outlined by the applicant. According to the application:

¹The radio industry is included in the North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS). It defines this industry as, "Establishments primarily engaged in broadcasting aural programs by radio to the public. Included in this industry are commercial, religious, educational, and other radio stations. Also included here are establishments primarily engaged in radio broadcasting and which produce radio program materials." This definition of the industry includes the vast majority of entities included in the defined community.

The Radio community is structured mainly under 8 world broadcasting Unions which represent radio broadcasting interests at the World Radio Frequencies Conferences and coordinate their work through the WBU, as described in response to Question 11H.

The WBU works through a number of permanent working commissions, such as the Technical Committee, which deals with technical standardization; the Sports Committee, dealing with the coverage of world sports events (such as Olympic Games and football world championships); ISOG (International Satellite Operations Group), dealing with satellite contribution circuit issues. Besides the WBU, other specialized broadcasting associations represent specific radio interests, such as the already mentioned AMARC and AER.

According to the AGB, "organized" implies that there is at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, with documented evidence of community activities.” As described above, there is no entity(ies) that represents all of the radio member categories outlined by the applicant. An “organized” community is one that is represented by at least one entity that encompasses the entire community as defined by the applicant. For example, there should be at least one entity that encompasses and organizes: “radio broadcasters, the associations, federations and unions they have created, radio professionals, Internet radios, podcasters, amateur radio (and their clubs), and companies providing specific services or products to the Radio industry.” Based on information provided in the application materials and the Panel’s research, there is no such entity that organizes the community defined in the application. Therefore, as there is no entity that is mainly dedicated to the community as defined in the .RADIO application, as the Panel has determined, there cannot be documented evidence of community activities.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application does not satisfy either of the two conditions to fulfill the requirements for organization.

Pre-existence

To fulfill the requirements for pre-existence, the community must have been active prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed).

The community as defined in the application was active prior to September 2007. Radio broadcast technologies have existed in one form or another for nearly a century. As the industry has evolved² through the uptake of new technologies, so too has industry membership. For example, in the early years of the industry, members of the radio industry included radio professionals, broadcasters and companies providing products to the industry, amongst others. With the advent of the internet and other radio technologies, the community has expanded to include Internet radios, podcasters and others. The Panel acknowledges that not all elements of the community defined in the application have been in existence since the dawn of the industry; however, the proposed community segments have been active prior to September 2007.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application fulfills the requirements for Pre-existence.

1-B Extension

2/2 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as identified in the application met the criterion for Extension specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application demonstrates considerable size and longevity for the community. The application received a maximum score of 2 points under criterion 1-B: Extension.

² According to the US Federal Communications Commission, in 1906 the first program including speech and music was transmitted over the radio; by 1912 the US government put in place regulations for radio stations and operators. See http://transition.fcc.gov/omd/history/radio/documents/short_history.pdf

Size

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for size: the community must be of considerable size, and it must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application is of a considerable size. The community for .RADIO as defined in the application is large in terms of the number of members. According to the application:

Currently, there are about 50,000 radio stations worldwide, according to the figure published by CIA World Facts on their website. In addition, there are at least another 50,000 web radios.

Moreover, the community as defined in the application has awareness and recognition among its members. This is because the community as defined consists of entities and individuals that are in the radio industry³, and as participants in this clearly defined industry, they have an awareness and recognition of their inclusion in the industry community.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application satisfies both the conditions to fulfill the requirements for Size.

Longevity

Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for longevity: the community must demonstrate longevity and it must display an awareness and recognition of a community among its members.

The community as defined in the application demonstrates longevity. The pursuits of the .RADIO community are of a lasting, non-transient nature. Radio services have, as noted, existed for more than a century and are likely to continue, although technological advances may change form and function.

Moreover, as mentioned previously, the community as defined in the application has awareness and recognition among its members. This is because the community as defined consists of entities and individuals that are in the radio industry⁴, and as participants in this clearly defined industry, they have an awareness and recognition of their inclusion in the industry community.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the community as defined in the application satisfies both the conditions to fulfill the requirements for Longevity.

Criterion #2: Nexus between Proposed String and Community

3/4 Point(s)

2-A Nexus

2/3 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application partially met the criterion for Nexus as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook. The string “identifies” the name of the community as defined in the application, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community, but it does not “match” the name of the community as defined. The application received a score of 2 out of 3 points under criterion 2-A: Nexus.

To receive the maximum score for Nexus, the applied-for string must “match” the name of the community or be a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community name. To receive a partial score for Nexus, the applied-for string must “identify” the community. “Identify” means that the applied-for string should closely describe the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community.

The applied-for string (.RADIO) identifies the name of the community. According to the applicant:

³ Ibid

⁴ Ibid

Radio means the operators, services and technologies defined here as the Radio community. Radio also means, and is, audio broadcasting. The station broadcasting or streaming that audio content is radio, and the company performing the audio broadcasting is radio. A radio is the receiver used by the listener. Radio is the name everybody uses to refer to the entire industry, and the whole community.

With the advent of streaming via the Internet and the continuous delivery of audio content to broad groups of listeners, we now often refer to the new services as web, net or Internet radio.

The Radio community could not find any other name, even vaguely appropriate, to designate the TLD for its community. .radio is the TLD for the Radio community and could not be anything else. It is perfectly tuned.

The string closely describes the community, without overreaching substantially beyond the community. The string identifies the name of the core community members (i.e. licensed professional and amateur radio broadcasters and their associated unions and clubs, and Internet radio). However, the community, as defined in the application, also includes some entities that are only tangentially related to radio, such as companies providing specific services or products to radio broadcasting organizations and which may not be automatically associated with the gTLD string. For example, network interface equipment and software providers to the industry, based on the Panel's research, would not likely be associated with the word RADIO⁵. However, these entities are considered to comprise only a small part of the community. Since only a small part of the community as defined by the applicant extends beyond the reference of the string, it is not a substantial over-reach. Therefore, the string identifies the community, as the public will generally associate the string with the community as defined by the applicant.

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string identifies the name of the community as defined in the application. It therefore partially meets the requirements for Nexus.

2-B Uniqueness

1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Uniqueness as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the string has no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 2-B: Uniqueness.

To fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness, the string must have no other significant meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application. The string as defined in the application demonstrates uniqueness, as the string does not have any other meaning beyond identifying the community described in the application. The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applied-for string satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Uniqueness.

Criterion #3: Registration Policies

4/4 Point(s)

3-A Eligibility

1/1 Point(s)

The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Eligibility as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as eligibility

⁵ There are numerous definitions of the word radio. These include: (a) the transmission and reception of electromagnetic waves of radio frequency, especially those carrying sound messages; (b) the activity or industry of broadcasting sound programs to the public; (c) an apparatus for receiving radio programs. Definition (b) closely reflects the core community as defined by the applicant, which includes: radio broadcasters, the associations, federations and unions they have created, radio professionals, Internet radios, podcasters, and amateur radio (and their clubs). However, the community members that provide "specific services or products to the Radio industry", such as software or interface equipment, would not be associated with the term "radio" by the general public.

<p>is restricted to community members. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-A: Eligibility.</p> <p>To fulfill the requirements for Eligibility, the registration policies must restrict the eligibility of prospective registrants to community members. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by restricting eligibility to the community categories mentioned in Delineation, and additionally requiring that the registered domain name be “accepted as legitimate; and beneficial to the cause and values of the radio industry; and commensurate with the role and importance of the registered domain name; and in good faith at the time of registration and thereafter.” (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Eligibility.</p>	
<p>3-B Name Selection</p>	<p><i>1/1 Point(s)</i></p>
<p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Name Selection as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as name selection rules are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-B: Name Selection.</p> <p>To fulfill the requirements for Name Selection, the registration policies for name selection for registrants must be consistent with the articulated, community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by specifying that the registrant’s nexus with the radio community and use of the domain must be commensurate with the role of the registered domain, and with the role and importance of the domain name based on the meaning an average user would reasonably assume in the context of the domain name. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Name Selection.</p>	
<p>3-C Content and Use</p>	<p><i>1/1 Point(s)</i></p>
<p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Content and Use as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the rules for content and use are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for TLD. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-C: Content and Use.</p> <p>To fulfill the requirements for Content and Use, the registration policies must include rules for content and use for registrants that are consistent with the articulated community-based purpose of the applied-for gTLD. The application demonstrates adherence to this requirement by specifying that use of the domain name must be beneficial to the cause and values of the radio industry, and commensurate with the role and importance of the registered domain name, etc. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies the condition to fulfill the requirements for Content and Use.</p>	
<p>3-D Enforcement</p>	<p><i>1/1 Point(s)</i></p>
<p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Enforcement as specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application provided specific enforcement measures as well as appropriate appeal mechanisms. The application received a maximum score of 1 point under criterion 3-D: Enforcement.</p> <p>Two conditions must be met to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement: the registration policies must include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set, and there must be appropriate appeals mechanisms. The applicant outlined policies that include specific enforcement measures constituting a coherent set. The enforcement program is based on random checks, and if the content or use of an existing domain name shows bad faith, it will be suspended. There is also an appeals mechanism, which is managed in</p>	

the first instance by the registry, with appeals heard by an independent, alternative dispute resolution provider. (Comprehensive details are provided in Section 20e of the applicant documentation). The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application satisfies both conditions to fulfill the requirements for Enforcement.

Criterion #4: Community Endorsement	4/4 Point(s)
4-A Support	2/2 Point(s)
<p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application fully met the criterion for Support specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the applicant had documented support from the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). The application received a maximum score of 2 points under criterion 4-A: Support.</p> <p>To receive the maximum score for Support, the applicant is, or has documented support from, the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s), or has otherwise documented authority to represent the community. “Recognized” means those institution(s)/organization(s) that, through membership or otherwise, are clearly recognized by the community members as representative of the community. To receive a partial score for Support, the applicant must have documented support from at least one group with relevance. “Relevance” refers to the communities explicitly and implicitly addressed.</p> <p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the applicant was not the recognized community institution(s)/member organization(s). However, the applicant possesses documented support from institutions/organizations representing a majority of the community addressed, and this documentation contained a description of the process and rationale used in arriving at the expression of support. The applicant received support from a broad range of recognized community institutions/member organizations, which represented different segments of the community as defined by the applicant. These entities represented a majority of the overall community. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant fully satisfies the requirements for Support.</p>	
4-B Opposition	2/2 Point(s)
<p>The Community Priority Evaluation panel determined that the application met the criterion for Opposition specified in section 4.2.3 (Community Priority Evaluation Criteria) of the Applicant Guidebook, as the application did not receive any relevant opposition. The application received the maximum score of 2 points under criterion 4-B: Opposition.</p> <p>To receive the maximum score for Opposition, the application must not have received any opposition of relevance. To receive a partial score for Opposition, the application must have received opposition from, at most, one group of non-negligible size.</p> <p>The application received letters of opposition, which were determined not to be relevant, as they were (1) from individuals or groups of negligible size, or (2) were not from communities either explicitly mentioned in the application nor from those with an implicit association to such communities. The Community Priority Evaluation Panel determined that the applicant satisfies the requirements for Opposition.</p>	

Disclaimer: Please note that these Community Priority Evaluation results do not necessarily determine the final result of the application. In limited cases the results might be subject to change. These results do not constitute a waiver or amendment of any provision of the Applicant Guidebook or the Registry Agreement. For updated application status and complete details on the program, please refer to the Applicant Guidebook and the ICANN New gTLDs microsite at <newgtlds.icann.org>.