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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
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.
The Requester (Vistaprint Limited) seeks reconsideration of the Expert Determination upholding Web.com Group, Inc.’s string confusion objections to the Requester’s applications for .WEBS.

I. Brief Summary.

The Requester submitted two applications for .WEBS – one as a standard application and one as a community application. The Web.com Group, Inc. applied for .WEB. Web.com Group, Inc. filed two string confusion objections to the Requester’s applications, and both Objections were upheld. The Requester claims that the ICDR failed to follow applicable ICDR procedures governing the appointment and conduct of experts. Specifically, the Requester claims that the ICDR violated applicable ICDR procedures concerning: (i) the timely appointment of an expert panel; (ii) the acceptance of additional written submissions; (iii) the timely issuance of an expert determination; (iv) an expert’s duty to remain impartial and independent; and (v) challenges to experts. The Requester also claims that the actions of the Panel were inconsistent with ICANN policies, which influenced the Panel’s decision to uphold the Objections. Specifically, the Requester claims that the Panel violated applicable ICANN policies concerning: (i) the Objector’s burden of proof; and (ii) the standards governing the evaluation of a string confusion objection.

The Requester asks ICANN to reject the Expert Determination and instruct a new panel to issue an expert determination that applies the standards defined by ICANN. In the event ICANN concludes that the ICDR and the “new” Panel adhered to and correctly applied ICDR
and ICANN processes and policies concerning string confusion objections, the Requester asks that ICANN derogate from its procedure because accepting the Expert Determination would purportedly result in discriminatory application of ICANN’s standards, policies and procedures.

With respect to each claim asserted by the Requester concerning the ICDR’s alleged violations of applicable ICDR procedures concerning experts, there is no evidence that the ICDR deviated from the standards set forth in the Applicant Guidebook, the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure, or the ICDR’s Supplementary Procedures for String Confusion Objections (Rules). The Requester has likewise failed to demonstrate that the Panel applied the wrong standard in contravention of established policy or procedure. Therefore, the BGC\(^1\) concludes that Request 14-5 be denied.

II. Facts.

A. Background Facts.

Vistaprint Limited (the “Requester”) applied for .WEBS.\(^2\)

Web.com Group, Inc. (the “Objector”) applied for .WEB. Six other applicants also applied for .WEB.

On 13 March 2013, the Objector filed two string confusion objections (the “Objection”)\(^3\) with the ICDR\(^4\) to the Requester’s applications. The Objector asserted that “the applied-for gTLD string is confusingly similar to an existing TLD or to another applied-for gTLD string in the same round of applications.” (Applicant Guidebook (“Guidebook”), § 3.2.1; Procedure, Art.

---

\(^1\) Board Governance Committee.

\(^2\) Six other applicants also applied for .WEB.

\(^3\) Because the Objections were consolidated and the Expert Panel issued just one Determination, this Recommendation may reference “Objection” and “Determination” in the singular or the plural; any singular references shall apply to both objections.

\(^4\) International Centre for Dispute Resolution.
2(e).) The Objector was the only .WEB applicant to file a string confusion objection to the .WEBS applications.

On 6 May 2013, the ICDR consolidated Case No. 50 504 T 00221 13 and Case No. 50 504 T 00246 13. (Request, Section 3, Pg. 2.)

On 23 May 2013, the Requester responded to the Objections.

On 28 June 2013, the ICC appointed Mr. Steve Y. Koh, Esq. as the expert to consider the Objections (the “First Expert”).

On 19 July 2013, the Objector submitted a supplemental written statement replying to the Requester’s response.

On 31 July 2013, the Requester objected to the Objector’s supplemental filing, to which the Objector responded on 5 August 2013.

On 8 August 2013, the Panel acknowledged receipt of the Objector’s supplemental written statement and the parties’ respective statements dated 31 July 2013 and 5 August 2013, and granted the Requester leave to submit a sur-reply no later than 6 September 2013.

The Requester filed its sur-reply on 29 August 2013.

On 1 October 2013, the ICDR removed the First Expert due to a new conflict that arose.

On 14 October 2013, the ICDR appointed Bruce W. Belding, Esq. as the new expert (the “Second Expert”).

On 24 October 2013, the Objector challenged the appointment of the Second Expert, to which the Requester responded on 30 October 2013.

On 4 November 2013, the ICDR removed the Second Expert in response to the Objector’s challenge.
On 20 November 2013, the ICDR appointed Professor Ilhyung Lee to serve as the expert ("Expert" or "Panel") to consider the Objector’s Objection (the “Third Expert”). No party objected to this Expert.

On 24 January 2014, the Panel issued an Expert Determination in favor of the Objector and deemed the Objector the prevailing party. (Determination, Pg. 18.)

On 27 January 2014, the ICDR notified the parties of the Expert Determination.

On 6 February 2014, the Requester filed Request 14-5.

B. The Requester’s Claims.

The Requester claims that the ICDR failed to adhere to the following:

• Article 13(a) of the New gTLD Dispute Resolution Procedure (“Procedure”), in particular the standards for the timely appointment of an Expert Panel;

• Article 17 of the Procedure, in particular the standards governing the submission of additional written statements;

• Article 21 of the Procedure, in particular the standards for the timely issuance of an Expert Determination;

• Article 13(c) of the Procedure, in particular the standards governing an expert’s duty to maintain his or her impartiality and independence; and

• Article 2 of the ICDR’s Supplementary Procedures for String Confusion Objections (Rules), in particular the standards governing challenges to experts.

The Requester claims that the Panel’s decision to uphold the Objection violates the following:

• Section 3.5 of the Guidebook and Article 20(c) of the Procedure, which together place the burden on the objector to prove “that its Objection should be sustained in accordance with applicable standards”; and

• Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook, in particular the standards governing the evaluation of a string confusion objection.

(Request, Section 10, Pgs. 7-23.) Specifically, the Requester makes the following claims:
1. The ICDR first appointed an expert six days after the date on which an expert had to be appointed in accordance with Article 13(a) of the Procedure;

2. The Expert Panel improperly accepted and considered unsolicited supplementary filings in violation of Article 17 of the Procedure;

3. The ICDR informed the parties that the First Expert would render his determination on 4 October 2013, which the Requester claims would have been untimely under Article 21 of the Procedure;

4. The removal of the First Expert “due to a new conflict” demonstrates that the First Expert failed to maintain his impartiality and independence in accordance with Article 13(c) of the Procedure;

5. The ICDR improperly accepted the Objector’s challenge to the Second Expert and improperly denied the Requester’s request to reconsider its decision;

6. The Expert Panel that ultimately considered the Objection failed to render a determination in a timely manner under Article 21 of the Procedure;

7. The Expert improperly concluded that the Objector had met the burden of proof without sufficiently analyzing or articulating the basis for this conclusion; and

8. The Expert Panel incorrectly applied the standards governing string confusion objections by failing to define the “average, reasonable Internet user.”

(Id.)

C. Relief Requested.

The Requester asks ICANN to reject the Expert Determination and instruct a new panel to issue an expert determination that applies the standards defined by ICANN. In the event ICANN concludes that the ICDR and the Panel adhered to and correctly applied ICDR and ICANN processes and policies concerning string confusion objections, the Requester asks that ICANN derogate from its procedure because accepting the Expert Determination would purportedly result in discriminatory application of ICANN’s standards, policies and procedures.

(Request, Section 9, Pg. 7.)

III. Issues.

In view of the claims set forth in Request 14-5, the issues for reconsideration are:
A. Whether the ICDR violated its processes or procedures governing the appointment and conduct of the experts, including whether:

1. The ICDR’s appointment of the First Expert was untimely;

2. The Expert Panel improperly accepted and considered unsolicited supplementary filings;

3. The ICDR violated established procedure when it informed the parties that an expert determination would be issued on 4 October 2013;

4. The First Expert failed to maintain his impartiality and independence;

5. The ICDR improperly accepted the Objector’s challenge to the Second Expert; and

6. The Expert Determination was untimely;

and

B. Whether the Expert Panel applied the wrong standards in contravention of established policies or processes, including whether:

1. The Expert Panel improperly concluded that the Objector had met its burden of proof without sufficient analysis; and

2. Whether the Expert Panel improperly failed to define the “average, reasonable Internet user” for purposes of evaluating the string confusion objection.

IV. The Relevant Standards for Evaluating Reconsideration Requests and String Confusion Objections.

ICANN’s Bylaws provide for reconsideration of a Board or staff action or inaction in accordance with specified criteria.5 (Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.) Dismissal of a request for

---

5 Article IV, Section 2.2 of ICANN’s Bylaws states in relevant part that any entity may submit a request for reconsideration or review of an ICANN action or inaction to the extent that it has 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
reconsideration of staff action or inaction is appropriate if the BGC concludes, or if the Board or the NGPC\textsuperscript{6} agrees to the extent that the BGC deems that further consideration is necessary, that the requesting party failed to satisfy the reconsideration criteria set forth in the Bylaws.\textsuperscript{7}

In the context of the New gTLD Program, the reconsideration process does not call for the BGC to perform a substantive review of expert determinations. Accordingly, the BGC is not to evaluate the Panel’s substantive conclusion that the Requester’s applications for .WEBS are confusingly similar to the Requester’s application for .WEB. Rather, the BGC’s review is limited to whether the Panel violated any established policy or process in reaching that Determination.

The standards for evaluating string confusion objections are set forth in Section 3.5.1 of the Applicant Guidebook (the “Guidebook”). Pursuant to Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook, the expert panel hearing a string confusion objection will “consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion.” The Guidebook provides:

\begin{quote}
String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. For a 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.
\end{quote}

(continued…)

(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.

\textsuperscript{6} New gTLD Program Committee.

\textsuperscript{7} ICANN has previously determined that the reconsideration process can properly be invoked for challenges to expert determinations rendered by panels formed by third party dispute resolution service providers, such as the ICDR, where it can be stated that the Panel failed to follow the established policies or processes in reaching the expert determination, or that staff failed to follow its policies or processes in accepting that determination. See http://www.icann.org/en/groups/board/governance/reconsideration/recommendation-booking-01aug13-en.doc, BGC Recommendation on Reconsideration Request 13-5.
Also relevant to the Requester’s claims are the ICDR’s Supplementary Procedures for String Confusion Objections (“Rules”). The Rules relevant to the Requester’s claims are discussed below.

V. Analysis and Rationale.

A. The Requester Failed To Demonstrate That The ICDR Violated Its Processes Or Procedures Governing The Appointment And Conduct Of Experts.

The Requester claims that the ICDR failed to follow applicable ICDR procedures concerning: (i) the timely appointment of an expert panel; (ii) the acceptance of additional written submissions; (iii) the timely issuance of an expert determination; (iv) an expert’s duty to remain impartial and independent; and (v) challenges to experts. As discussed in detail below, the Requester provided no support for its contention that the ICDR incorrectly applied any ICDR process or procedure.

1. The ICDR’s Purported Failure To Appoint The First Expert In A Timely Manner Does Not Support Reconsideration.

The Requester claims that the ICDR’s appointment of the First Expert was untimely. Specifically, the Requester claims that its response was submitted on May 23, 2013, such that the expert “had to be appointed by June 22, 2013.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 9.) Because it “took the ICDR until June 28, 2013 to appoint Steve Y. Koh, Esq.,” the Requester contends that the expert’s appointment was in violation of Article 13(a) of the Procedure, which provides: “The DRSP shall select and appoint the Panel of Expert(s) within thirty (30) days after receiving the Response.” (Procedure, Art. 13(a.).)

First, the Requester has failed to provide any evidence that it contemporaneously challenged the timeliness of the ICDR’s appointment of the First Expert. Had the Requester
submitted a challenge or other objection to the ICDR when the First Expert was appointed, the ICDR could have addressed that challenge in an appropriate fashion. A Reconsideration Request is not the appropriate mechanism to raise the issue for the first time.

Furthermore, and more importantly, the Requester has not shown, because it cannot show, that it was “materially” and “adversely” affected by the purported brief delay in appointing the First Expert. Absent evidence that the Requester has been materially and adversely affected by the brief delay, reconsideration is not appropriate. (Bylaws, Art. IV, §2.2.)

2. The First Expert Did Not Incorrectly Accept Additional Submissions.

On 19 July 2013, the Objector submitted a supplementary filing to the First Expert. The Requester claims that the First Expert’s acceptance of this supplementary filing violated Article 17 of the Procedure. The Requester’s claim must be rejected.

As the Requester points out, Article 17 of the Procedure provides that:

*The Panel may decide* whether the parties shall submit any written statements in addition to the Objection and the Response, and it shall fix time limits for such submissions. (Procedure, Art. 17(a) (emphasis added).) It is thus entirely within the expert’s discretion to determine whether to accept additional written statements. Here, in exercising that discretion, the First Expert deemed it appropriate to accept the Objector’s supplemental filing. It is not the BGC’s role to second-guess any expert panel in this regard. Moreover, the First Expert allowed the Requester to respond to the Objector’s supplemental filing, which the Requester did on 29 August 2013. (Request, Section 10, Pg. 13-14; Determination, Pg. 2.)

---

8 Citing Article 18 of the Procedure, the Requester claims that “there were no exceptional circumstances” warranting the acceptance of the Objector’s supplementary filings and that the expert’s acceptance of the Objector’s filing “created unreasonable additional costs for the Requester.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 13.) Article 18 of the Procedure does not apply here. Article 18 states that “[i]n exceptional cases, the Panel
The Requester also contends that the Expert who ultimately issued the Determination in the instant proceeding (the Third Expert) should have made “an independent assessment whether or not to require additional submissions and evidence.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 14.) In support, the Requester states only that “[w]hen a Panel needs to be replaced, decisions by a previous Panel cease to exist.” (Id.) There is no support for the Requester’s summary conclusion. Indeed, the Requester fails to cite any provision in the Guidebook, the Procedure, the Rules or elsewhere that somehow voids a decision of a previous panel concerning the submission of additional materials.

3. The ICDR’s Purported Representation That An Expert Determination Would Be Issued By 4 October 2013 Does Not Support Reconsideration.

The Requester claims that “[o]n September 18, 2013 (i.e. 82 days after the appointment of Mr. Koh as Panel) … the ICDR informed the parties that the expert determination was going to be issued on or about October 4, 2013 (i.e. 98 days after the appointment of Mr. Koh as Panel).” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 9.) The Requester contends that this would have resulted in the issuance of an untimely Expert Determination because Article 21(a) of the Procedure provides that “[t]he DSRP and the Panel shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is rendered within forty-five (45) days of the constitution of the Panel.” The Requester’s claims do not support reconsideration.

First, the Requester presents only a hypothetical alleged violation of one provision of the Procedure. On 1 October 2013, before the expert determination was purportedly to be issued, (continued…)

may require a party to provide additional evidence.” (Procedure, Art. 18.) Here, no party was “required” to provide any additional evidence. The parties submitted supplementary filings on their own volition and it was within the expert’s discretion to accept the additional materials. (See Procedure, Art. 17(a).)
the ICDR removed the First Expert. The action (or inaction) that Requester seeks to challenge (i.e. the failure to timely issue an Expert Determination) never occurred. The BGC therefore cannot evaluate whether the First Expert rendered an untimely determination in violation the Procedure because he was removed before an Expert Determination could be issued. As such, no established policy or process was violated.

Second, the 45-day timeline set out in the Procedure cited by the Requester applies to the Expert’s submission of the Expert Determination “in draft form to the DRSP’s scrutiny as to form before it is signed.” (Procedure, Art. 21(a)-(b).) Moreover, pursuant to Article 21(a) of the Procedure, the ICDR and the Expert are to exercise “reasonable efforts” to issue a determination within forty-five (45) days of the constitution of the Panel. (Procedure, Art. 21(a) (emphasis added).) The Requester has not presented any evidence that the DRSP or the Expert failed to make such “reasonable efforts.” On the contrary, as the Requester acknowledges, the First Expert was considering consolidated cases, and “additional submissions that were authorized by Mr. Koh” were submitted, including the Objector’s reply brief with twenty-five (25) annexes of additional evidence and the Requester’s sur-reply. (Request, Section 10, Pg. 9.) The Requester has not presented any evidence demonstrating that the First Expert did anything other than consider these supplementary materials and make reasonable efforts to issue its determination in a timely fashion.


On 1 October 2013, the ICDR informed the parties that “due to a new conflict, the Expert, Steve Koh … will no longer be able to serve and has been removed.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 9.) The Requester concludes that this “shows that Mr. Koh failed to maintain his impartiality and independence and thus violated [Article 13(c) of] the Procedure. (Request, Section 10, Pg. 10.) The Requester’s claim is unsupported.
Article 13(c) of the Procedure states that “[a]ll Experts acting under this Procedure shall be impartial and independent of the parties.” (Procedure, Art. 13(c).) Section 3.4.4. of the Guidebook provides that the ICDR will “follow its adopted procedures for requiring such independence, including procedures for challenging and replacing an expert for lack of independence.” (Guidebook, Section 3.4.4.)

The Requester provides no evidence demonstrating that the First Expert failed to follow the applicable ICDR procedures for independence and impartiality. The only evidence the Requester cites in support of its argument that Mr. Koh failed to maintain his independence during the proceeding is the ICDR’s statement that it had decided to remove Mr. Koh “due to a new conflict.” (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 9-10.) The ICDR did not provide any further information as to the nature of the conflict. Conflicts can take many forms, such as scheduling or personal conflicts unrelated to the proceedings. There is no evidence that the conflict that inflicted Mr. Koh was related to the instant proceedings or otherwise impacted Mr. Koh’s ability to remain impartial and independent.

Furthermore, the Requester neither claims to have been, nor presents any evidence of being, materially and adversely affected by Mr. Koh’s removal. Indeed, had the Requester successfully challenged Mr. Koh for lack of independence at the time he was removed, the remedy under the applicable ICDR procedures would have been the removal of Mr. Koh, which was the result here.

5. The ICDR’s Acceptance Of The Objector’s Challenge To The Second Expert Does Not Support Reconsideration.

On 14 October 2013, the ICDR informed the parties that it had appointed Bruce W. Belding, Esq. as the new expert (Second Expert) to consider the Objection. On 24 October 2013, the Objector timely challenged the appointment of Mr. Belding. On 4 November 2013, the
ICDR accepted the Objector’s challenge and indicated its intention to appoint a new (or Third) Expert. On 5 November 2013, the Requester asked the ICDR to reconsider its decision to accept the challenge to the continued service of the Second Expert. On 8 November 2013, the ICDR denied the Requester’s request. The Requester claims that the ICDR’s acceptance of the Objector’s challenge to the Second Expert and the denial of the Requester’s request to reconsider this decision constitute a violation of the Procedure. The Requester’s claims do not support reconsideration.

The Requester does not state which provision of the Procedure was purportedly violated. The procedure governing challenges to experts is set forth in Article 2 of the ICDR’s Supplementary Procedures for String Confusion Objections (Rules). Article 2, Section 3 states as follows:

> Upon review of the challenge the DRSP in its sole discretion shall make the decision on the challenge and advise the parties of its decision.

(Rules, Art. 2(3).)

While the Requester may disagree with the ICDR’s decision to accept the Objector’s challenge to the Second Expert, that decision was in the “sole discretion” of the ICDR. (Id.) It is not the BGC’s role to second guess the ICDR’s discretion in this regard.


On 20 November 2013, the ICDR appointed Professor Ilhyung Lee as the Third Expert. The Requester claims that, pursuant to Article 21 of the Procedure, the Expert Determination therefore “should have been rendered by January 4, 2014,” which was forty-five (45) days after the Panel was constituted. (Request, Section 10, Pg. 11; see also Procedure, Art. 21.) Because “it took this Panel until January 24, 2014 to render the Decision,” the Requester contends that the Expert Determination was untimely. The Requester’s claims do not support reconsideration.
Article 21 provides in pertinent part as follows:

The DRSP and the Panel shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that the Expert Determination is rendered within forty-five (45) days of the constitution of the Panel. In specific circumstances such as consolidated cases and in consultation with the DRSP, if significant additional documentation is requested by the Panel, a brief extension may be allowed.

The Panel shall submit its Expert Determination in draft form to the DRSP’s scrutiny as to form before it is signed, unless such scrutiny is specifically excluded by the applicable DRSP rules.... The signed Expert Declaration shall be communicated to the DRSP, which in turn will communicate that Expert Determination to the Parties and ICANN.

(Procedure, Art. 21(a)-(b).)

Thus, according to the Procedure, the Expert must exercise reasonable efforts to ensure that it submits the Expert Determination “in draft form to the DRSP’s scrutiny as to form before it is signed” within forty-five (45) days of the Panel being constituted. (Id.) There is no evidence that the Expert failed to comply with this Procedure. When the ICDR communicated to the parties and to ICANN the signed Expert Determination on 27 January 2014, this was done in accordance with Article 21(b) of the Procedure. (See Procedure, Art. 21(b) (“The signed Expert Determination shall be communicated to the DRSP, which in turn will communicate that Expert Determination to the Parties and ICANN.”)). At bottom, because the Requester presented no evidence that the Expert failed to submit its Determination in draft form to the DRSP’s scrutiny as to form before it was signed within the forty-five (45) day timeframe, the Requester’s claims fail.

B. The Requester Failed To Demonstrate That The Panel Applied The Wrong Standards In Contravention Of Established Policy or Process.

The Requester contends that the Panel failed to correctly apply the Procedure and failed to follow the Guidebook’s substantive objection standards for evaluating whether the applied-for
gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion. As discussed in detail below, there is no support for the Requester’s contention that the Panel incorrectly applied any ICANN standard in contravention of established policy or process.

1. The Panel Did Not Incorrectly Apply The Burden Of Proof Requirement.

The Requester claims that the Third Expert contravened ICANN process by “fail[ing] to correctly apply the burden of proof rule.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 15.) In support, the Requester contends that “the Panel does not give an analysis showing that the Objector had met the burden of proof” and that “[i]t is unclear how the Panel came to [the] conclusion [that the .WEBS string would result in string confusion].” (Id.)

The relevant standard for evaluating a String Confusion Objection is set out in Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook:

A DRSP panel hearing a string confusion objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion. String confusion exists where a string so nearly resembles another that it likely to deceive or cause confusion. For a 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. (Guidebook, § 3.5.1.) As the Third Expert correctly notes, “during the formal string confusion objection stage, the objection is not limited to visual similarity. Rather, confusion based on any type of similarity (including visual, aural, or similarity of meaning) may be claimed by an objector.” (Determination, Pg. 10.)

Contrary to the Requester’s contention, the Third Expert extensively detailed the support for its conclusion that the .WEBS string so nearly resembles .WEB – visually, aurally and in
meaning – that it is likely to cause confusion. Specifically, the Expert based its conclusion on
the following:

• “The Applicant’s .webs is visually identical to the Objector’s .web, except for the letter ‘s’ at the end of ‘.web’”;

• “When read aloud, the words in the two strings also sound the same, again with only the phonetic ‘s’ at the end of ‘web’ distinguishing the two”;

• “Regarding the meaning of ‘web’, the Panel is not entirely unsympathetic to the Applicant’s argument that ‘web’ commonly refers to the world wide web, and as such, it is not normally a word where the plural form would be used. Nevertheless, ‘web’ is also used in the context of, for example, a ‘spider web’, and ‘webs’ is the plural of ‘web’.”

(Determination, Pg. 10.) The Expert considered all of the foregoing “indicia of similarity” and “determine[d] that the resemblance between .webs and .web is likely to cause confusion.” (Id.) There is no support for the Requester’s claim that “the Panel does not given an analysis showing that the Objector had met the burden of proof.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 15.) To the contrary, the Expert carefully considered the issues relevant to determining the existence of string confusion. Reconsideration is not warranted on the grounds posited by the Requester.9

2. The Panel Did Not Incorrectly Apply The Standards Governing String Confusion Objections.

The Requester claims that the Third Expert violated ICANN processes by incorrectly applying the standards governing string confusion objections. (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 18-23.)

---

9 The Requester also claims that “[i]t is unclear whether the Objector would have met the burden of proof according to the Panel without the acceptance of [the] additional submission.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 15.) As set forth above, the acceptance of additional written submissions by both parties did not contravene ICANN process or policy. The acceptance of the supplementary filings therefore does not impact the BGC’s conclusion concerning the application of the burden of proof.
Specifically, the Requester contends that the Expert “failed to provide a description of the average, reasonable Internet user.” (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 21-22.) In support, the Requester relies on the following Expert statement:

The Guidebook does not define “average, reasonable Internet user”. It appears to be ICANN’s intention to allow individual panelists to determine the likely perceptions of such Internet user. (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 18-19.) The Requester contends that “[n]othing could be further from the truth. It was never ICANN’s intention to allow individual panelists to determine the likely perceptions of the average, reasonable Internet user.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 19.)

The standards governing string confusion objections are set forth in Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook:

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. (Guidebook, § 3.5.1.) The Requester does not cite, because it cannot cite, any provision in the Guidebook or otherwise that requires the Expert to “provide a description of the average, reasonable Internet user” in the Expert Determination. (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 21-22.) Absent an articulation of what process the Requester claims was violated in this regard, reconsideration is not appropriate.

Moreover, as the Requester recognizes, the Third Expert considered and rejected the descriptions and perceptions of Internet users as articulated by other panels. (Determination, Pgs. 17-18; Request, Section 10, Pgs. 21-22.) The Requester has not identified any provision in the Guidebook or otherwise that this Determination purportedly contravenes. The Requester’s disagreement as to whether the standards should have resulted in a finding in favor of Requester’s application does not mean that the panel violated any policy or process in reaching the decision.
The Requester also claims that the Panel “failed to apply the burden of proof and the standards imposed by ICANN” because the Expert “questions whether the co-existence between the Requester’s <webs.com> and the Objector’s <web.com> for many years without (any evidence of) actual confusion is relevant to his determination.” (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 22-23.)

As set forth in Section 3.5.1 of the Guidebook:

A DRSP panel hearing a string confusion case objection will consider whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion.

(Guidebook, § 3.5.1 (emphasis added).) The relevant consideration for the Expert is therefore whether the applied-for gTLD string is likely to result in string confusion. The issue is not, as the Requester urges, whether there will be confusion between second level domain names. (Request, Section 10, Pgs. 22-23.) The Requester does not cite any provision of the Guidebook, the Procedure, or the Rules that have been contravened in this regard.

At bottom, it appears that the Requester simply disagrees with the Expert Determination and it is not the role of the BGC to evaluate the Expert’s substantive determination.\(^{10}\)

VI. Decision

Based on the foregoing, the BGC concludes that the Requester has not stated proper grounds for reconsideration, and therefore denies Vistaprint Limited’s Reconsideration Request. As there is no indication that the ICDR or the Expert violated any policy or process in reaching the Determination, this Request should not proceed. If the Requester believes that it has

\(^{10}\) The Requester concludes with the following claim: “The cursory nature of the Decision and the arbitrary and selective discussion of the parties’ arguments by the Panel show the lack of either the Panel’s independence and impartiality or the Panel’s appropriate qualifications.” (Request, Section 10, Pg. 23.) The Requester’s assertion is not accompanied by any discussion or further explanation for how ICANN processes were purportedly violated. The Requester’s summary conclusions are without merit and insufficient to warrant reconsideration. Furthermore, the Requester’s claim that the Determination was “cursory” and only contained “selective discussion of the parties’ arguments” is unsupported. The Determination was eighteen pages long and contained more than six pages of discussion of the parties’ arguments and evidence.
somehow been treated unfairly in the process, the Requester is free to ask the Ombudsman to review this matter.

In accordance with Article IV, Section 2.15 of the Bylaws, the BGC’s determination on Request 14-5 shall be final and does not require Board (or NGPC) consideration. The Bylaws provide that the BGC is authorized to make a final determination for all Reconsideration Requests brought regarding staff action or inaction and that the BGC’s determination on such matters is final. (Bylaws, Art. IV, § 2.15.) As discussed above, Request 14-5 seeks reconsideration of a staff action or inaction. After consideration of this Request, the BGC concludes that this determination is final and that no further consideration by the Board is warranted.
C-R-3
Frequently Asked Questions

• What is a Legal Rights Objection?
• Does ICANN offer other types of objection options?
• What criteria will a panel use to determine the outcome of a Legal Rights Objection?
• Until when can a Legal Rights Objection be filed?
• How does a rights owner submit a Legal Rights Objection?
• Is it necessary for an applicant to file a response to a Legal Rights Objection?
• What are the main stages of a Legal Rights Objection?
• How many rounds of pleadings are involved?
• Are there hearings?
• Can the parties mediate/settle their dispute?
• How much does it cost to file/defend a Legal Rights Objection?
• Are there language requirements?
• Are there word/page limits?
• Who are the experts available for appointment?
• How is the expert panel appointed?
• What are the remedies available?
• What happens if there is more than one Objection to an applied-for New gTLD?
• What level of Objection-related information is made publicly available?
• Do parties retain their court options?
• What is the WIPO Center’s role in Legal Rights Objections?
• Background on WIPO’s involvement in Legal Rights Objections
• What trademark protection mechanisms are available after new gTLDs are approved?
• Additional information on WIPO’s involvement in the Domain Name System
• Questions?

What is a Legal Rights Objection?

Prior to ICANN’s approval of a New gTLD, third parties may file a formal objection to an application on several grounds, including, for trademark owners and Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs), on the basis of a “Legal Rights Objection.”

When such an objection is filed, an independent panel (comprised of one or three experts) will determine whether the applicant’s potential use of the applied-for gTLD would be likely to infringe (described below) the objector’s existing trademark, or IGO name or acronym.
According to the ICANN Applicant Guidebook, a panel determination is "considered an expert determination and advice that ICANN will accept within the dispute resolution process." Such determination is independent of any determination under either of the other types of ICANN objection options available.

**Does ICANN offer other types of objection options?**

To address potential disputes over new gTLD applications, ICANN offers three other types of pre-delegation objection-based dispute resolution procedures which are not administered by WIPO, namely, “String Confusion Objection,” “Limited Public Interest Objection,” and “Community Objection.” For the latter two types of objections, ICANN is also making available an “Independent Objector” by way of public service. ICANN has furthermore established a process for the ICANN Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) to provide “GAC Advice on New gTLDs” concerning applications identified by governments as problematic. For more detailed information on all ICANN objection options, see Module 3 of the ICANN Applicant Guidebook.

**What criteria will a panel use to determine the outcome of a Legal Rights Objection?**

As provided for in section 3.5.2 of the ICANN Applicant Guidebook, the independent panel will determine whether the potential use of the applied-for gTLD by the applicant:

(i) takes unfair advantage of the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s registered or unregistered trademark or service mark (“mark”) or IGO name or acronym, or

(ii) unjustifiably impairs the distinctive character or the reputation of the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym, or

(iii) otherwise creates an impermissible likelihood of confusion between the applied-for gTLD and the objector’s mark or IGO name or acronym.

The panel will ordinarily determine the merits of the objection based solely on the parties’ pleadings, and may make reference to a range of non-exclusive consideration factors listed below.
For an objection based on trademark rights, the panel will consider the following non exclusive consideration factors:
1. Whether the applied-for gTLD is identical or similar, including in appearance, phonetic sound, or meaning, to the objector’s existing mark.
2. Whether the objector’s acquisition and use of rights in the mark has been bona fide.
3. Whether and to what extent there is recognition in the relevant sector of the public of the sign corresponding to the gTLD, as the mark of the objector, of the applicant or of a third party.
4. Applicant’s intent in applying for the gTLD, including whether the applicant, at the time of application for the gTLD, had knowledge of the objector’s mark, or could not have reasonably been unaware of that mark, and including whether the applicant has engaged in a pattern of conduct whereby it applied for or operates TLDs or registrations in TLDs which are identical or confusingly similar to the marks of others.
5. Whether and to what extent the applicant has used, or has made demonstrable preparations to use, the sign corresponding to the gTLD in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a bona fide provision of information in a way that does not interfere with the legitimate exercise by the objector of its mark rights.
6. Whether the applicant has marks or other intellectual property rights in the sign corresponding to the gTLD, and, if so, whether any acquisition of such a right in the sign, and use of the sign, has been bona fide, and whether the purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent with such acquisition or use.
7. Whether and to what extent the applicant has been commonly known by the sign corresponding to the gTLD, and if so, whether any purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent therewith and bona fide.
8. Whether the applicant’s intended use of the gTLD would create a likelihood of confusion with the objector’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the gTLD.
For an objection based on rights in the name or acronym of an IGO, the panel will consider the following non-exclusive consideration factors:

1. Whether the applied-for gTLD is identical or similar, including in appearance, phonetic sound or meaning, to the name or acronym of the objecting IGO.
2. Historical coexistence of the IGO and the applicant’s use of a similar name or acronym. Factors considered may include: a. Level of global recognition of both entities; b. Length of time the entities have been in existence; c. Public historical evidence of their existence, which may include whether the objecting IGO has communicated its name or abbreviation under Article 6ter of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property.
3. Whether and to what extent the applicant has used, or has made demonstrable preparations to use, the sign corresponding to the TLD in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a bona fide provision of information in a way that does not interfere with the legitimate exercise of the objecting IGO’s name or acronym.
4. Whether and to what extent the applicant has been commonly known by the sign corresponding to the applied-for gTLD, and if so, whether any purported or likely use of the gTLD by the applicant is consistent therewith and bona fide.
5. Whether the applicant’s intended use of the applied-for gTLD would create a likelihood of confusion with the objecting IGO’s name or acronym as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the TLD.

Until when can a Legal Rights Objection be filed?

Subsequent to ICANN’s closing of its new gTLD application window (which ran from January 12 to May 30, 2012), and announcement/posting of all applications, the objection filing window commenced on June 13, 2012. The objection filing window was nine months and closed on 13 March 2013 at 23:59:59 UTC.
Concurrent with the objection filing window, ICANN is undertaking so-called Initial Evaluation of applications for compliance with ICANN Applicant Guidebook formalities; ICANN has indicated that they plan to release the first of the Initial Evaluations on March 23, 2013, with further Initial Evaluations released on a rolling basis thereafter based on Prioritization Draw results.

**How does a rights owner submit a Legal Rights Objection?**

All Legal Rights Objections had to be submitted electronically by email to lro@wipo.int using the WIPO Center's LRO Model Objection with a copy of the objection to ICANN and the applicant. The objection filing had to be submitted at the time of filing.

An objection must contain at least the following: (i) the names and full contact information of the objector; (ii) a statement of the objector’s basis for standing under the procedure; and (iii) a confirmation of the basis for the objection (i.e., “Legal Rights Objection”) including “an explanation of the validity of the objection and why the objection should be upheld.”

**Is it necessary for an applicant to file a response to a Legal Rights Objection?**

Responses must be submitted electronically to the WIPO Center by email to lro@wipo.int using the WIPO Center’s LRO Model Response with a copy to ICANN and the objector. The response filing fee must be submitted at the time of filing of the response.

A response must contain at least the following: (i) the names and full contact information of the applicant; and (ii) a "point-by-point response to the statements made in the objection." An applicant’s failure to reply to an objection would be considered a “default” and would result in the objection being deemed successful.

**What are the main stages of a Legal Rights Objection?**

On receipt of an objection or response, the WIPO Center will conduct an administrative compliance review and process the case filing fee. Any administrative deficiencies must be corrected within five (5) days of notification by the Center. Within 30 days of the close of the objection window, ICANN will publish a "Dispute Announcement" listing all administratively compliant objections. The WIPO Center will then notify applicants of any objections; applicants will then have 30 days to file a response. Within 30 days of receiving a response, the WIPO Center will appoint the expert panel. Normally the panel will render its determination within 45 days of appointment.

A graphic overview is provided by the respective "Objection and Dispute Resolution" and “Evaluation Process” flow charts found in the ICANN Applicant Guidebook.

**How many rounds of pleadings are involved?**

While the panel has discretion to order or admit additional written statements, the ICANN dispute resolution procedure typically contemplates a single round of pleadings.

**Are there hearings?**

Only in exceptional cases may a panel hold a hearing (by videoconference if possible).

**Can the parties mediate/settle their dispute?**
In the event the parties wish to participate in mediation/settlement negotiations, at any point during the proceedings, they may jointly request a 30-day suspension. The WIPO Center can assist the parties in finding an appropriately qualified mediator to help the parties in seeking to reach a mutually satisfactory settlement of their dispute, under the WIPO Mediation Rules. In such event, the WIPO Center will not charge any additional fee for its mediation case administration services.

**How much does it cost to file/defend a Legal Rights Objection?**

For a case involving an objection to one application (i.e., for one gTLD) to be decided by one expert, the fee payable upon filing will be USD 10,000 for each party (this includes a non-refundable USD 2,000 case administration fee), subject to a refund of the expert fee (USD 8,000) to the prevailing party. Different fee arrangements apply to three-member panels and to possible consolidation scenarios; full details are provided in the WIPO Schedule of Fees for New gTLD Dispute Resolution.

For all objections and responses filed with WIPO, the initial fee to be paid at the time of filing of the objection or response is 10,000 (which covers the WIPO DRSP fee and Panel fee). Any applicable reduced Panel fees specified below (i.e. where a consolidation scenario is applied by WIPO in accordance with the WIPO Rules for New gTLD Dispute Resolution), would be refunded to the appropriate party from the initial filing fee, after the close of proceedings.

Payments may be made by any of the following means: bank transfer, credit card, WIPO Account. Please see the Schedule of Fees and Costs: New gTLD Pre-Delegation Legal Rights Objection Procedure for more details.

*Non-payment of fees by an objector will result in rejection of the objection, without panel appointment. Non payment of response fees by an applicant will result in the objection being deemed successful.*

**Are there language requirements?**

In all cases, the language of proceedings is English. According to the ICANN Applicant Guidebook, "Parties may submit supporting evidence in its original language, provided and subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, that such evidence is accompanied by a certified or otherwise official English translation of all relevant text."

**Are there word/page limits?**

The substantive portion of an objection or response is limited to 5,000 words or 20 pages, whichever is less, excluding attachments. The objector or applicant must also list, describe and provide copies of any attached supporting evidence.

**Who are the experts available for appointment?**

The WIPO Center has posted a list of experts available for appointment prior to the start of the objection filing period. This list takes into account requirements of professional expertise and may be subject to additional development by the WIPO Center in light of case needs. As part of the process of appointment to an actual case, experts are required to affirm their neutrality by signing the WIPO Center’s LRO Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence.

**How is the expert panel appointed?**
Unless the parties agree on a three-member expert panel, for a single-member expert panel the WIPO Center will appoint the expert in its sole discretion. Where the parties agree on a three-member expert panel, each party may submit a list of three candidates from the WIPO Center's list of experts, one of whom would be appointed as the respective party-elected expert co-panelist; the WIPO Center will then provide the parties with a list of five candidates from the WIPO Center's list of experts for the parties' respective ranking, with a view to the WIPO Center's appointment of the third (presiding) expert panelist.

**What are the remedies available?**

The remedies are limited to the success or dismissal of the objection. There are no monetary damages, but the prevailing party is entitled to a partial refund of the panel fee (as described above). According to the ICANN Applicant Guidebook, a panel determination is “considered an expert determination and advice that ICANN will accept within the dispute resolution process.” Such determination is independent of any determination under either of the other types of ICANN objection options available.

**What happens if there is more than one Objection to an applied-for New gTLD?**

In certain scenarios, such as where multiple objections are filed against the same application, to streamline costs and for procedural efficiency, the WIPO Center will endeavor where appropriate to consolidate such objections for determination by a single panel; in such consolidated cases, a separate determination would be rendered for each objection. Within seven days of the WIPO Center's notification of the commencement of the response filing period to the applicant, the parties themselves may also propose, for the WIPO Center's determination, in its discretion, that objections be consolidated. The WIPO Center may take into account factors such as whether the same or similar application is at issue; any request/opposition of the parties; the trademarks/evidence relied-upon; or expert availability.

**What level of Objection-related information is made publicly available?**

Upon registering an objection for processing, the WIPO Center will post on its website the following information about the objection: the proposed string to which the objection is directed; the names of the objector and applicant; the grounds for objection (i.e., "Legal Rights Objection"); and the date of the WIPO Center's receipt of the objection.

On conclusion of a case the WIPO Center will post the determination in full on its website, unless in exceptional circumstances the panel has deemed it appropriate to redact portions of its determination.

**Do parties retain their court options?**

The availability of the Legal Rights Objection as an administrative dispute resolution option does not preclude court options which either party may have to submit the dispute to court.

**What is the WIPO Center's role in Legal Rights Objections?**

The WIPO Center's role is limited to case administration, including verifying that the objection and response satisfy the relevant filing requirements, issuing case related notifications, appointment of the panel of experts, coordinating communications between the parties and panel, and otherwise facilitating efficient case resolution. The WIPO Center is independent and impartial in this case administration role; the merits of an objection are determined by the appointed expert.
Background on WIPO’s involvement in Legal Rights Objections

In December 2007, ICANN sought "Expressions of Interest from Potential Dispute Resolution Service Providers for [its] New gTLD Program." In January 2008, the WIPO Center signaled its readiness to assist ICANN in devising and applying appropriate trademark-based dispute resolution procedures for New gTLDs. From that time, using the WIPO "Joint Recommendation Concerning Provisions on the Protection of Marks, and Other Industrial Property Rights in Signs, on the Internet" as a foundation, the WIPO Center has collaborated with ICANN on the development of substantive criteria and procedural rules for pre-(TLD) delegation dispute resolution for trademark-based Legal Rights Objections as set out in module 3.5.2 of the ICANN Applicant Guidebook. The WIPO Center subsequently accepted to administer disputes under the ICANN Legal Rights Objection Procedure; the ICANN Applicant Guidebook includes the resulting WIPO Rules for New gTLD Dispute Resolution including a Schedule of Fees and Costs.

What trademark protection mechanisms are available after new gTLDs are approved?

Beyond the above-described pre-delegation objection procedures (available prior to any new gTLD being approved and becoming operational), ICANN has established a range of “Rights Protection Mechanisms” (RPMs). These include a Trademark Clearinghouse (for use in connection with Sunrise periods and Trademark Claims services), a Uniform Rapid Suspension system (URS), and a Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP). In addition, the existing Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) will be applicable to all new gTLDs. More information on these RPMs can be found in the WIPO Center’s overview of Trademark Rights Protection Mechanisms for New gTLDs.

Additional information on WIPO’s involvement in the Domain Name System

WIPO has been engaging with Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) for the Domain Name System (DNS) since it conducted the First WIPO Internet Domain Name Process in 1998 and 1999, which provided the blueprint for ICANN’s adoption of the UDRP. With a globally unique range of jurisprudential resources, the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center is the leading provider of UDRP case administration services; through 2011, it has processed over 22,000 such cases. The Center furthermore has engaged in a range of further activities such as Sunrises, ccTLD policy advice and case administration, and policy input for New gTLDs.

- WIPO Observations on New gTLD Dispute Resolution Mechanisms
- Selected WIPO correspondence with ICANN
- Domain Name Disputes (including UDRP)

Questions?

For more information about the Legal Rights Objection procedure, please direct any inquiries by email to lro@wipo.int, or by telephone to +41 22 338 8247 or (toll free) 0800 888 549. More detailed information can be found in the ICANN Applicant Guidebook.

Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arbitration and Mediation Center</th>
<th>Arbitration and Mediation Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, chemin des Colombettes</td>
<td>Maxwell Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box 18</td>
<td>32 Maxwell Road #02-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/lro/faq/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1211 Geneva 20</th>
<th>Singapore 069115</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T +41 22 338 8247 or 0800 888 549</td>
<td>T +65 6225 2129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F +41 22 740 3700 or 0800 888 550</td>
<td>F +65 6225 3568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. From its beginning in 1965, an exchange over a telephone line between a computer at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a computer in California, to the communications colossus that the Internet has become, the Internet has constituted a transformative technology. Its protocols and domain name system standards and software were invented, perfected, and for some 25 years before the formation of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), essentially overseen, by a small group of researchers working under contracts financed by agencies of the Government of the United States of America, most notably by the late Professor Jon Postel of the Information Sciences Institute of the University of Southern California and Dr. Vinton Cerf, founder of the Internet Society. Dr. Cerf, later the distinguished leader of ICANN, played a major role in the early development of the Internet and has continued to do so. European research centers also contributed. From the origin of the Internet domain name system in 1980 until the incorporation of ICANN in 1998, a small community of American computer scientists controlled the management of Internet identifiers. However the utility, reach, influence and exponential growth of the Internet quickly became quintessentially international. In 1998, in recognition of that fact, but at the same time determined to keep that management within the private sector rather than to subject it to the ponderous and politicized processes of international governmental control, the U.S. Department of Commerce, which then contracted on behalf of the U.S. Government with the managers of the Internet, transferred operational responsibility over the protocol and domain names system of the Internet to the newly formed Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”).

2. ICANN, according to Article 3 of its Articles of Incorporation of November 21, 1998, is a nonprofit public benefit corporation organized under the California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation Law “in recognition of the fact that the Internet is an international network of networks, owned by no single nation, individual or organization...” ICANN is charged with

“promoting the global public interest in the operational stability of the Internet by (i) coordinating the assignment of Internet technical parameters as needed to maintain universal connectivity on the Internet; (ii) performing and overseeing functions related to the coordination of the Internet Protocol (“IP”) address space; (iii) performing and overseeing functions related to the coordination of the Internet domain name system (“DNS”), including the development of
policies for determining the circumstances under which new top-level domains are added to the DNS root system; (iv) overseeing operation of the authoritative Internet DNS root server system...” (Claimant’s Exhibits, hereafter “C”, at C-4.)

ICANN was formed as a California corporation apparently because early proposals for it were prepared at the instance of Professor Postel, who lived and worked in Marina del Rey, California, which became the site of ICANN’s headquarters.

3. ICANN, Article 4 of its Articles of Incorporation provides,

“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.”

4. ICANN’s Bylaws, as amended effective May 29, 2008, in Section 1, define the mission of ICANN as that of coordination of the allocation and assignment

“of the three sets of unique identifiers for the Internet, ...(a) domain names forming a system referred to as “DNS”, (b) ...Internet protocol (“IP”) addresses and autonomous system (“AS”) numbers and (c) Protocol port and parameter numbers”. ICANN “coordinates the operation and evolution of the DNS root server system” as well as “policy development reasonably and appropriately related to these technical functions.” (C-5.)

5. Section 2 of ICANN’s Bylaws provides that, in performing its mission, core values shall apply, among them:

“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 interest 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.

... 

“6. Introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practicable and beneficial in the public interest.

... 

“8. Making decisions by applying documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness.

... 

“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.” (C-5.)

6. The Bylaws provide in Article II that the powers of ICANN shall be exercised and controlled by its Board, whose international composition, representative of various stakeholders, is otherwise detailed in the Bylaws. Article VI, Section 4.1 of the Bylaws provides that “no official of a national government or a multinational entity established by treaty or other agreement between national governments may serve as a Director”. They specify that “ICANN shall not apply its standards, policies, procedures, or practices inequitably, or single out any particular party for disparate treatment unless justified by substantial and reasonable cause, such as the promotion of effective competition.” ICANN is to operate in an open and transparent manner “and consistent with procedures designed to ensure fairness” (Article III, Section 1.) In those cases “where the policy action affects public policy concerns,” ICANN shall “request the opinion of the Governmental Advisory Committee and take duly into account any advice timely presented by the Governmental Advisory Committee on its own initiative or at the Board’s request” (Article III, Section 6).
7. Article IV of the Bylaws, Section 3, provides that: “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.” Any person materially affected by a decision or action of the Board that he or she asserts “is inconsistent” with those Articles and Bylaws may submit a request for independent review which shall be referred to an Independent Review Panel (“IRP”). That Panel “shall be charged with declaring whether the Board has acted consistently with the provisions of those Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws”. “The IRP shall be operated by an international arbitration provider appointed from time to time by ICANN...using arbitrators...nominated by that provider.” The IRP shall have the authority to “declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or the Bylaws” and “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”. Section 3 further specifies that declarations of the IRP shall be in writing, based solely on the documentation and arguments of the parties, and shall “specifically designate the prevailing party.” The Section concludes by providing that, “Where feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP declaration at the Board’s next meeting.”


9. Article XI of ICANN’s Bylaws provides, inter alia, for a Governmental Advisory Committee (“GAC”) to “consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN as they relate to concerns of governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN’s policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues”. It further provides that the Board shall notify the Chair of the GAC in a timely manner of any proposal raising public policy issues. “The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. The Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually
acceptable solution.” If no such solution can be found, the Board will state in its final decision the reasons why the GAC’s advice was not followed.

PART TWO: FACTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE DISPUTE

10. The Domain Name System (“DNS”), a hierarchical name system, is at the heart of the Internet. At its summit is the so-called “root”, managed by ICANN, although the U.S. Department of Commerce retains the ultimate capacity of implementing decisions of ICANN to insert new top-level domains into the root. The “root zone file” is the list of top-level domains. Top-level domains (“TLDs”), are identified by readable, comprehensible, “user-friendly” addresses, such as “.com”, “.org”, and “.net”. There are “country-code TLDs” (ccTLDs), two letter codes that identify countries, such as .uk (United Kingdom), .jp (Japan), etc. There are generic TLDs (“gTLDs”), which are subdivided into sponsored TLDs (“sTLDs”) and unsponsored TLDs (“gTLDs”). An unsponsored TLD operates under policies established by the global Internet community directly through ICANN, while a sponsored TLD is a specialized TLD that has a sponsor representing the narrower community that is most affected by the TLD. The sponsor is delegated, and carries out, policy-formulation responsibilities over matters concerning the TLD. Thus, under the root, top-level domains are divided into gTLDs such as .com, .net, and .info, and sTLDs such as .aero, .coop, and .museum. And there are ccTLDs, such as .fr (France). Second level domains, under the top-level domains, are legion; e.g., Microsoft.com, dassault.fr. While the global network of computers communicate with one another through a decentralized data routing mechanism, the Internet is centralized in its naming and numbering system. This system matches the unique Internet Protocol address of each computer in the world — a string of numbers — with a recognizable domain name. Computers around the world can communicate with one another through the Internet because their Internet Protocol addresses uniquely and reliably correlate with domain names.

11. When ICANN was formed in 1998, there were three generic TLDs: .com, .org, and .net. They were complemented by a few limited-use TLDs, .edu, .gov, .mil, and .int. Since its formation, ICANN has endeavored to introduce new TLDs. In 2000, ICANN opened an application process for the introduction of new gTLDs. This initial round was a preliminary effort to test a “proof of concept” in respect of new gTLDs. ICANN received forty-seven applications for both sponsored and unsponsored TLDs.

12. Among them was an application by the Claimant in these proceedings, ICM Registry (then under another ownership), for an unsponsored .XXX TLD,
which would responsibly present “adult” entertainment (i.e., pornographic entertainment). ICANN staff recommended that the Board not select .XXX during the “proof of concept” round because “it did not appear to meet unmet needs”, there was “controversy” surrounding the application, and the definition of benefits of .XXX was “poor”. It observed that, “at this early ‘proof of concept’ stage with a limited number of new TLDs contemplated, other proposed TLDs without the controversy of an adult TLD would better serve the goals of this initial introduction of new TLDs.” (C-127, p. 230.) In the event, the ICANN Board authorized ICANN’s President and General Counsel to commence contract negotiations with seven applicants including three sponsored TLDs, .museum, .aero and .coop. Agreements were “subject to further Board approval or ratification.” (Minutes of the Second Annual Meeting of the Board, November 16, 2000, ICANN Exhibit G.)

13. In 2003, the ICANN Board passed resolutions for the introduction of new sponsored TLDs in another Round. The Board resolved that “upon the successful completion of the sTLD selection process, an agreement reflecting the commercial and technical terms shall be negotiated.” (C-78.) It posted a “Request for Proposals” (“RFP”), which included an application form setting out the selection criteria that would be used to evaluate proposals. The RFP’s explanatory notes provided that the sponsorship criteria required “the proposed sTLD [to] address the needs and interest of a ‘clearly defined community’…which can benefit from the establishment of a TLD operating in a policy formulation environment in which the community would participate.” Applicants had to show that the Sponsored TLD Community was (a) “Precisely defined, so it can readily be determined which persons or entities make up that community” and (b) “Comprised of persons that have needs and interests in common but which are differentiated from those of the general global Internet community”. (ICANN, New gTLD Program, ICANN Exhibit N.) The sponsorship criteria further required applicants to provide an explanation of the Sponsoring Organization’s policy-formulation procedures. They additionally required the applicant to demonstrate “broad-based support” from the sponsored TLD community. None of the criteria explicitly addressed “morality” issues or the content of websites to be registered in the new sponsored domains.

14. ICANN in 2004 received ten sTLD applications, including that of ICM Registry of March 16, 2004 for a .XXX sTLD. ICM’s application was posted on ICANN’s website. Its application stated that it was to
and who are interested in the " (C-Confidential Exh. B.) The International Foundation for Online Responsibility (“IFFOR”), a Canadian organization whose creation by ICM was in process, was proposed to be ICM’s sponsoring organization. The President of ICM Registry, Stuart Lawley, a British entrepreneur, was to explain that the XXX sTLD is a

“significant step towards the goal of protecting children from adult content, and [to] facilitate the efforts of anyone who wishes to identify, filter or avoid adult content. Thus, the presence of “.XXX” in a web address would serve a dual role: both indicating to users that the website contained adult content, thereby allowing users to choose to avoid it, and also indicating to potential adult-entertainment consumers that the websites could be trusted to avoid questionable business practices.” (Lawley Witness Statement, para. 15.)

15. ICANN constituted an independent panel of experts (the “Evaluation Panel”) to review and recommend those sTLD applications that met the selection criteria. That Panel found that two of the ten applicants met all the selection criteria; that three met some of the criteria; and that four had deficiencies that could not be remedied within the applicant’s proposed framework. As for .XXX, the Evaluation Panel found that ICM was among the latter four; it fully met the technical and financial criteria but not some of the sponsorship criteria. The three-member Evaluation Panel, headed by Ms. Elizabeth Williams of Australia, that analyzed sponsorship and community questions did not believe that the .XXX application represented “a clearly defined community”; it found that “the extreme variability of definitions of what constitutes the content which defines this community makes it difficult to establish which content and associated persons or services would be in or out of the community”. The Evaluation Panel further found that the lack of cohesion in the community and the planned involvement of child advocates and free expression interest groups would preclude effective formulation of policy for the community; it was unconvinced of sufficient support outside of North America; and “did not agree that the application added new value to the Internet name space”. Its critical evaluation of ICM’s application concluded that it fell into the category of those “whose deficiencies cannot be remedied with the applicant’s proposed framework” (C-110.)

16. Because only two of ten applicants were recommended by the Evaluation Panel, and because the Board remained desirous of expanding the number of sTLDs, the ICANN Board resolved to give the other sTLD applicants further opportunity to address deficiencies found by the
Evaluation Panel. ICM Registry responded with an application revised as of December 7, 2004. It noted that the independent teams that evaluated the technical merits and business soundness of ICM’s application had unreservedly recommended its approval. It submitted, contrary to the analysis of the Evaluation Panel, that ICM and IFFOR also met the sponsorship criteria. “Nonetheless, the Applicants fully understand that the topic of adult entertainment on the Internet is controversial. The Applicants also understand that the Board might be criticized whether it approves or disapproves the Proposal.” (C-127, p. 176.) In accordance with ICANN’s practice, ICM’s application again was publicly posted on ICANN’s website.

17. Following discussion of its application in the Board, ICM was invited to give a presentation to the Board, which it did in April 2005, in Mar del Plata, Argentina. Child protection and free speech advocates were among the representatives of ICM Registry. The Chairman of the Governmental Advisory Committee, Mohamed Sharil Tarmizi, was in attendance for part of the meeting as well as other meetings of the Board. ICM offered then and at ICANN meetings in Capetown (December 2004) and Luxembourg (July 2005) to discuss its proposal with the GAC or any of its members, a proposal that was not taken up (C-127, p. 231; C-170, p.2). In a letter of April 3, 2005, the GAC Chairman informed the ICANN President and CEO, Paul Twomey, that: “No GAC members have expressed specific reservations or comments, in the GAC, about applications for sTLDs in the current round.” (C-158, p.1.) ICM’s Mar del Plata presentation to the ICANN Board included the results of a poll conducted by XBiz in February 2005 of “adult” websites that asked: “What do you think of Internet suffixes (.sex, .xxx) to designate adult sites?” 22% of the responders checked, “A Horrible Idea”; 57% checked, “A Good Idea”; 21% checked, “It’s No Big Deal Either Way”. ICM, while recognizing that its proposal aroused some opposition in the adult entertainment community, maintained throughout that it fully met the RFP requirement of demonstrating that it had “broad-based support from the community to be represented”. (C-45.)

18. The ICANN Board held a special meeting by teleconference on May 3, 2005, the Chairman of the ICANN Board, Dr. Vinton G. Cerf, presiding. The minutes record, in respect of the .XXX sTLD application, that there was broad discussion of whether ICM’s application met the RFP criteria, “particularly relating to whether or not there was a ‘sponsored community’”. It was agreed to “discuss this issue” at the next Board meeting. (C-134.)
19. On June 1, 2005, the Board met by teleconference and after considerable discussion adopted the following resolutions, with a 6-3 vote in favor, 2 abstentions and 4 Board members absent:

“Resolved...the Board authorizes the President and General Counsel to enter into negotiations relating to proposed commercial and technical terms for the .XXX sponsored top-level domain (sTLD) with the applicant.”

“Resolved...if after entering into negotiations with the .XXX sTLD applicant the President and General Counsel are able to negotiate a set of proposed commercial and technical terms for a contractual arrangement, the President shall present such proposed terms to this board, for approval and authorization to enter into an agreement relating to the delegation of the sTLD.” (C-120.)

20. While a few of the other applications that were similarly cleared to enter into negotiations relating to proposed commercial and technical terms, e.g., those of .JOBS, and .MOBI, contained conditions, the foregoing resolutions relating to ICM Registry contained no conditions. The .JOBS resolution, for example, specified that

“the board authorizes the President and General Counsel to enter into negotiations relating to proposed commercial and technical terms for the .JOBS sponsored top-level domain (sTLD) with the applicant. During these negotiations, the board requests that special consideration be taken as to how broad-based policy-making would be created for the sponsored community, and how this sTLD would be differentiated in the name space.”

In contrast, the .XXX resolutions do not refer to further negotiations concerning sponsorship, nor do the resolutions refer to further consideration by the Board of the matter of sponsorship. Upon the successful conclusion of the negotiation, the terms of an agreement with ICM Registry were to be presented to the Board “for approval and authorization to enter into an agreement relating to the delegation of the sTLD”.

21. At the meeting of the Governmental Advisory Committee in Luxembourg July 11-12, 2005, under the chairmanship of Mr. Tarmizi, the foregoing resolutions gave rise to comment. The minutes contain the following summary reports:
“The Netherlands, supported by several members, including Brazil, EC and Egypt, raised the point about what appears to be a change in policy as regards the evaluation for the .xxx TLD.

“On that issue, the Chair stressed that the Board came to a decision after a very difficult and intense debate which has included the moral aspects. He wondered what the GAC could have done in this context.

“Brazil asked clarification about the process to provide GAC advice to the ICANN Board and to consult relevant communities on matter such as the creation of new gTLDs. The general public was likely to assume that GAC had discussed and approved the proposal; otherwise GAC might be perceived as failing to address the matter. This is a public policy issue rather than a moral issue.

“Denmark commented on the fact that the issue of the creation of the .xxx extension should have been presented to the GAC as a public policy issue. EC drew attention to the 2000 Evaluation report on .xxx that had concluded negatively.

“France asked about the methodology to be followed for the evaluation of new gTLDs in future and if an early warning system could be put in place. Egypt wished to clarify whether the issue was the approval by ICANN or the apparent change in policy.

“USA remarked that GAC had several opportunities to raise questions, notably at Working Group level, as the process had been open for several years. In addition there are not currently sufficient resources in the WGI to put sufficient attention to it. We should be working on an adequate methodology for the future. Netherlands commented that the ICANN decision making process was not sufficiently transparent for GAC to know in time when to reach [sic; react] to proposals.

“The Chair thanked the GAC for these comments which will be given to the attention of the ICANN Board.” (C-139, p. 3.)

22. There followed a meeting of the GAC with the ICANN Board, at which the following statements are recorded in the summary minutes:
“Netherlands asked about the new criteria to be retained for new TLDs as it seems there was a shift in policy during the evaluation process.

“Mr. Twomey replied that there might be key policy differences due to learning experiences, for example it is now accepted not to put a limit on the number of new TLDs. He also noted that no comments had been received from governments regarding .xxx.

“Dr. Cerf added, taking the example of .xxx that there was a variety of proposals for TLDs before, including for this extension, but this time the way to cope with the selection was different. The proposal this time met the three main criteria, financial, technical and sponsorship. They [sic: There] were doubts expressed about the last criteria [sic] which were discussed extensively and the Board reached a positive decision considering that ICANN should not be involved in content matters.

“France remarked that there might be cases where the TLD string did infer the content matter. Therefore the GAC could be involved if public policies issues are to be raised.

“Dr. Cerf replied that in practice there is no correlation between the TLD string and the content. The TLD system is neutral, although filtering systems could be solutions promoted by governments. However, to the extent the governments do have concerns they relate to the issues across TLDs. Furthermore one could not slip into censorship.

“Chile and Denmark asked about the availability of the evaluation Report for .xxx and wondered if the process was in compliance with the ICANN Bylaws.

“Brazil asserted that content issues are relevant when ICANN is creating a space linked to pornography. He considered the matter as a public policy issue in the Brazilian context and repeated that the outside world would assume that GAC had been fully cognizant of the decision-making process.

“Mr. Twomey referred to the procedure for attention for GAC in the ICANN Bylaws that could be initiated if needed. The bylaws could work both ways: GAC could bring matters to ICANN’s attention. Dr. Cerf invited GAC to comment in the context of the ICANN public
comments process. Spain suggested that ICANN should formally request GAC advice in such cases.

“The Chair [Dr. Cerf] noted in conclusion that it is not always clear what the public policy issues are and that an early warning mechanism is called for.” (C-139, P. 5.)

23. When it came to drafting the GAC Communique, the following further exchanges were summarized:

“Brazil referred to the decision taken for the creation of .xxx and asked if anything could be done at this stage...

“On .xxx, USA thought that it would be very difficult to express some views at this late stage. The process had been public since the beginning, and the matter could have been raised before at Plenary or Working group level...

“Italy would be in favour of inserting the process for the creation of new TLDs in the Communique as GAC failed in some way to examine in good time the current set of proposal [sic] for questions of methodology and lack of resources.

“Malaysia recalled the difficult situation in which governments are faced with the evolution of the DNS system and the ICANN environment. ICANN and GAC should be more responsive to common issues...

“Canada raise [sic] the point of the advisory role of the GAC vis-à-vis ICANN and it would be difficult to go beyond this function for the time being.

“Denmark agreed with Canada but considered that the matter could have been raised before within the framework of the GAC; if necessary issues could be raised directly in Plenary.

“France though [sic] that the matter should be referred to in the Communique. Since ICANN was apparently limiting its consideration to financial, technical and sponsorship aspects, the content aspects should be treated as a problem for the GAC from the point of view of the general public interest.”
“The Chair took note of the comments that had been made. He mentioned that the issues of new gTLDs...would be mentioned in the Communique.” (C-139, p. 7.)

24. Finally, in respect of “New Top Level Domains”

“...the Chair recalled that members had made comments during the consultation period regarding the .tel and .mobi proposals, but not regarding other sTLD proposals.

“The GAC has requested ICANN to provide the Evaluation Report on the basis of which the application for .xxx was approved. GAC considered that some aspects of content related to top level extensions might give rise of [sic] public policies [sic] issues.

“The Chair confirmed that, having consulted the ICANN Legal Counsel, GAC could still advise ICANN about the .xxx proposal, should it decide to do so. However, no member has yet raised this as an issue for formal comments to be given to ICANN in the Communique.” (C-139, p. 13.)

25. The Luxembourg Communique of the GAC as adopted made no express reference to the application of ICM Registry nor to the June 1, 2005 ICANN Board resolutions adopted in response to it. In respect of “New Top Level Domains”, the Communique stated:

“The GAC notes from recent experience that the introduction of new TLDs can give rise to significant public policy issues, including content. Accordingly, the GAC welcomes the initiative of ICANN to hold consultations with respect to the implementation of the new Top Level Domains strategy. The GAC looks forward to providing advice to the process.” (C-159, p. 1.)

26. Negotiations on commercial and technical terms for a contract between ICANN’s General Counsel, John Jeffrey, and the counsel of ICM Registry, Ms. J. Beckwith Burr, in pursuance of the ICANN Board’s resolutions of June 1, 2005, progressed smoothly, resulting in the posting in early August 2005 of the First Draft Registry Agreement. It was expected that the Board would vote on the contract at its meeting of August 16, 2005.

27. This expectation was overturned by ICANN’s receipt of two letters. On August 11, 2005, Michael D. Gallagher, Assistant Secretary for
Communications and Information of the U.S. Department of Commerce, wrote Dr. Cerf, with a copy to Mr. Twomey, as follows:

“I understand that the Board of Directors of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) is scheduled to consider approval of an agreement with the ICM Registry to operate the .xxx top level domain (TLD) on August 16, 2005. I am writing to urge the Board to ensure that the concerns of all members of the Internet community on this issue have been adequately heard and resolved before the Board takes action on this application.

“Since the ICANN Board voted to negotiate a contract with ICM Registry for the .xxx TLD in June 2005, this issue has garnered widespread public attention and concern outside of the ICANN community. The Department of Commerce has received nearly 6000 letters and emails from individuals expressing concern about the impact of pornography on families and children and opposing the creation of a new top level domain devoted to adult content. We also understand that other countries have significant reservations regarding the creation of a .xxx TLD. I believe that ICANN has also received many of these concerned comments. The volume of correspondence opposed to the creation of a .xxx TLD is unprecedented. Given the extent of the negative reaction, I request that the Board will provide a proper process and adequate additional time for these concerns to be voiced and addressed before any additional action takes place on this issue.

“It is of paramount importance that the Board ensure the best interests of the Internet community as a whole are fully considered as it evaluates the addition to this new top level domain...” (C-162, p. 1.)

28. On August 12, 2005, Mohamed Sharil Tarmizi, Chairman, GAC, wrote to the ICANN Board of Directors, in his personal capacity and not on behalf of the GAC, with a copy to the GAC, as follows:

“As you know, the Board is scheduled to consider approval of a contract for a new top level domain intended to be used for adult content...

“You may recall that during the session between the GAC and the Board in Luxembourg that some countries had expressed strong positions to the Board on this issue. In other GAC sessions, a number of other governments also expressed some concern with the potential
introduction of this TLD. The views are diverse and wide ranging. Although not necessarily well articulated in Luxembourg, as Chairman, I believe there remains a strong sense of discomfort in the GAC about the TLD, notwithstanding the explanations to date.

“I have been approached by some of these governments and I have advised them that apart from the advice given in relation to the creation of new TLDs in the Luxembourg Communiqué that implicitly refers to the proposed TLD, sovereign governments are also free to write directly to ICANN about their specific concerns.

“In this regard, I would like to bring to the Board’s attention the possibility that several governments will choose to take this course of action. I would like to request that in any further debate that we may have with regard to this TLD that we keep this background in mind.

“Based on the foregoing, I believe that the Board should allow time for additional governmental and public policy concerns to be expressed before reaching a final decision on this TLD.”

29. The volte face in the position of the United States Government evidenced by the letter of Mr. Gallagher appeared to have been stimulated by a cascade of protests by American domestic organizations such as the Family Research Council and Focus on the Family. Thousands of email messages of identical text poured into the Department of Commerce demanding that .XXX be stopped. Copies of messages obtained by ICM under the Freedom of Information Act show that while officials of the Department of Commerce concerned with Internet questions earlier did not oppose and indeed apparently favored ICANN’s approval of the application of ICM, the Department of Commerce was galvanized into opposition by the generated torrent of negative demands, and by representations by leading figures of the so-called “religious right”, such as Jim Dobson, who had influential access to high level officials of the U.S. Administration. There was even indication in the Department of Commerce that, if ICANN were to approve a top level domain for adult material, it would not be entered into the root if the United States Government did not approve (C-165, C-166.) The intervention of the United States came at a singularly delicate juncture, in the run-up to a United Nations sponsored conference on the Internet, the World Summit on the Information Society, which was anticipated to be the forum for concentration of criticism of the continuing influence of the United States over the Internet. The Congressional Quarterly Weekly ran a story entitled, “Web Neutrality vs. Morality” which said: “The flap over .xxx has put ICANN
in an almost impossible position. It is facing mounting pressure from within the United States and other countries to reject the domain. But if it goes back on its earlier decision, many countries will see that as evidence of its allegiance to and lack of independence from the U.S. government. ‘The politics of this are amazing,’ said Cerf. ‘We’re damned if we do and damned if we don’t.’ (C-284.)

30. Doubt about the desirability of allocating a top-level domain to ICM Registry, or opposition to so doing, was not confined to the U.S. Department of Commerce, as illustrated by the proceedings at Luxembourg quoted above. A number of other governments also expressed reservations or raised questions about ICM’s application on various grounds, including, at a later stage, those of Australia (letter from the Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts of February 28, 2007 expressing Australia’s “strong opposition to the creation of a .XXX sTLD”), Canada (comment expressing concern that ICANN may be drawn into becoming a global Internet content regulator, Exhibit DJ) and the United Kingdom (letter of May 4, 2006 stressing the importance of ICM’s monitoring all .XXX content from “day one”, C-182). The EC expressed the view that consultation with the GAC had been inadequate. The Deputy Director-General of the European Commission on September 16, 2005 wrote Dr. Cerf stating that the June 1, 2005 resolutions were adopted without the benefit of such consultation and added:

“Moreover, while the .xxx TLD raises obvious and predictable public policy issues, the fact that a similar application from the same applicants had been rejected in 2000 (following a negative evaluation) had, not surprisingly, led many GAC representatives to expect that a similar decision would have been reached on this occasion...such a change in approach would benefit from an explanation to the GAC.

“I would therefore ask ICANN to reconsider the decision to proceed with this application until the GAC have had an opportunity to review the evaluation report.” (C-172, p. 1.)

31. The State Secretary for Communications and Regional Policy of the Government of Sweden, Jonas Bjelfvenstam, wrote Dr. Twomey a letter carrying the date of November 23, 2005, as follows:

“I have followed recent discussions by the Board of Directors of ...ICANN concerning the proposed top level domain (TLD) .xxx. I appreciate that the Board has deferred further discussions on the
subject...taking account of requests from the applicant ICM, as well as the ...GAC Chairman’s and the US Department of Commerce’s request to allow for additional time for comments by interested parties.

“Sweden strongly supports the ICANN mission and the process making ICANN an organization independent of the US Government. We appreciate the achievements of ICANN in the outstanding technical and innovative development of the Internet, an ICANN exercising open, transparent and multilateral procedures.

“The Swedish line on pornography is that it is not compatible with gender equality goals. The constant exposure of pornography and degrading pictures in our everyday lives normalizes the exploitation of women and children and the pornography industry profits on the documentation.

“A TLD dedicated for pornography might increase the volume of pornography on the Internet at the same time as foreseen advantages with a dedicated TLD might not materialize. These and other comments have been made in the many comments made directly to ICANN through the ICANN web site. There are a considerable number of negative reactions within and outside the Internet community.

“I know that all TLD applications are dealt with in procedures open to everyone for comment. However, in a case like this, where public interests clearly are involved, we feel it could have been appropriate for ICANN to request advice from GAC. Admittedly, GAC could have given advice to ICANN anyway at any point in the process and to my knowledge, no GAC members have raised the question before the GAC meeting July 9-12 in Luxembourg. However, we all probably rested assure that ICANN’s negative opinion on .xxx, expressed in 2000, would stand.

“From the ICANN decision on June 1, 2005, there was too little time for GAC to have an informed discussion on the subject at its Luxembourg summer meeting. ..

“Therefore we would ask ICANN to postpone conclusive discussions on .xxx until after the upcoming GAC meeting in November 29-30 in Vancouver...In due time before that meeting, it would be helpful if ICANN could present in detail how it means that .xxx fulfils the criteria set in advance...” (C-168, p. 1.)
32. At its meeting by teleconference of September 15, 2005, the Board, “after lengthy discussion involving nearly all of the directors regarding the sponsorship criteria, the application, and additional supplemental materials, and the specific terms of the proposed agreement,” adopted a resolution providing that:

“...”

"Whereas the ICANN Board has expressed concerns regarding issues relating to the compliance with the proposed .XXX Registry Agreement (including possible proposals for codes of conduct and ongoing obligations regarding potential changes in ownership)..."

“Whereas, ICANN has received significant levels of correspondence from the Internet community users over recent weeks, as well as inquiries from a number of governments,

“Resolved...that the ICANN President and General Counsel are directed to discuss possible additional contractual provisions or modifications for inclusion in the XXX Registry Agreement, to ensure that there are effective provisions requiring development and implementation of policies consistent with the principles in the ICM application. Following such additional discussions, the President and General Counsel are requested to return to the board for additional approval, disapproval or advice.” (C-119, p. 1.)

33. At the Vancouver meeting of the Board in December 2005, the GAC requested an explanation of the processes that led to the adoption of the Board’s resolutions of June 1. Dr. Twomey replied with a lengthy and detailed letter of February 11, 2006. The following extracts are of interest:

“Where an applicant passed all three sets of criteria and there were no other issues associated with the application, the Board was briefed and the application was allowed to move on to the stage of technical and commercial negotiations designed to establish a new sTLD. One application – POST – was in this category. In other cases – where an evaluation team indicated that a set of criteria was not met, or there were other issues to be examined – each applicant was provided an opportunity to submit clarifying or additional documentation before presenting the evaluation panel’s recommendation to the Board for a decision on whether the applicant could proceed to the next stage. The other nine applications, including .XXX, were in this category.
“Because of the more subjective nature of the sponsorship/community value issues being reviewed, it was decided to ask the Board to review these issues directly.

... 

“It should be noted that, consistent with Article II, Section 1 of the Bylaws, it is the ICANN Board that has the authority to decide, upon the conclusion of technical and commercial negotiations, whether or not to approve the creation of a new sTLD...Responsibility for resolving issues relating to an applicant’s readiness to proceed to technical and commercial negotiations and, subsequently, whether or not to approve delegation of a new sTLD, rests with the Board.

... 

“Extensive Review of ICM Application

...

“On 3 May 2005, the Board held a ‘broad discussion...regarding whether or not there was a ‘sponsored community’. The Board agreed that it would discuss this issue again at the next Board Meeting.’

“Based on the extensive public comments received, the independent evaluation panel’s recommendations, the responses of ICM and the proposed Sponsoring Organization (IFFOR) to those evaluations, ...at its teleconference on June 1, 2005, the Board authorized the President and General Counsel to enter into negotiations relating to proposed commercial and technical terms with ICM. It also requested the President to present any such negotiated agreement to the Board for approval and authorization...” (C-175.)

34. Subsequent draft registry agreements of ICM were produced in response to specific requests of ICANN staff for amendments, to which requests ICM responded positively. In particular, a provision was included stating that all requirements for registration would be “in addition to the obligation to comply with all applicable law[s] and regulation[s]”. (Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, pp. 128-129.)

35. Just before the Board met in Wellington, New Zealand in March 2006, the GAC convened and, among other matters, discussed the above letter of the
ICANN President of February 11, 2006. Its Communique of March 28 states that the GAC

“does not believe that the February 11 letter provides sufficient detail regarding the rationale for the Board determination that the application [of ICM Registry] had overcome the deficiencies noted in the Evaluation Report. The Board would request a written explanation of the Board decision, particularly with regard to the sponsored community and public interest criteria outlined in the sponsored top level domain selection criteria.

“...ICM promised a range of public interest benefits as part of its bid to operate the .xxx domain. To the GAC’s knowledge, these undertakings have not yet been included as ICM obligations in the proposed .xxx Registry Agreement negotiated with ICANN."

“The public policy aspects identified by members of the GAC include the degree to which the .xxx application would:

- Take appropriate measures to restrict access to illegal and offensive content;

- Support the development of tools and programs to protect vulnerable members of the community;

- Maintain accurate details of registrants and assist law enforcement agencies to identify and contact the owners of particular websites, if need be; and

“Without in any way implying an endorsement of the ICM application, the GAC would request confirmation from the Board that any contract currently under negotiation between ICANN and ICM Registry would include enforceable provisions covering all of ICM Registry’s commitments, and such information on the proposed contract being made available to member countries through the GAC.

“Nevertheless without prejudice to the above, several members of the GAC are emphatically opposed from a public policy perspective to the introduction of a .xxx sTLD.”

36. At the Board’s meeting in Wellington of March 31, 2006, a resolution was adopted by which it was:
“Resolved, the President and General Counsel are directed to analyze all publicly received inputs, to continue negotiations with ICM Registry, and to return to the Board with any recommendations regarding amendments to the proposed sTLD registry agreement, particularly to ensure that the TLD sponsor will have in place adequate mechanisms to address any potential registrant violations of the sponsor's policies.” (C-184, p. 1.)

37. On May 4, 2006, Dr. Twomey sent a further letter to the Chairman and members of the GAC in response to the GAC's request for information regarding the decision of the ICANN Board to proceed with several sTLD applications, notwithstanding negative reports from one or more evaluation teams. The following extracts are of interest:

“It is important to note that the Board decision as to the .XXX application is still pending. The decision by the ICANN Board during its 1 June 2005 Special Board Meeting reviewed the criteria against the materials supplied and the results of the independent evaluations. ...the board voted to authorize staff to enter into contractual negotiations without prejudicing the Board's right to evaluate the resulting contract and to decide whether it meets all the criteria before the Board including public policy advice such as might be offered by the GAC. The final conclusion on the Board's decision to accept or reject the .XXX application has not been made and will not be made until such time as the Board either approves or rejects the registry agreement relating to the .XXX application. In fact, it is important to note that the Board has reviewed previous proposed agreements with ICM for the .XXX registry and has expressed concerns regarding the compliance structures established in those drafts.

...

In some instances, such as with .XXX, while the additional materials provided sufficient clarification to proceed with contractual discussions, the Board still expressed concerns about whether the applicant met all of the criteria, but took the view that such concerns could possibly be addressed by contractual obligations to be stated in a registry agreement.” (C-188, pp. 1, 2.)

38. On May 10, 2006, the Board held a telephonic special meeting and addressed ICM's by now Third Draft Registry Agreement. After a roll call, there were 9 votes against accepting the agreement and 5 in favor. Those
who voted against (including Board Chairman Cerf and President Twomey), in brief explanations of vote, indicated that they so voted because the undertakings of ICM could not in their view be fulfilled; because the conditions required by the GAC could not be met; because doubts about sponsorship remained and had magnified as a result of opposition from elements of the adult entertainment community; because the agreement’s reference to “all applicable law” raised a wide and variable test of compliance and enforcement; and because guaranty of compliance with obligations of the contract was lacking. Those who voted in favor indicated that changing ICANN’s position after an extended process weakens ICANN and encourages the exertions of pressure groups; found that there was sufficient support of the sponsoring community, while invariable support was not required; held it unfair to impose on ICM a complete compliance model before it is allowed to start, a requirement imposed on no other applicant; maintained that ICANN is not in the business and should not be in the business of judging content which rather is the province of each country, that ICANN should not be a “choke-point for content limitations of governments”; and contended that ICANN should avoid applying subjective and arbitrary criteria and should concern itself with the technical merits of applications. (C-189.) The vote of May 10, 2006 was not to approve the agreement as proposed “but it did not reject the application” of ICM (C-197.)

39. ICM Registry filed a Request for Reconsideration of Board Action on May 21, 2006, pursuant to Article IV, Section 2 of ICANN’s Bylaws providing for reconsideration requests. (C-190.) However, after being informed by ICANN’s general counsel that the Board would be prepared to consider still another revised draft agreement, ICM withdrew that request on October 29, 2006. Working as she had throughout in consultation with ICANN’s staff, particularly its general counsel, Ms. Burr, on behalf of ICM, engaged in further negotiations with ICANN endeavoring to accommodate its requirements, demonstrate that the concerns raised by the GAC had been met to the extent possible, and provide ICANN with additional support for ICM’s commitment to abide by the provisions of the proposed agreement. Among the materials provided, earlier and then, were a list of persons within the child safety community willing to serve on the board of IFFOR, commitments to enter into agreements with rating associations to provide tags for filtering .XXX websites and to monitor compliance with rules for the suppression of child pornography provisions, and data about a “pre-reservation service” for reservations for .XXX from webmasters operating adult sites on other ICANN-recognized top level domains. ICANN claimed to have registered more than 75,000 pre-reservations in the first six months that this service was publicly available. (Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits,
The proposed agreement was revised to include, *inter alia*, provision for imposing certain requirements on registrants; develop mechanisms for compliance with those requirements; create dispute resolution mechanisms; and engage independent monitors. ICM agreed to enter into a contract with the Family Online Safety Institute. The clause regarding registrants' obligations to comply with "all applicable law" was deleted because, in ICM's view, it had given rise to misunderstanding about whether ICANN would become involved in monitoring content. ICM maintains that, in the course of exchanges about making these revisions and preparing its Fourth Draft Registry Agreement, "ICANN never sought to have ICM attempt to re-define the sponsored community or otherwise demonstrate that it met any of the RFP criteria". (Id., p. 141.)

40. On February 2, 2007, the Chairman and Chairman-Elect of the GAC wrote the Chairman of the ICANN Board, speaking for themselves and not necessarily for the GAC, as follows:

"We note that the Wellington Communique...requested clarification from the ICANN Board regarding its decision of 1 June 2005 authorising staff to enter into contractual negotiations with ICM Registry, despite deficiencies identified by the Sponsorship...Panel...we reiterate the GAC's request for a clear explanation of why the ICANN Board is satisfied that the .xxx application has overcome the deficiencies relating to the proposed sponsorship community.

"In Wellington, the GAC also requested confirmation from the ICANN Board that the proposed .xxx agreement would include enforceable provisions covering all of ICM Registry's commitments...

"...GAC members would urge the Board to defer any final decision on this application until the Lisbon meeting." (C-198.)

41. A special meeting of the ICANN Board on February 12, 2007, was held by teleconference. Consideration of the proposed .XXX Registry Agreement was introduced by Mr. Jeffrey, who asked the Board to consider (a) public comment on the proposed agreement (which had been posted by ICANN on its website) (b) advice proffered by the GAC and (c) "how ICM measures up against the RFP criteria" (C-199, p.1). He noted in relation to community input that since the initial ICM application over 200,000 pertinent emails had been sent to ICANN.

42. Rita Rodin, a new Board member, noted that she had not been on the Board at previous discussions of the ICM application, but based on her
review of the papers “she had some concerns about whether the proposal met the criteria set forth in the RFP. For example, she noted that it was not clear to her whether the sponsoring community seeking to run the domain genuinely could be said to represent the adult on-line community. However Rita requested that John Jeffrey and Paul Twomey confirm that this sort of discussion should take place during this meeting. She said that she did not want to reopen issues if they had already been decided by the Board.” (Id., pp. 2-3.)

43. While there was no direct response to the foregoing request of Ms. Rodin, Dr. Cerf noted “that had been the subject of debate by the Board in earlier discussions in 2006...over the last six months, there seem to have been a more negative reaction from members of the online community to the proposal.” Rita Rodin agreed; “there seems to be a ‘splintering of support in the adult on-line community.” She was also concerned “that approval of this domain in these circumstances would cause ICM to become a de facto arbiter of policies for pornography on the Internet...she was not comfortable with ICANN saying to a self-defined group that they could define policy around pornography on the internet. This was not part of ICANN’s technical decision-making remit...” (Id., p. 3) Dr. Twomey said that the Board needed to focus on whether there was a need for further public comment on the new version, the GAC comments, “and whether ICM had demonstrated to the Board’s satisfaction that it had met criteria against the RFP for sTLDs.” Dr. Cerf agreed that “the sponsorship grouping for a new TLD was difficult to define.”

44. Susan Crawford expressed the view that “no group can demonstrate in advance that they will meet the interests and concerns of all members in their community and that this was an unrealistic expectation to place on any applicant....if that test was applied to any sponsor group for a new sTLD, none would ever be approved.”

45. The Acting Chair conducted a “straw poll” of the Board as to whether members held “serious concerns” about the level of support for the creation of the domain from this sponsoring community. A majority indicated that they did, while a minority indicated that “it was an inappropriate burden to place on ICM to ensure that the entire adult online community was supportive of the proposed domain”. (Id.) The following resolution was unanimously adopted:
“Whereas a majority of the Board has serious concerns about whether the proposed .XXX domain has the support of a clearly-defined sponsored community as per the criteria for sponsored TLDs;

“Whereas a minority of the Board believed that the self-described community of sponsorship made known by the proponent of the .XXX domain, ICM Registry, was sufficient to meet the criteria for an sTLD.

“Resolved that:

I. The revised version [now the fifth version of the draft agreement] be exposed to a public comment period of no less than 21 days, and

II. ICANN staff consult with ICM and provide further information to the Board prior to its next meeting, so as to inform a decision by the Board about whether sponsorship criteria is [sic] met for the creation of a new .XXX sTLD.” (Id., p. 4.)

46. The Governmental Advisory Committee met in Lisbon on March 28, 2007 and issued “formal advice to the Board”. It reaffirmed the Wellington Communiqué as “a valid and important expression of the GAC's views on .xxx. The GAC does not consider the information provided by the Board to have answered the GAC concerns as to whether the ICM application meets the sponsorship criteria.” It called attention to an expression of concern by Canada that, with the revised proposed ICANN-ICM Registry agreement, “the Corporation could be moving towards assuming an ongoing management and oversight role regarding Internet content, which would be inconsistent with its technical mandate.” (C-200, pp. 4, 5.) It also adopted “Principles Regarding New TLDs” which contain the following provision in respect of delegation of new gTLDs:

“2.5 The evaluation and selection procedure for new gTLD registries should respect the principles of fairness, transparency and non-discrimination. All applicants for a new gTLD registry should therefore be evaluated against transparent and predictable criteria, fully available to the applicants prior to the initiation of the process. Normally, therefore, no subsequent additional selection criteria should be used in the selection process.” (Id., p. 12.)

47. The climactic meeting of the ICANN Board took place in Lisbon, Portugal, on March 30, 2007. A resolution was adopted by a vote of nine to five, with one abstention (that of Dr. Twomey), whose operative paragraphs provide that:
“...the board has determined that

“ICM’s application and the revised agreement failed to meet, among other things, the sponsored community criteria of the RFP specification.

“Based on the extensive public comment and from the GAC’s communiqués, that this agreement raises public policy issues.

“Approval of the ICM application and revised agreement is not appropriate, as they do not resolve the issues raised in the GAC communiqués, and ICM’s response does not address the GAC’s concern for offensive content and similarly avoids the GAC’s concern for the protection of vulnerable members of the community. The board does not believe these public policy concerns can be credibly resolved with the mechanisms proposed by the applicant.

“The ICM application raises significant law enforcement compliance issues because of countries’ varying laws relating to content and practices that define the nature of the application, therefore obligating ICANN to acquire responsibility related to content and conduct.

“The board agrees with the reference in the GAC communiqué from Lisbon that under the revised agreement, there are credible scenarios that lead to circumstances in which ICANN would be forced to assume an ongoing management and oversight role regarding Internet content, which is inconsistent with its technical mandate.

Accordingly, it is resolved...that the proposed agreement with ICM concerning the .xxx sTLD is rejected and the application request for delegation of the .XXX sTLD is hereby denied.”

48. Debate in the Board over adoption of the resolution was intense. Dr. Cerf, who was to vote in favor of the resolution (and hence against the ICM application) observed that he had voted in favor of proceeding to negotiate a contract.

“Part of the reason for that was to try to understand more deeply exactly how this proposal would be implemented, and seeing the contractual terms...would put much more meat on the bones of the initial proposal. I have been concerned about the definition of ‘responsible’...there’s uncertainty in my mind about what behavioral
patterns to expect...over time, the two years that we’ve considered this, there has been a growing disagreement within the adult content community as to the advisability of this proposal. As I looked at the contract...the mechanisms for assuring the behavior of the registrants in this top-level domain seemed, to me, uncertain. And I was persuaded...that there were very credible scenarios in which the operation of IFFOR and ICM might still lead to ICANN being propelled into responding to complaints that some content on some of the registered .xxx sites didn't somehow meet the expectations of the general public this would propel ICANN and its staff into making decisions or having to examine content to decide whether or not it met the IFFOR criteria...I would also point out that the GAC has raised public policy concerns about this particular top level domain.” (C-201, p. 6.)

49. Rita Rodin said that she did not believe

“that this is an appropriate sponsored community...it's inappropriate to allow an applicant in any sTLD to simply define out...any people that are not in in favor of this TLD..as irresponsible...this will be an enforcement headache...for ICANN..way beyond the technical oversight role of ICANN's mandate...there's porn all over the Internet and...there isn't a mechanism with this TLD to have it all exclusively within one string to actually effect some of the purposes of the TLD...to be responsible with respect to the distribution of pornography, to prevent child pornography on the Internet...” (id., p. 7.)

50. Peter Dengate Thrush, who favored acceptance of the ICM contract, voted against the resolution. On the issue of the sponsored community,

“there is on the evidence a sufficiently identifiable, distinct community which the TLD could serve. It’s the adult content providers wanting to differentiate themselves by voluntary adoption of this labeling system. It’s not affected ... by the fact that that's a self-selecting community...or impermanence of that community...This is the first time in any of these sTLD applications that we have had active opposition. And we have no metrics...to establish what level of opposition by members of the potential community might have caused us concern...the resolution I am voting against is particularly weak on this issue. On why the board thinks this community is not sufficiently identified. No fact or real rationale are provided in the resolution, and...given the considerable importance that the board has placed on this...and the cost and effort that the applicant has gone to answer the
board's concern demonstrating the existence of a sponsored community...this silence is disrespectful to the applicant and does a disservice to the community...I've also been concerned ... about the scale of the obligations accepted by the applicant...some of those have been forced upon them by the process...in the end I am satisfied that the compliance rules raise no new issues in kind from previous contracts. And I say that if ICANN is going to raise this kind of objection, then it better think seriously of getting out of the business of introducing new TLDs ... I do not think that this contract would make ICANN a content regulator...” (Id., pp. 7-8.)

51. Njeri Ronge stated that, in addition to the reasons stated in the resolution, “the ICM proposal will not protect the relevant or interested community from the adult entertainment Web sites by a significant percentage; ... the ICM proposal focuses on content management which is not in ICANN's technical mandate.” (Id., p. 8.)

52. Susan Crawford dissented from the resolution, which she found “not only weak but unprincipled”. “I am troubled by the path the board has followed on this issue...ICANN only creates problems for itself when it acts in an ad hoc fashion in response to political pressures. ICANN...should resist efforts by governments to veto what it does...The most fundamental value of the global Internet community is that people who propose to use the Internet protocols and infrastructures for otherwise lawful purposes, without threatening the operational stability or security of the Internet, should be presumed to be entitled to do so. In a nutshell, everything not prohibited is permitted. This understanding...has led directly to the striking success of the Internet around the world. ICANN's role in gTLD policy development is to seek to assess and articulate the broadly shared values of the Internet community. We have very limited authority. I am personally not aware that any global consensus against the creation of a triple X domain exists. In the absence of such a prohibition, and given our mandate to create TLD competition, we have no authority to block the addition of this TLD to the root. It is very clear that we do not have a global shared set of values about content on line, save for the global norm against child pornography. But the global Internet community clearly does share the core value that no centralized authority should set itself up as the arbiter of what people may do together on line, absent a demonstration that most of those affected by the proposed activity agree that it should be banned...the
fact is that ICANN evaluated the strength of the sponsorship of triple X, the relationship between the applicant and the community behind the TLD, and...concluded that this criteria [sic] had been met as of June 2005.  ICANN then went on to negotiate specific contractual terms with the applicant.  Since then, real and AstroTurf comments - that's an Americanism meaning filed comments claiming to be grass roots opposition that have actually been generated by organized campaigns - have come into ICANN that reflect opposition to this application.  I do not find these recent comments sufficient to warrant revisiting the question of the sponsorship strength of this TLD which I personally believe to be closed.  No applicant for any sponsored TLD could ever demonstrate unanimous, cheering approval for its application.  We have no metric against which to measure this opposition....We will only get in the way of useful innovation if we take the view that every new TLD must prove itself to us before it can be added to the root...what is meant by sponsorship...is that there is enough interest in a particular TLD that it will be viable.  We also have the idea that registrants should participate in and be bound by the creation of policies for a particular string.  Both of these requirements have been met by this applicant.  There is clearly enough interest, including more than 70,000 preregistrations from a thousand or more unique registrants who are member of the adult industry, and the applicant has undertaken to us that it will require adherence to its self-regulatory policies by all of its registrants...Many of my fellow board members are undoubtedly uncomfortable with the subject of adult entertainment material.  Discomfort may have been sparked anew by first the letter from individual GAC members...and second the letter from the Australian Government.  But the entire point of ICANN's creation was to avoid the operation of chokepoint control over the domain name system by individual or collective governments.  The idea was the U.S. would serve as a good steward for other governmental concerns by staying in the background and...not engaging in content-related control.  Australia's letter and concerns expressed...by Brazil and other countries about triple X are explicitly content-based and, thus, inappropriate...If after the creation of a triple X TLD certain governments of the world want to ensure that their citizens do not see triple X content, it is within their prerogative as sovereigns to instruct Internet access providers physically located within their territory to block such content...But content-related censorship should not be ICANN's concern...To the extent there are public policy concerns with this TLD, they can be dealt with through local laws.” (Id., pp. 9-11.)
53. Demi Getschko declared that her vote in favor of the resolution was her own decision “without any kind of pressure”. (Id., p. 12.) Alejandro Pisanty denied that “the board has been swayed by political pressure of any kind” and affirmed that, “ICANN has acted carefully and strictly within the rules.” He accepted “that there is no universal set of values regarding adult content other than those related to child pornography...the resolution voted is based precisely on that view, not on any view of content itself.” (Id.

PART THREE: THE ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

The Contentions of ICM Registry

54. ICM Registry contends that (a) the Independent Review Process is an arbitration; (b) that Process does not afford the ICANN Board a “deferential standard of review”; (c) the law to be applied by that Process comprises the relevant principles of international law and local law, i.e., California law, and that the particularly relevant principle is good faith; (d) in its treatment and rejection of the application of ICM Registry, ICANN did not act consistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

The Nature of the Independent Review Process

55. In respect of the nature of the Independent Review Process, ICM, noting that these proceedings are the first such Process brought under ICANN's Bylaws, maintains that they are arbitral and not advisory in character. It observes that the current provisions governing the Independent Review Process were added to the Bylaws in December 2002 partly as a result of international and domestic concern about ICANN's lack of accountability. It recalls that ICANN's then President, Stuart Lynn, announced in a U.S. Senate hearing in 2002 that ICANN planned to “strengthen ... confidence in the fairness of ICANN decision-making through... creating a workable mechanism for speedy independent review of ICANN Board actions by experienced arbitrators...” (Claimant's Memorial on the Merits, p. 162). His successor, Dr. Twomey, stated to a committee of the U.S. House of Representatives in 2006 that, “ICANN does have well-established principles and processes for accountability in its decision-making and in its bylaws...there is ability for appeal to...independent arbitration.” (Id., p. 163.) Article IV, Section 3, of ICANN's Bylaws provides that: “The IRP shall be operated by an international arbitration provider appointed from time to time by ICANN...using arbitrators...nominated by that provider.” Pursuant to that provision, ICANN appointed the International Centre for Dispute Resolution (“ICDR”) of the American Arbitration Association as the international arbitration provider
The term “arbitration” imports the binding resolution of a dispute. Courts in the United States – including the Supreme Court of California – have held that the term “arbitration” connotes a binding award. (Id., pp. 168-169.) Article 27(1) of the ICDR Rules provides that “[a]wards...shall be final and binding on the parties. The parties undertake to carry out any such award without delay.” (C-11.) The Supplementary Procedures for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) Independent Review Process specify that “the ICDR’s International Arbitration Rules...will govern the Process in combination with these Supplementary Procedures.” They provide that the “Independent Review Panel (IRP) refers to the neutral(s) appointed to decide the issue(s) presented.” “The Declaration shall specifically designate the prevailing party.” (C-12.) In view of all of the foregoing, ICM maintains that the IRP is an arbitral process designed to produce a decision on the issues that is binding on the parties.

The Standard of Review is Not Deferential

56. ICM also maintains that, contrary to the position now advanced by counsel for ICANN, ICANN’s assertion that the Panel must afford the ICANN Board “a deferential standard of review” has no support in the instruments governing this proceeding. The term “independent review” connotes a review that is not deferential. Both Federal law and California law treat provision for an independent review as the equivalent of de novo review. In California law, when an appellate court employs independent, de novo review, it generally gives no special deference to the findings or conclusions of the court from which appeal is taken. (Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, with citations, pp. 173-174.) ICANN’s reliance on the “business judgment rule” and the related doctrine of “judicial deference” under California law is misplaced, because under California law the business judgment rule is employed to protect directors from personal liability (typically in shareholder suits) when the directors have made good faith business decisions on behalf of the corporation. The IRP is not a court action seeking to impose individual liability on the ICANN board of directors. Rather, this is an Independent Review Process with the specific purpose of declaring “whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws.” As California courts have explicitly stated, “the rule of judicial deference to board decision-making can be limited ... by the association’s governing documents.” The IRP, to quote Dr. Twomey’s testimony before Congress, is a process meant to establish a “final method of accountability.”
The notion now advanced on behalf of ICANN, that this Panel should afford the Board “a deferential standard of review” and only “question” the Board’s actions upon “a showing of bad faith” is at odds with that purpose as well as with the plain meaning of “independent review”. (Id., pp. 176-177.)

**The Applicable Law of this Proceeding**

57. Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation provides that, “The Corporation shall operate for the benefit of the Internet community as a whole, carrying out its activities in conformity with the relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law...” (C-4). The prior version of the draft Articles had provided for ICANN’s “carrying out its activities with due regard for applicable local and international law”. This language was regarded as inadequate, and was revised, as the then Interim Chairman of ICANN explained, “to mak[e] it clear that ICANN will comply with relevant and applicable international and local law”. (Id., p. 180.) As ICANN’s President testified in the U.S. Congress in 2003, the International Review Process was put in place so that disputes could “be referred to an independent review panel operated by an international arbitration provider with an appreciation for and understanding of applicable international laws, as well as California not-for-profit corporation law.” (Id., p. 182.) According to the Expert Report of Professor Jack Goldsmith, on which ICM relies:

“...in an attempt to bring accountability and thus legitimacy to its decisions, ICANN (a) assumed in its Articles of Incorporation an obligation to act in conformity with ‘relevant principles of international law’ and (b) in its Bylaws extended to adversely affected third parties a novel right of independent review in this arbitration proceeding for consistency with ICANN’s Articles and Bylaws. The parties have agreed to international arbitration in this forum to determine consistency with the international law standards set forth in Article 4 of the Articles of Incorporation. California law allows a California non-profit corporation to bind itself in this way.” (Id., p. 11.)

In ICM’s view, Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation acts as a choice-of-law provision. It notes that Article 28 of the ICDR Arbitration Rules specifically provides that “the Tribunal shall apply the substantive law(s) or rules of law designated by the parties as applicable to this dispute.” (C-11.) It points out that the choice of a concurrent law clause – as in ICANN’s Articles providing for the application of relevant principles of both
international and domestic law – is not unusual, especially in transactions involving a public resource.

58. Professor Goldsmith observes that: “... “principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law” refers to three types of law. Local law means the law of California. Applicable international conventions refers to treaties. “The term ‘principles of international law’ includes general principles of law. Given that the canonical reference to the sources of international law is Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which lists international conventions, customary international law, and “the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations”, the reference to “principles of international law” in ICANN's Articles must refer to customary international law and to the general principles of law. (Expert Report, p. 12.) Professor Goldsmith notes that the Iran-United States Claims Tribunal has interpreted the “principles of commercial and international law” to include the general principles of law. ICSID tribunals similarly have interpreted “the rules of international law” to include general principles of law.

“It is perfectly appropriate to apply general principles in this IRP even though ICANN is technically a non-profit corporation and ICM is a private corporation. ICANN voluntarily subjected itself to these general principles in its Articles of Incorporation, something that both California law permits and that is typical in international arbitrations, especially when public goods are at stake. The ‘international’ nature of this arbitration – ... is evidenced by the global impact of ICANN's decisions...ICANN is only nominally a private corporation. It exercises extraordinary authority, delegated from the U.S. Government, over one of the globe’s most important resources...its control over the Internet naming and numbering system does make sense of its embrace of the ‘general principles’ standard. While there is no doubt that ICANN can and has bound itself to general principles of law as that phrase is understood in international law... the general principles relevant here complement, amplify and give detail to the requirements of independence, transparency and due process that ICANN has otherwise assumed in its Articles and Bylaws and under California law. General principles thus play their classic supplementary role in this proceeding.” (Id., pp. 15-16.)

59. Professor Goldsmith continues: “The general principle of good faith is ‘the foundation of all law and all conventions’” (quoting the seminal work of Bin Cheng, *General Principles of Law as Applied by International Courts and*
“As the International Court of Justice has noted, ‘the principle of good faith is a well established principle of international law’”. (Case concerning the Land and Maritime Boundary between Cameroon and Nigeria, Preliminary Objections, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1998, p. 296, with many citations.) Applications of the principle are “the requirement of good faith in complying with legal restrictions” and “the requirement of good faith in the exercise of discretion, also known as the doctrine of non-abuse of rights...” as well as the requirement of good faith in contractual negotiations. (Id., pp. 17-18.) The principle is “equally applicable to relations between individuals and to relations between nations.” (Cheng, loc. cit.).

60. Professor Goldsmith maintains that the abuse of right alleged by ICM that is

“most obvious is the clearly fictitious basis ICANN gave for denying ICM’s application...the concern about ‘law enforcement compliance issues because of countries’ varying laws relating to content and practices that define the nature of the application’ applies to many top-level domains besides .XXX. The website ‘pornography.com’ would be no less subject to various differing laws around the world than the website ‘pornography.xxx.’ ...a website on the .XXX domain is easier for nations to regulate and exclude from computers in their countries because they can block all sites on the .XXX domain with relative ease but have to look at the content, or make guesses based on domain names, to block unwanted pornography on .COM and other top level domains. In short, this reason for ICANN’s denial, if genuine, would extend to many top-level domains and would certainly apply to all generic top-level domains (like .COM, .INFO, .NET and .ORG) where pornographic sites can be found. But ICANN has only applied this reason for denial to the .XXX domain. This strongly suggests that the reasons for the denial are pretextual and thus the denial is an abuse of right...”

61. Professor Goldsmith further argues that “similarly pretextual is ICANN’s claim that ‘there are credible scenarios that leads to circumstances in which ICANN would be forced to assume an ongoing management and oversight role regarding Internet content.”’ He contends that the scenario is “unlikely”, but, more importantly, “the same logic applies to generic top level domains like .COM. The identical scenario could arise if a national court ordered...the registry operator for .COM...to shut down one of the hundreds of thousands of pornography sites on .COM. But ICANN has only expressed concern about ICM...”
ICANN Did Not Act Consistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws

62. ICM Registry contends that ICANN failed to act consistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws in the following respects.

63. ICANN, ICM maintains, conducted the 2004 Round of applications for top-level domains as a two-step process, in which it was first determined whether or not each applicant met the RFP criteria. If the criteria were met, “upon the successful completion of the sTLD process” (ICANN Board resolution of October 31, 2003, C-78), the applicant then would proceed to negotiate the commercial and technical terms of a registry agreement. (This Declaration, paras. 13-16, supra.) The RFP included detailed description of the criteria to be met to enable the applicant to proceed to contract negotiations, and specified that the selection criteria would be applied “based on principles of objectivity, non-discrimination and transparency”. (C-45.) On June 1, 2005, the ICANN Board concluded that ICM had met all of the RFP criteria - financial, technical and sponsorship – and authorized ICANN’s President and General Counsel to enter into negotiations over the “commercial and technical terms” of a registry agreement with ICM. “The record evidence in this case demonstrates overwhelmingly that when the Board approved ICM to proceed to contract negotiations on 1 June 2005, the Board concluded that ICM had met all of the RFP criteria – including, specifically, sponsorship.” (Claimant’s Post-Hearing Submission, p. 11.) While ICANN now claims that the sponsorship criterion remained open, and that the Board’s resolution of June 1, 2005, authorized negotiations in which whether ICM met sponsorship requirements could be more fully tested, ICM argues that no credible evidence, in particular, no contemporary documentary evidence, supports these contentions. To the contrary, ICM:

- (a) recalls that ICANN’s written announcement of applications received provided: “The applications will be reviewed by independent evaluation teams beginning in May 2004. The criteria for evaluation were posted with the RFP. All applicants that are found to satisfy the posted criteria will be eligible to enter into technical and commercial negotiations with ICANN for agreements for the allocation and sponsorship of the requested TLDs.” (C-82.)

- (b) emphasizes that ICANN’s Chairman of the Board, Dr. Cerf, is recorded in the GAC’s Luxembourg minutes as stating, shortly after the adoption of the June 1, 2005, resolution, that the application of .xxx “this time met the three main criteria, financial, technical and sponsorship”. Sponsorship was
extensively discussed “and the Board reached a positive decision considering that ICANN should not be involved in content matters.” (C-139; supra, para. 22.)

- (c) notes that a letter of ICANN’s President of February 11, 2006. states that: “…it is the ICANN Board that has the authority to decide, upon the conclusion of technical and commercial negotiations, whether or not to approve the creation of a new sTLD…Responsibility for resolving issues relating to an applicant’s readiness to proceed to technical and commercial negotiations…rests with the Board.” (Supra, paragraph 33.)

- (d) notes that the GAC’s Wellington Communique states, in respect of a letter of February 11, 2006 of ICANN’s President, that the GAC “does not believe that the February 11 letter provides sufficient detail regarding the rationale for the Board determination” that ICM’s application “had overcome the deficiencies noted in the Evaluation Report”. (Supra, paragraph 35.)

- (e) stresses that the ICANN Vice President in charge of the Round, Kurt Pritz, whom ICANN chose not to call as a witness in the hearing, stated in a public forum meeting in April 2005 that: “If it was determined that an application met those three baseline criteria, technical, commercial and sponsorship community, they, then, were informed that they would enter into a phase of commercial and technical negotiation with ICANN, the culmination of those negotiations is and was intended to result in the designation of the new top-level domain. At the conclusion of that, we would sign agreements that would be forwarded to the Board for their approval.” (C-88.)

- (f) recalls that Dr. Pritz stated in Luxembourg that ICM was among the “applicants that have been found to satisfy the baseline criteria and they’re presently in negotiation for the designation of registries…” (C-140, p. 28).

- (g) observes that the General Counsel of ICANN, Mr. Jeffery, in an exchange with Ms. Burr acting as counsel of ICM, accepted a draft press release in respect of the June 1, 2005 resolution stating that, “ICANN’s board of directors today determined that the proposal for a new top level domain submitted by ICM Registry meets the criteria established by ICANN.” (C-221.)

- (h) reproduces a Fox News Internet story of June 2, 2005, captioned, “Internet Group OKs New Suffix for Porn Sites,” which cites ICANN spokesman Kieran Baker as saying that adult oriented sites, a $12 billion industry, “could begin buying .xxx addresses as early as fall or winter depending on ICM’s plans.” (C-283.)
- (i) recalls that a member of the Board when the June 1, 2005 resolution was adopted, Joicho Ito, posted on his blog the next day that “the .XXX proposal, in my opinion, has met the criteria set out in the RFP. Our approval of .XXX is a decision based on whether .XXX met the criteria and does not endorse or condone any particular type of content or moral belief.” (Burr Exhibit 35.)

ICM argues that ICANN’s witnesses had no response to the foregoing evidence, other than to say that they could not remember or had not seen it (testimony of Dr. Cerf, Tr. 615:18-21, 660:9-12, 675:3-16; Testimony of Dr. Twomey, 914: 4-11, 915:2-11).

64. Dr. Cerf testified at the hearing that,

“At the point where the question arose whether we should proceed or could proceed to contract negotiation, in the absence of having decided that the sponsorship criteria had been met, the board consulted with counsel [the General Counsel, Mr. Jeffery] and my recollection of this discussion is that we could leave undetermined and undecided the question of sponsorship and could use the discussions with regard to the contract as a means of exposing and understanding more deeply whether the sponsorship criteria had been or could be adequately met...prior to the board vote on the question, should we proceed to contract, this question was raised, and it was my understanding that we were not deciding the question of sponsorship. We were using the contract negotiations as a means of clarifying whether or not...the sponsorship criteria could be or had been met or would be met...” (Tr. 600:6-18, 601: 1-8).

65. ICM however claims that Dr. Cerf's testimony “is flatly contradicted by the numerous contemporaneous statements of ICANN Board members and officials that ICM had, in fact, met the criteria, including Dr. Cerf's own contemporaneous statement to the GAC in Luxembourg...” (Claimant's Post-Hearing Submissions, p. 14.) ICM maintains that there is no contemporary documentary evidence that sustains Dr. Cerf's recollection. Nor did ICANN present Mr. Jeffery as a witness, despite his presence in the hearing room. No mention of reservations about sponsorship is to be found in the June 1, 2005 resolution; it contains no caveats, unlike the resolutions adopted in respect of the applications for .JOBS and .MOBI adopted by the Board in 2004.
66. ICANN further argues, ICM observes, that the June 1, 2005, resolution provides that the contract would be entered into “if” the parties were able to negotiate “commercial and technical terms”; therefore ICM should have known that all other issues also remained open. But, responds ICM, “Complete silence on an issue – when other issues are specifically mentioned – does not create ambiguity on the missing issue. It means that the missing issue is no longer an issue.” (Id., pp. 15-16.)

67. Shortly after adoption of the June 1, 2005 resolution, contract negotiations commenced. As predicted by Mr. Jeffrey in a June 13, 2005, email to Ms. Burr, the negotiations were “quick” and “straightforward”. (C-150.) Agreement on the terms of a registry contract was reached between them by August 1, 2005. That draft registry agreement was posted on the ICANN website on August 9, 2005. The Board was scheduled to discuss it at a meeting to be held on August 16.

68. But then came the intervention of the U.S. Department of Commerce described supra, paragraphs 27 and 29. ICM argues that it is remarkable that the U.S. Government responded in the way it did to a lobbying campaign largely generated by the website of the Family Research Council. “What is even more remarkable is the extent to which ICANN altered its course of conduct with respect to ICM in response to the U.S. government’s intervention.” ICM contends that: “The unilateral intervention by the U.S. government was entirely inappropriate and ICANN knew it. But rather than adhere to the principles of its Articles and Bylaws, ICANN quickly bowed to the U.S. intervention, and, at the same time tried to conceal it.” (Claimant’s Post-Hearing Submission, p. 27.) The charge of concealment relates to Dr. Twomey’s having “suggested” to the Chairman of the GAC that he write to ICANN requesting delay in considering the draft contract with ICM (supra, paragraph 28). Dr. Twomey acknowledged at the hearing that he so suggested but explained that the letter was nothing more than a confirmation of what Board members had heard weeks before from the GAC in Luxembourg. (Tr. 856:8-19, 859:1-12, 861:10-20, and supra, paragraphs 21-25.)

69. ICM invokes the witness statement provided by the chair of the Sponsorship Evaluation Team, Dr. Williams, who, as a fellow Australian, had a close working relationship with Dr. Twomey. She wrote that:

“The June 2005 vote should have marked the completion of the substantive discussions of the .XXX application, especially in light of the Board resolution that approved the .XXX application with no
reservations or caveats. Instead, following the vote, the ICANN
Governmental Advisory Committee ‘woke up’ to the .XXX application,
and ICANN began to feel pressure from a number of governments,
especially from the United States and Australia...An open dispute with
the United States would have been very damaging to ICANN's
credibility, and it was therefore very difficult to resist pressure from
the United States...Dr. Twomey expressed to me his anxiety about the
.XXX registry agreement as a result of this [Gallagher] intervention.
This concern went to the heart of ICANN's legitimacy as a quasi-
independent technical regulatory organization with the power to
establish the process by which new TLDs could be created and put on
the root. If the United States Government disagreed with ICANN's
process or decision at any point and did not enter a TLD accepted by
ICANN to the root, it would call into question ICANN's authority,
competence, and entire reason for existence.” (Witness Statement of
Elizabeth Williams, pp. 26-28.)

70. ICM points out that the Wellington Communique of the GAC (supra,
paragraph 35) referred to “the Board determination that the [ICM] application
had overcome the deficiencies noted in the Evaluation Report.” ICM
maintains that, at ICANN’s staff prompting, ICM responded to all of the
concerns raised in the GAC’s Wellington Communique. Thus, the Third Draft
Registry Agreement of April 18, 2006, included commitments of ICM to
establish policies and procedures to label the sites on the domain, to use
automated tools to detect and prevent child pornography, to maintain
accurate lists of registrants and assist law enforcement agencies to identify
and contact the owners of particular sites, and to ensure the intellectual
property and trademark rights, personal names, country names, names of
historical, cultural and religious significance and names of geographic
 identifiers, drawing on domain name registry best practices (C-171).

71. ICM construes a statement of Dr. Cerf at the hearing as indicating that
the reason, or a reason, why ICM ultimately did not obtain a registry
agreement was that ICM could not provide adequate solutions “to deal with
the problem of pornography on the Net”. It counters that ICM had never
undertaken to “deal with” or solve “the problem of pornography on the Net”.
“The purpose of .XXX was to create an sTLD where responsible adult content
providers would agree, inter alia, to submit to technological tools to help tag
and filter their sites; allow their sites to be ‘crawled’ for indicia of child
pornography (real or virtual); and otherwise adhere to best practices for
responsible members of the industry (including practices to prevent credit
card fraud, spam, misuse of personal data, the sending of unsolicited
promotional email, the ‘capture’ of visitors to their sites, etc.).” (Claimant’s Post-Hearing Submission, p. 42.) However, Dr. Twomey seized on a phrase in the Wellington Communique “in order to impose an impossible burden on ICM.” According to ICM, Dr. Twomey asserted that “the GAC was now insisting that ICM be responsible for ‘enforcing restrictions’ around the world on access to illegal and offensive content.” (Id., pp. 42-43.) But, ICM argues, to the extent that the GAC was requesting ICM to enforce restrictions on illegal and offensive content, ICANN was “not merely acting outside its mission. It was also imposing a requirement on ICM that had never been imposed on any other registrant for any other top level domain, and that, indeed, no registrant could possibly fulfill. .COM, for example, is unquestionably filled with content that is considered ‘illegal and offensive’ in many countries. Some of its content is considered ‘illegal and offensive’ in all countries. Adult content can be found on numerous other TLDs...Dr. Cerf had told the GAC in Luxembourg in July 2005, when he was explaining the Board’s determination that ICM had met the RFP criteria: ‘to the extent that governments do have concerns they relate to the issues across TLDs.’ ICANN has never suggested that the registries for those other TLDs must ‘enforce’ restrictions on access to illegal or offensive content for sites on their TLDs.” (Id., pp. 43-44.)

72. ICM adds that if “the GAC was in fact asking ICANN to impose such an absurd requirement on ICM, then ICANN should have told the GAC that it could not do so.” The GAC is no more than an advisory body supposed to provide “advice” on a “timely” basis. “ICANN is by no means under any obligation to do whatever the GAC tells it to do.” Indeed, ICANN’s Bylaws specifically contemplate that the Board may decide not to follow the GAC’s advice. (Id., p. 44.)

73. ICM invokes the terms of the Bylaws, Section 2(1)(j), which provide that:

“The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies. In the event that the ICANN Board determines to take an action that is not consistent with the Governmental Advisory Committee advice, it shall so inform the Committee and state the reasons why it decided not to follow that advice. The Governmental Advisory Committee and the ICANN Board will then try, in good faith and in a timely and efficient manner, to find a mutually acceptable solution. If no such solution can be found, the ICANN Board will state
in its final decision the reasons why the Governmental Advisory
Committee's advice was not followed, and such statement will be
without prejudice to the rights or obligations of Governmental Advisory
Committee members with regard to public policy issues falling within
their responsibilities.” (C-5, and supra, paragraph 9.)

74. ICM further argues however that Dr. Twomey's reading of the Wellington
Communique was not a reasonable one. The Wellington Communique recalls
that “ICM promised a range of public interest benefits as part of its bid to
operate the .xxx domain...The public policy aspects identified by members of
the GAC include the degree to which .xxx application would: Take
appropriate measures to restrict access to illegal and offensive content...”
(Id. p. 45; C-181). As promised in its application, ICM in fact proposed
numerous measures to restrict access to illegal and offensive content. But
nowhere did the GAC state that ICM should be responsible for “enforcing” the
restrictions of countries on access to illegal and offensive content. ICM
argues that the very fact that the GAC wanted ICM to “maintain accurate
details of registrants and assist law enforcement agencies to identify and
contact the owners of particular websites” (C-181, p. 3) demonstrates that
the GAC did not expect ICM to enforce various national restrictions on
access to illegal and offensive content.

75. The numerous measures that ICM set out in its revised draft registry
agreement in consultation with the staff of ICANN did not constitute an
agreement or “representation to enforce the laws of the world on
pornography” (testimony of Ms. Burr, Tr. 1044: 8-9). Actually the activation of
an .XXX TLD would make it far easier for governments to restrict access to
content that they deemed illegal or offensive. Indeed, as Dr. Cerf told the
GAC in Luxembourg in July 2005 in defending ICANN’s agreeing to enter into
contract negotiations with ICM, “The TLD system is neutral, although
filtering systems could be solutions promoted by governments.” (C-139, p. 5.)
“In other words,” ICM argues, “the appropriate place for restricting access to
content deemed illegal or offensive by any particular country is within that
particular country. ICM offered far more tools for countries to effectuate
such restrictions than have ever existed before. Thus, ICM provided
‘appropriate measures to restrict access to illegal and offensive content.’"
(Claimant’s Post-Hearing Submission, p. 47.)

76. ICM alleges that, “Nonetheless, on 10 May 2006, the ICANN Board
proceeded to reject ICM’s registry agreement because, in Dr. Twomey’s
words, ICM had not demonstrated how it would ‘ensure enforcement of these
contractual terms’ as they relate to various countries’ individual laws
‘concerning pornographic content’ [citing C-189, p.6]. In other words, ICM’s draft registry agreement was rejected on the basis of its inability to comply with a contractual undertaking to which it had never agreed in the first place.” (Id., p. 48.)

77. At that same meeting of the Board, Dr. Twomey drew attention to a letter of May 4, 2006 from Martin Boyle, UK Representative to the GAC, which read as follows:

“The discussions held by the Governmental Advisory Committee in Wellington in March have highlighted some of the key concerns, and strong opposition by some administrations, to the application for a new top-level domain for pornographic content, dot.xxx. I thought that it would be helpful to follow up those discussions by submitting directly to the ICANN Board the views of the UK Government. In preparing these views, we have consulted a number of stakeholders in the UK, including Internet safety groups...

“Having examined the proposal in detail, and recognizing ICANN’s authority to grant such domain names, the UK expresses its firm view that if the dot .xxx domain name is to be authorized, it would be important that ICANN ensures that the benefits and safeguards proposed by the registry, ICM, including the monitoring of all dot.xxx content and rating of content on all servers pointed to by .xxx, are genuinely achieved from day one. Furthermore, it will be important to the integrity of ICANN’s position as final approving authority for the dot.xxx domain name, to be seen as able to intervene promptly and effectively if for any reason failure on the part of ICM in any of these fundamental safeguards becomes apparent. It would also in our view be essential that ICM liase with the relevant bodies in charge of policing illegal Internet content at national level, such as the Internet Watch Foundation (IWF) in the UK, so as to ensure the effectiveness of the solutions it proposes to avoid the further propagation of illegal content. Specifically, ICM should undertake to monitor all dot.xxx content as it proposed and cooperate closely with IWF and equivalent agencies.

“This is an important decision that the ICANN Board has to take and whatever you decide will probably attract criticism from one quarter or another. This makes it all the more important that in making a decision, you reach a clear view on the extent to which the benefits which ICM claim are likely to be sustainable and reliable.” (C-182.)
78. Dr. Twomey said this about Mr. Boyle’s position:

“...the contractual terms put forward by ICM to meet the sorts of public-policy concerns raised by the Governmental Advisory Committee in my view are very difficult to implement, and I retain concerns about their ability to actually be implemented in an international environment where the important phrase, ‘all applicable law’, would raise a very wide and variable test for enforcement and compliance. And I can’t see how that will actually be achieved under the contract. The letter from the UK is an indication of the expectations of the international governmental community to ensure enforcement of these contractual terms as they individually interpret them against their own law concerning pornographic content. This will put ICANN in an untenable position.” (C-189, p. 6.)

79. ICM contends that “it is impossible to reconcile the points made in Mr. Boyle’s letter – i.e., that ICANN should ensure that ICM delivered from “day one” on the ‘benefits and safeguards’ promised in its contract, and that ICM should liaise with the IWF – as a requirement ‘to ensure enforcement of the contractual terms as they each individually interpret them against their own law concerning pornographic content’. And even if Mr. Boyle had been making such a demand, it would have been entirely outside ICANN’s mandate to impose it on ICM, and would have imposed a requirement on ICM that it has never imposed on any other registry.” (Claimant’s Post-Hearing Submission, p. 50.)

80. ICM however acknowledges that other members of the Board shared Dr. Twomey’s analysis. It concludes that:

“...the ICANN Board was now imposing a requirement that was outside the mission of ICANN; that had never been imposed on any other registry; and that – had it been included in the RFP – would have kept any applicant from applying for an sTLD dealing with adult content.” (Id., p. 51.)

81. ICM observes that, following the ICANN Board’s rejection of the ICM registry agreement on May 10, 2006, and then its renewed consideration of it after ICM withdrew its request for reconsideration (supra, paragraph 39), ICM responded to further requests of ICANN staff. It agreed to conclude a contract with what is now known as the Family Online Safety Institute (“FOSI”) specifying that FOSI was “to use an automated tool to scan” the .XXX domain and develop other ways to monitor ICM’s compliance with its
commitments. ICM notes that, throughout the entire negotiation process, the ICANN staff never asked ICM to change the definition of the sponsored community, which remained the same though each of the five renderings of the draft registry agreement.

82. At the Board's meeting of February 12, 2007, the question of the solidity of ICM's sponsorship was re-opened – in ICM's view, inappropriately --- as described above (supra, paragraphs 41-45 and C-199). ICM argues that the data that it responsively submitted to the ICANN Board in March 2007 demonstrated that its application met the RFP standard of "broad-based support from the community". 76,723 adult website names had been pre-reserved in .XXX since June 1, 2005; 1,217 adult webmasters from over 70 countries had registered on the ICM Registry website, saying that they supported .XXX. But, ICM observes, none of the Board members voting against acceptance of ICM's application at the dispositive meeting of March 30, 2007, mentioned the extensive evidence provided by ICM in support of sponsorship.

83. For the reasons set forth above in paragraphs 63-82, ICM contends that the Board's rejection of its application was not consistent with ICANN's Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. As regards the five specific reasons for rejection set forth in the Board's resolution of March 30, 2007 (supra, paragraph 47), ICM makes the following allegations of inconsistency.

84. Reason 1: ICM's application and revised agreement fail to meet the sponsored community criteria of the RFP specification. ICM responds that the Board concluded by its resolution of June 1, 2005, that ICM had met the RFP's sponsorship criteria; and that the Board's abandonment of the two-step process and its reopening of sponsorship at the eleventh hour, and only in respect of ICM's application, violated ICANN's Articles and Bylaws. The manner in which it then "reapplied" the sponsorship criteria to ICM was "incoherent, discriminatory and pretextual". (Claimant's Post-Hearing Submission, pp. 61-62.) There was no evidence before the Board that ICM's support in the community was eroding. No other applicant was held to a similar standard of demonstrating community support. ICM produced sufficient evidence of what was required by the RFP: "broad-based support from the community".

85. ICANN also complained that ICM's community definition was self-identifying but that was true of numerous sTLDs; as Dr. Twomey acknowledged in a letter of May 6, 2006, "(m)embers of both .TEL and .MOBI communities are self-identified". Both sTLDs are now in the root.
86. ICANN further complained that the sponsored community as defined by ICM was not sufficiently differentiated from other adult entertainment providers. But, besides the fact that ICM had set forth numerous criteria by which members of its community would differentiate themselves from others providers of the adult community, this too could be said to apply to other TLDs. Thus .TRAVEL, much like .XXX, is designed to provide an sTLD for certain members of the industry that wish to follow the rules of a particular charter.

87. ICANN further complained that .XXX would merely duplicate content found elsewhere on the Internet. But again, the same was true for virtually all of the other sTLDs.

88. In sum “ICANN’s reopening of the sponsorship criteria – which it did only for ICM – was unfair, discriminatory and pretextual, and a departure from transparent, fair and well documented policies...not done neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness...[it] singled out ICM for disparate treatment, without substantial and reasonable cause.” (Id., p. 65.)

89. Reason 2: based on the extensive comment and from the GAC’s Communiques, ICM’s agreement raises public policy issues. ICANN never precisely identified the “public policy” issues raised nor does it explain why they warrant rejection of the application. But, ICM argues, Reasons 2-5 all arise from the same flawed interpretation of the Wellington Communique and other governmental comments, namely, that ICM was to be responsible for enforcing the world’s various and different laws and standards concerning pornography. That interpretation “was sufficiently absurd as to have been made in bad faith”; in any event it holds ICM to an “impossible standard”, and is one never imposed on any other registrant and that no registrant could possibly perform. It led to further flawed conclusions, viz., that if ICM could not meet its responsibility (and no one could) then ICANN would have to take it over, and, if it did so, ICANN would be taking on an oversight role regarding Internet content, which was beyond its technical mandate. ICANN’s imposition of this impossible requirement on ICM alone was discriminatory. It rejected ICM’s application on grounds that were not applied neutrally and objectively, which were suggestive of a “pretextual basis to ‘cover’ the real reason for rejecting .XXX, i.e., that the U.S. government and several other powerful governments objected to its proposed content.” (Id., pp. 66-67.)

90. Reason 3: the ICM application and revised agreement do not resolve GAC’s issues, its concern for offensive content and protection of the vulnerable; the Board finds that these public policy concerns cannot be
credibly resolved with the mechanisms proposed by the applicant. ICM responds that this is merely an elaboration of Reason 2. ICM’s proposed agreement contained detailed provisions to address child pornography issues and detailed mechanisms that would permit the identification and filtration of content deemed to be illegal or offensive.

91. Reason 4: the ICM application raises significant law enforcement compliance issues because of countries’ varying laws relating to content and practices that define the nature of the application, therefore obligating ICANN to acquire a responsibility related to content and conduct. ICM responds that this builds on the fallacy of Reasons 2 and 3: according to the Board’s apparent reasoning, the GAC was requiring ICM to enforce local restrictions on access to illegal and offensive content and if proved unable to do so, ICANN would have to do so. ICM responds that ICANN could not properly require ICM to undertake such enforcement obligations, whether or not the GAC actually so requested. Given that it would have been discriminatory and unfeasible to require ICM to enforce varying national laws regarding adult content, ICANN would not have been obligated to take over that responsibility if ICANN were unable to fulfill it.

92. Reason 5: there are credible scenarios in which ICANN would be forced to assume an ongoing management and oversight role regarding Internet content, inconsistent with its technical mandate. ICM responds that this largely restates Reason 4. ICANN interpreted the GAC’s advice to require ICM to be responsible for regulating content on the Internet – a task plainly outside ICANN’s mandate. ICANN then criticized ICM for taking on that task and complained that it would have to undertake the task if ICM were unable to fulfill it. But ICANN could not properly require ICM to regulate content on the Internet and ICM did not undertake to do so.

93. The above exposition of the contentions of ICM, while long, does not exhaust the full range of its arguments, which were developed at length and in detail in its Memorial and in oral argument. It does not, for example, fully set out its contentions on the effect of international law and the local law on these proceedings. The essence of that argument is that ICANN is bound to act in good faith, an argument that the Panel does not find it necessary to expound since the conclusion is not open to challenge and is not challenged by counsel for ICANN. ICANN does not accept ICM’s reliance on principles of international law but it agrees that the principle of good faith is found in the corporate law of California and hence is applicable in the instant dispute.
94. The “Relief Requested” by ICM Registry consists, inter alia, of requesting that the Panel declare that its Declaration is binding upon ICM and ICANN; and that ICANN acted inconsistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws by:

   “i. Failing to conduct negotiations in good faith and to conclude an agreement with ICM to serve as registry operator for the .XXX sTLD;

   “ii. Rejecting ICM’s proposed agreement to serve as registry operator...

   “iii. Rejecting ICM’s application on 30 March 2007, after having previously concluded that it met the RFP criteria on 1 June 2005;

   “iv. Rejecting ICM’s application on 30 March 2007 on the basis of the five grounds set forth...none of which were based on criteria set forth in the RFP criteria...

   “v. Rejecting ICM’s application after ICANN had approved ICM to proceed to contract negotiations...” (Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, pp. 265-267.)

The Contentions of ICANN

95. ICANN maintains that (a) the Independent Review Process is advisory, not arbitral; (b) the judgments of the ICANN Board are to be deferentially appraised; (c) the governing law is that of the State of California, not the principles of international law; and (d) in its treatment and disposition of the application of ICM Registry, ICANN acted consistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws.

The Nature of the Independent Review Process

96. ICANN invokes the provisions of the Bylaws that govern the IRP process, entitled, “Independent Review of Board Actions”. Article IV, Section 3, provides that:

   “1. ...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 of 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.

“3. Requests for such independent review shall be referred to an Independent Review Panel (“IRP”) 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 and Bylaws.

“4. The IRP shall be operated by an international arbitration provider appointed from time to time by ICANN (“the IRP Provider”) using arbitrators ...nominated by that provider.

“5. Subject to the approval of the Board, the IRP Provider shall establish operating rules and procedures, which shall implement and be consistent with this Section 3.

...

“8. The IRP shall have the authority to:

...

b. declare whether an action or inaction of the Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws; and

c. 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.

...

“12. Declarations of the IRP shall be in writing. The IRP 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 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.
“13. The IRP operating procedures, and all petitions, claims and declarations, shall be posted on the Website when they become available.

... 

“15. Where feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP declaration at the Board’s next meeting.” (C-5.)

97. ICANN contends that the foregoing terms make it clear that the IRP’s declarations are advisory and not binding. The IRP provisions commit the Board to review and consideration of declarations of the Panel. The Bylaws direct the Board to “consider” the declaration. “The direction to ‘consider’ the Panel’s declaration necessarily means that the Board has discretion whether and how to implement it; if the declaration were binding such as with a court judgment or binding arbitration ruling, there would be nothing to consider, only an order to implement.” (ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, p. 32.) ICANN’s Board is specifically directed to “review” the Panel’s declarations, not to implement them. Moreover, the Board is “not even required to review or consider the declaration immediately, or at any particular time,” but is encouraged to do so at the next Board meeting, where “feasible”, reinforcing the fact that the Board’s review and consideration of the Panel’s declaration does not require its acceptance. The Panel may “recommend”, but not require, interim action. If final Panel declarations were binding, it would make no sense for interim remedies to be merely recommended to the Board. (Id., p. 33.)

98. ICANN maintains that the preparatory work of the Bylaws demonstrates that the Independent Review Process was designed to be advisory. The Draft Principles for Independent Review state that the IRP’s authority would be persuasive, “rest[ing] on its independence, on the prestige and professional standing of its members, and on the persuasiveness of its reasoned opinions”. But “the ICANN Board should retain ultimate authority over ICANN’s affairs – after all, it is the Board...that will be chosen by (and is directly accountable to) the membership and supporting organizations”. (Id., p. 34.) The primary pertinent document, “ICANN: A Blueprint for Reform,” calls for the creation of “a process to require non-binding arbitration by an international arbitration body to review any allegation that the Board has acted in conflict with ICANN’s Bylaws”. ICM Registry’s counsel in its negotiations with ICANN for a top-level domain, Ms. Burr, who as a senior official of the U.S. Department of Commerce was the principal official figure immediately involved in the creation and launching of ICANN, in addressing
the independent review process, observed that “decisions will be nonbinding, because the Board will retain final decision-making authority”. (Ibid., p. 36.) In accepting recommendations for an independent review process that expressly disclaimed creation of a “Supreme Court” for ICANN, the Board changed the reference to “decisions” of the IRP to “declarations” precisely to avoid any inference that IRP determinations are binding decisions akin to those of a judicial or arbitral tribunal. (Ibid., p. 38.)

99. ICANN further points out that, while the IRP Provider selected by it is the American Arbitration Association’s International Centre for Dispute Resolution, and while its Rules apply to IRP proceedings, those Rules in their application to IRP were amended to omit provision for the binding effect of an award.

The Standard of Review is Deferential

100. ICANN contends that the actions of the ICANN Board are entitled to substantial deference from this Panel. It maintains that that conclusion follows from the terms of Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws that set out the core values of ICANN (supra, paragraph 5). Article 1, Section 2 of the Bylaws provides that, “In performing its mission, the following core values should guide the decisions and actions of ICANN”; and the core values referred to in paragraph 5 of this Declaration are then spelled out. Section 2 concludes:

“Our 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.” (C-5.)

101. ICANN argues that since, pursuant to the foregoing provision, the ICANN Board “shall exercise its judgment” in the application of competing core values, and since those core values embrace the neutral, objective and fair decision-making at issue in these proceedings, “the deference expressly
accorded to the Board in implementing the core values applies...” ICANN continues:

“Thus, by its terms, the Bylaws’ conferral of discretionary authority makes clear that any reasonable decision of the ICANN Board is, ipso facto, not inconsistent with the Bylaws and consequently must be upheld. Indeed, the Bylaws even go so far as to provide that outright departure from a core value is permissible in the judgment of the Board, so long as the Board reasonably ‘exercise[s] its judgment’ in determining that other relevant principles outweighed that value in the particular circumstances at hand.”

While in the instant case, in ICANN’s view, there was not even an arguable departure from the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws, “...because such substantial deference is in fact due, there is no basis whatsoever for a declaration in ICM’s favor because the Board’s decisions in this matter were, at a minimum, clearly justified and within the range of reasonable conduct.” (ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, pp. 45-47.)

102. ICANN further argues that the Bylaws governing the independent review process sustain this conclusion. Article 4, Section 3, “strictly limits the scope of independent review proceedings to the narrow question of whether ICANN acted in a manner ‘inconsistent with’ the Articles of Incorporation and the Bylaws. In confining the inquiry into whether ICANN’s conduct was inconsistent with its governing documents, the presumption is one of consistency so that inconsistency must be established, rather than the reverse...independent review is not to be used as a mechanism to upset arguable or reasonable actions of the Board.” (Ibid., p. 48.)

103. ICANN contends, moreover, that,

“Basic principles of corporate law supply an independent basis for the deference due to the reasonable judgments of the ICANN Board in this matter. It is black-letter law that ‘there is a presumption that directors of a corporation have acted in good faith and to the best interest of the corporation’...In California...these principles require deference to actions of a corporate board of directors so long as the board acted ‘upon reasonable investigation, in good faith and with regard for the best interests’ of the corporation and ‘exercised discretion within the scope of its authority’”. This includes the boards of not-for-profit corporations.” (Ibid., pp. 49-50.)
The Applicable Law of This Proceeding

104. ICANN contests ICM’s invocation of principles of international law, in particular the principle of good faith, and allied principles, estoppel, legitimate expectations and abuse of right. It notes that ICM’s invocation of international law depends upon a two-step argument: first, ICM interprets Article 4 of the Articles of Incorporation, providing that ICANN will operate for the benefit of the Internet community “in conformity with relevant principles of international law”, as a “choice-of-law” provision; second, ICM infers that “any violation of any principles of international law” constitutes a violation of Article 4 (thus allegedly falling within the Panel’s jurisdiction to evaluate the consistency of ICANN’s actions with its Articles and Bylaws).

105. ICANN contends that that two-step argument contravenes the plain language of the governing provisions as well as their drafting history. Article 4 of the Articles does not operate as a “choice-of-law” provision for the IRP processes prescribed in the Bylaws. Rather the provisions of the Bylaws and Articles, as construed in the light of the law of California, govern the claims before the Panel. Nor are the particular principles of international law invoked by ICM relevant to the circumstances at issue in these proceedings.

106. Article 4 is quoted in full in paragraph 3 of this Declaration. The specific activities that ICANN must carry out “in conformity with the relevant principles of international law and applicable international conventions and local law” are specified in Article 3 (supra, paragraph 2). Thus “relevant” in Article 4 means only principles of international law relevant to the activities specified in Article 3. “ICANN did not adopt principles of international law indiscriminately, but rather to ensure consistency between its policies developed for the world-wide Internet community and well-established substantive international law on matters relevant to various stakeholders in the global Internet community, such as general principles on trademark law and freedom of expression relevant to intellectual property constituencies and governments.” (ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, pp. 59-60.) The principles of international law relied upon by ICM in this proceeding – the requirement of good faith and related doctrines – are principles of general applicability, and are not specially directed to concerns relating to the Internet, such as freedom of expression or trademark law. Therefore, ICANN argues, they are not “relevant”. (Ibid.) Article 4 does not operate as a choice-of-law provision requiring ICANN to adapt its conduct to any and all principles of international law. It is not worded as choice-of-law clauses are. As ICANN’s expert, Professor David D. Caron notes, it is unlikely that a choice-of-law clause would designate three sources of law on the
same level. It is the law of California, the place of ICANN's incorporation, that – by reason of ICANN's incorporation under the law of California – governs how ICANN runs its business and interacts with another U.S. corporation regarding a contract to be performed within the United States. The IRP provisions of the Bylaws, drafted years after the Articles of Incorporation, and their drafting history, do not even mention Article 4 of the Articles.

107. Moreover, the specification of “relevant” principles of international law in Article 4 “must mean principles of international law that apply to a private entity such as ICANN” (id., p. 66.) As a private party, ICANN is not subject to law governing sovereigns. International legal principles do not apply to a dispute between private entities located in the same nation because the dispute may have global effects.

108. Furthermore, ICM’s cited general principles perform no clarifying role in this proceeding. The applicable rules set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws and Articles as well as California law render resort to general principles unnecessary. In any event, California law and the Bylaws and Articles themselves provide sufficient guidance for the Panel's analysis.

ICANN Acted Consistently with its Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws

109. ICANN contends that each of ICM’s key factual assertions is wrong. In view of the deference that should be accorded to the judgments of the ICANN Board, the Panel should declare that ICANN’s conduct was not inconsistent with its Bylaws and Articles even if ICM’s treatment of the facts were largely correct (as it is not). The issues presented to the ICANN Board by ICM’s .XXX sTLD application were “difficult”, ICANN’s Board addressed them with “great care”, and devoted “an enormous amount of time trying to determine the right course of action”. ICANN was fully heard; the Board deliberated openly and transparently. ICANN is unaware of a corporate deliberative process more open and transparent than its own. After this intensive process, the Board twice concluded that ICM’s proposal should be rejected, “with no hint whatsoever of the ‘bad faith’ ICM alleges.” (ICANN’s Response to Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, pp. 79-80.)

110. ICM’s claims “begin with the notion that ICANN adopted, and was bound by, an inflexible, two-step procedure for evaluating sTLD applications. First, according to ICM, applications would be reviewed by the Evaluation Panel for the baseline selection criteria. Second, only after applications were finally and irrevocably approved by the ICANN Board would the applications
proceed to contract negotiations with ICANN staff with no ability by the Board to address any of the issues that the Board had previously raised in conjunction with the sTLD application.” But the RFP refutes this contention. It does not suggest that the Board’s “allowance for an application to proceed to contract negotiations confirms the close of the evaluation process.” ICANN recalls the public statement of Mr. Pritz in Kuala Lumpur in 2004: “Upon completion of the technical and commercial negotiations, successful applicants will be presented to the ICANN Board with all the associated information, so the Board can independently review the findings along with the information and make their own adjustments. And then final decisions will be made by the Board, and they’ll authorize staff to complete or execute the agreements with the sponsoring organizations...” (Ibid., pp. 81-82.) It observes that Dr. Cerf affirmed that: “ICANN never intended that this would be a formal, ‘two-step’ process, where proceeding to contract negotiations automatically constituted a de facto final and irrevocable approval with respect to the baseline selection criteria, including sponsorship.” (At p. 82, quoting V. Cerf Witness Statement, para. 15.) ICANN maintains that there were “two overlapping phases in the evaluation of the sTLDs” and the Board always retained the right “to vote against a proposed sTLD should the Board find deficiencies in the proposed registry agreement or in the sTLD proposal as a whole”. (P. 83.) There was a two-stage process but the two phases could and often did overlap in time. This is confirmed not only by Dr. Cerf but by Dr. Twomey and the then Vice-Chairman of the Board, Alejandro Pisanty. Each explains that the ICANN Board retained the authority to review and assess the baseline RFP selection criteria even after an applicant was allowed to proceed to contract negotiations. After the June 1, 2005, vote, members supporting ICM’s application did not argue that the Board had already approved the .XXX sTLD. The following exchange with Dr. Cerf took place in the course of the hearing:

“Q. Now, ICM’s position in this proceeding is that if the board voted to proceed to contract negotiations, the board was at that time making a finding that a particular applicant had satisfied the technical, financial and sponsorship criteria and that that issue was closed. Is that consistent with your understanding of how the process worked?

“A. Not, it's not. The matter was discussed very explicitly during our consideration of the ICM proposal. We were using the contract negotiations as a means of clarifying whether or not...the sponsorship criteria could be or had been met...this was not a decision that all three of the criteria had been met.” (Tr. 601:4:13.)
111. ICM’s evidence is not to the contrary. That evidence shows that there were two major steps in the evaluation process. It does not show that those steps could not be overlapping. The relevant question, not answered by ICM, is whether ICANN’s Bylaws required these steps to be non-overlapping. “such that contract negotiations could not commence until the satisfaction of the RFP criteria was finally and irrevocably determined…” (Ibid., p. 84.)

112. ICM’s claims are also based on the argument that, by its terms, the Board’s resolutions of June 1, 2005 gave “unconditional” approval of the .XXX sTLD application. (The June 1, 2005 resolutions are set out supra, paragraph 19.) But nothing in the resolutions actually says that ICM’s application satisfied the RFP criteria, including sponsorship. In fact, nothing in the resolutions expresses approval at all because it provides that “if”, after entering negotiations, the applicant is able to negotiate commercial and technical terms for a contractual arrangement, those terms shall be presented to the Board for approval and authorization to enter into an agreement relating to the delegation of the sTLD. “The plain language of the resolutions makes clear that they did not themselves constitute approval of the .XXX sTLD application. The resolutions thus track the RFP, which makes clear that a ‘final decision will be made by the Board’ only after‘completion of the technical and commercial negotiations”’. (Ibid., p. 86.)

113. ICANN maintains that as of June 2005, there remained numerous unanswered questions and concerns regarding ICM’s ability to satisfy the baseline sponsorship criteria set forth in the RFP. An important purpose of the June 1 resolutions was to permit ICM to proceed to contract negotiations in an effort to determine whether ICM’s sponsorship shortcomings could be resolved in the contract.

114. The ICANN Board also permitted other applicants for sTLDs -- .JOBS and .MOBI – to proceed to contract negotiations despite open questions relating to the initial RFP criteria. However, ICM was unique among the field of sTLD applicants due to “the extremely controversial nature of the proposed sTLD, and concerns as to whether ICM had identified a ‘community’ that existed and actually supported the proposed sTLD...there was a significant negative response to ICM’s proposed .XXX sTLD by many adult entertainment providers, the very individuals and entities who logically would be in ICM's proposed community.” (Ibid., p. 87.)

115. ICM’s position is further refuted by continued discussion by the Board of sponsorship criteria at meetings subsequent to June 1, 2005. The fact that most Board members expressed concern about sponsorship
shortcomings after the June 1, 2005, resolutions negates any notion that the Board had conclusively determined the sponsorship issue.

116. A member of the Board elected after the June 1, 2005, vote, Rita Rodin, expressed “some concerns about whether the [ICM] proposal met the criteria set forth in the RFP...” She said that she did not want to re-open issues if they had already been decided by the Board (supra, paragraphs 42-43). In response to her query, no one stated that the sponsorship issue had already been decided by the Board. (ICANN’S Response to Claimant’s Memorial on the Merits, p. 90.)

117. ICANN also draws attention to Dr. Twomey’s letter of May 4, 2006 (supra, paragraph 37) in which he wrote that the Board’s decision of June 1, 2005, was without prejudice to the Board’s right to decide whether the contract reached with ICM meets all the criteria before the Board.

118. ICANN recalls that within days of the posting of the June 1, 2005, resolutions, GAC Chairman Tarmizi wrote Dr. Cerf expressing the GAC’s “diverse and wide-ranging concerns” with the .XXX sTLD. The ICANN Board was required by the ICANN Bylaws to take account of the views of the GAC. Nor could ICANN have ignored concerns expressed by the U.S. Government and other governments. ICANN recalls the concerns expressed thereafter, in the Wellington Communique and otherwise. It observes that “some countries were concerned that, because the .XXX application would not require all pornography to be located within the .XXX domain, a new .XXX sTLD would simply result in the expansion of the number of domain names that involved pornography.” (Ibid., p. 102.)

119. ICANN points out that:

“In revising its proposed registry agreement to address the GAC’s concerns...ICM took the position that it would install ‘appropriate measures to restrict access to illegal and offensive content,’ including monitoring such content globally. This was immediately controversial among many ICANN Board members because complaints about ICM’s ‘monitoring’ would inevitably be sent to ICANN, which is neither equipped nor authorized to monitor (much less resolve) ‘content-based’ objections to Internet sites.” (Ibid., pp. 103-104.)

120. ICANN recalls Board concerns that were canvassed at its meetings of May 10, 2006, (supra, paragraph 38) and February 12, 2007, (supra, paragraphs 41-45). Board members increasingly were concluding that the results promised by ICM were unachievable. Whether their conclusions were
or were not incorrect is “irrelevant for purposes of determining whether the Board violated its Bylaws or Articles in rejecting ICM’s application.” (Ibid., p. 105.) Board doubts were accentuated by growing opposition to the .XXX sTLD from elements of the online adult entertainment industry (ibid.).

121. The Board’s May 10, 2006 vote (supra, paragraph 38) rejected ICM’s then current draft, but provided ICM “yet another opportunity to attempt to revise the agreement to conform to the RFP specifications. Notably, the Board’s decision to allow ICM to continue to work the problem is directly at odds with ICM’s position that the Board decided ‘for political reasons’ to reject ICM’s application; if so, it would have been much easier for the Board to reject ICM’s application in its entirety in 2006.” (Ibid., p. 106.)

122. At its meeting of February 12, 2007, (supra, paragraphs 41-45), concerns in the Board about whether ICM’s application enjoyed the support of the community it purported to represent were amplified.

123. At the meeting of March 30, 2007 at which ICM’s application and agreement were definitively rejected, the majority was, first, concerned by ICM’s definition of its community to include only those members of the industry who supported the creation of .XXX sTLD and its exclusion from the sponsored community of all online adult entertainment industry members who opposed ICM’s application.

“Such self-selection and extreme subjectivity regarding what constituted the content that defined the .XXX community made it nearly impossible to determine which persons or services would be in or out of the community...without a precisely defined Sponsored TLD Community, the Board could not approve ICM’s sTLD application.” (Ibid., pp. 108-109.)

124. Second, ICM’s proposed community was not adequately differentiated; ICM failed to demonstrate that excluded providers had separate needs or interests from the community it sought to represent. As contract negotiations progressed, it became increasingly evident that ICM was actually proposing an unsponsored TLD for adult entertainment, “a uTLD, disguised as an sTLD, just as ICM had proposed in 2000.” (Ibid., p. 209.)

125. Third, whatever community support ICM may have had at one time, it had “fallen apart by early 2007” (ibid.). During the final public comment period in 2007, “a vast majority of the comments posted to the public forum and sent to ICANN staff opposed ICM’s .XXX sTLD...” (p. 110). “Broad-based support” was lacking. (P. 111.) 75,000 pre-registrations for .XXX... “Out of 58
the over 4.2 million adult content websites in operation” hardly represents broad-based support. (P. 115.)

126. Fourth, ICM could not demonstrate that it was adding new and valuable space to the Internet name space, as required by the RFP. “In fact, the existence of industry opposition to the .XXX sTLD demonstrated that the needs of online adult entertainment industry members were met via existing TLDs without any need for a new TLD.” (P. 112.)

127. Fifth and finally, ICM and its supporting organization, IFFOR, proposed to “proactively reach out to governments and international organizations to provide information about IFFOR’s activities and solicit input and participation”. But such measures “diluted the possibility that their policies would be ‘primarily in the interests of the Sponsored TLD Community’ as required by the sponsorship selection criteria.” (Pp. 112-113.)

128. ICANN concludes that, “despite the good-faith efforts of both ICANN and ICM over a lengthy period of time, the majority of the Board determined that ICM could not satisfy, among other things, the sponsorship requirements of the RFP.” Reasonable people might disagree – as did a minority of the Board – “but that disagreement does not even approach a violation of a Bylaw or Article of Incorporation.” (P. 113.)

129. The treatment of ICM’s application was procedurally fair. It was not the object of discrimination. Applications for .JOBS and .MOBI were also allowed to proceed to contractual negotiations despite open questions relating to selection criteria. ICANN applied documented policies neutrally and objectively, with integrity and fairness. ICM was provided with every opportunity to address the concerns of the Board and the GAC. ICANN did not reject ICM’s application only for reasons of public policy (although they were important). ICM’s application was rejected because of its inability to show how the sTLD would meet sponsorship criteria. The Board ultimately rejected ICM’s application for “many of the same sponsorship concerns noted in the initial recommendation of the Evaluation Panel.” (Ibid., p. 124.) It also rejected the application because ICM’s proposed registry agreement “would have required ICANN to manage the content of the .XXX sTLD” (p. 126). The Board took into account the views of the GAC in arriving at its independent judgment. “Had the ICANN Board taken the view that the GAC’s views must in every case be followed without independent judgment, the Board presumably would have rejected ICM’s application in late 2005 or early 2006, rather than waiting another full year for the parties to try to identify a resolution that would have allowed the sTLD to proceed.” (Ibid.)
130. As to whether ICM was treated unfairly and was the object of discrimination, ICANN relies on the following statement of Dr. Cerf at the hearing:

“...I am surprised at an assertion that ICM was treated unfairly...the board could have simply accepted the recommendations of the evaluation teams and rejected the proposal at the outset...the board went out of its way to try to work with ICM through the staff to achieve a satisfactory agreement. We spent more time on this particular proposal than any other...We repeatedly defended our continued consideration of this proposal...If...ICM believes that it was treated in a singular way, I would agree that we spent more time and effort on this than any other proposal that came to the board with regard to sponsored TLDs.” (Tr. 654:3-655:7.)

PART FOUR: THE ANALYSIS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL

The Nature of the Independent Review Panel Process

131. ICM and ICANN differ on the question of whether the Declaration to be issued by the Independent Review Panel is binding upon the parties or advisory. The conflicting considerations advanced by them are summarized above at paragraphs 51 and 91-94. In the light of them, the Panel acknowledges that there is a measure of ambiguity in the pertinent provisions of the Bylaws and in their preparatory work.

132. ICANN’s officers testified before committees of the U.S. Congress that ICANN had installed provision for appeal to “independent arbitration” (supra, paragraph 55). Article IV, Section 3 of ICANN’s Bylaws specifies that, “The IRP shall be operated by an international arbitration provider appointed from time to time by ICANN...using arbitrators...nominated by that provider”. The provider so chosen is the American Arbitration Association’s International Centre for Dispute Resolution (“ICDR”), whose Rules (at C-11) in Article 27 provide for the making of arbitral awards which “shall be final and binding on the parties. The parties undertake to carry out any such award without delay.” The Rules of the ICDR “govern the arbitration” (Article 1). It is unquestioned that the term, “arbitration” imports production of a binding award (in contrast to conciliation and mediation). Federal and California courts have so held. The Supplementary Procedures adopted to supplement the independent review procedures set forth in ICANN’s Bylaws provide that the ICDR’s “International Arbitration Rules...will govern the process in combination with these Supplementary Procedures”. (C-12.) They specify
that the Independent Review Panel refers to the neutrals “appointed to
decide the issue(s) presented” and further specify that, “DECLARATION
refers to the decisions/opinions of the IRP”. “The DECLARATION
shall specifically designate the prevailing party.” All of these elements are
suggestive of an arbitral process that produces a binding award.

133. But there are other indicia that cut the other way, and more deeply.
The authority of the IRP is “to declare whether an action or inaction of the
Board was inconsistent with the Articles of Incorporation or Bylaws” – to
“declare”, not to “decide” or to “determine”. Section 3(8) of the Bylaws
continues that the IRP shall have the authority to “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”. The
IRP cannot “order” interim measures but do no more than “recommend”
them, and this until the Board “reviews” and “acts upon the opinion” of the
IRP. A board charged with reviewing an opinion is not charged with
implementing a binding decision. Moreover, Section 3(15) provides that,
“Where feasible, the Board shall consider the IRP declaration at the Board’s
next meeting.” This relaxed temporal proviso to do no more than “consider”
the IRP declaration, and to do so at the next meeting of the Board “where
feasible”, emphasizes that it is not binding. If the IRP’s Declaration were
binding, there would be nothing to consider but rather a determination or
decision to implement in a timely manner. The Supplementary Procedures
adopted for IRP, in the article on “Form and Effect of an IRP Declaration”,
significantly omit the provision of Article 27 of the ICDR Rules specifying that
award “shall be final and binding on the parties”. (C-12.) Moreover, the
preparatory work of the IRP provisions summarized above in paragraph 93
confirms that the intention of the drafters of the IRP process was to put in
place a process that produced declarations that would not be binding and
that left ultimate decision-making authority in the hands of the Board.

134. In the light of the foregoing considerations, it is concluded that the
Panel’s Declaration is not binding, but rather advisory in effect.

The Standard of Review Applied by the Independent Review Process

135. For the reasons summarized above in paragraph 56, ICM maintains that
this is a de novo review in which the decisions of the ICANN Board do not
enjoy a deferential standard of review. For the reasons summarized above in
paragraphs 100-103, ICANN maintains that the decisions of the Board are
entitled to deference by the IRP.
136. 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 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 non-profit, 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 – as in the RFP – 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.

The Applicable Law of this Proceeding

137. The contrasting positions of the parties on the applicable law of this proceeding are summarized above at paragraphs 59-62 and 104-109. Both parties agree that the “local law” referred to in the provision of Article 4 of the Articles of Incorporation – “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” – is the law of California. But they differ on what are “relevant principles of international law” and their applicability to the instant dispute.

138. In the view of ICM Registry, principles of international law are applicable; that straightforwardly follows from their specification in the foregoing phrase of Article 4 of the Articles, and from the reasons given in introducing that specification. (Supra, paragraphs 53-54.) Principles of international law in ICM’s analysis include the general principles of law recognized as a source of international law in Article 38 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Those principles are not confined, as ICANN argues, to the few principles that may be relevant to the interests of Internet stakeholders, such as principles relating to trademark law and freedom of expression. Rather they include international legal principles of general applicability, such as the fundamental principle of good faith and allied principles such as estoppel and abuse of right. ICM’s expert, Professor Goldsmith, observes that there is ample precedent in international contracts and in the holdings of international tribunals for the proposition that non-sovereigns may choose to apply principles of international law to the determination of their rights and to the disposition of their disputes.

139. ICANN and its expert, Professor David Caron, maintain that international law essentially governs relations among sovereign States; and that to the extent that such principles are “relevant” in this case, it is those few principles that are applicable to a private non-profit corporation that bear on the activities of ICANN described in Article 3 of its Articles of Incorporation (supra, paragraph 2). General principles of law, such as that of good faith, are not imported by Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation; still less are principles derived from treaties that protect legitimate expectations. Nor is Article 4 of the Articles a choice-of-law provision; in fact, no governing law has been specified by the disputing parties in this case. If ICANN, by reason of its functions, is to be treated as analogous to public international organizations established by treaty (which it clearly is not), then a relevant principle to be extracted and applied from the jurisprudence of their administrative tribunals is that of deference to the discretionary authority of executive organs and of bodies whose decisions are subject to review.

140. In the view of the Panel, ICANN, in carrying out its activities “in conformity with the relevant principles of international law,” is charged with acting consistently with relevant principles of international law, including the general principles of law recognized as a source of international law.
That follows from the terms of Article 4 of its Articles of Incorporation and from the intentions that animated their inclusion in the Articles, an intention that the Panel understands to have been to subject ICANN to relevant international legal principles because of its governance of an intrinsically international resource of immense importance to global communications and economies. Those intentions might not be realized were Article 4 interpreted to exclude the applicability of general principles of law.

141. That said, the differences between the parties on the place of principles of international law in these proceedings are not of material moment to the conclusions that the Panel will reach. The paramount principle in play is agreed by both parties to be that of good faith, which is found in international law, in the general principles that are a source of international law, and in the corporate law of California.

The Consistency of the Action of the ICANN Board with the Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws

142. The principal – and difficult – issue that the Panel must resolve is whether the rejection by the ICANN Board of the proposed agreement with ICM Registry and its denial of the application’s request for delegation of the .XXX sTLD was or was not consistent with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. The conflicting contentions of the parties on this central issue have been set forth above (paragraphs 63-93, 109-131).

143. The Panel will initially consider the primary questions of whether by adopting the resolutions of June 1, 2005, the ICANN Board determined that the application of ICM Registry met the sponsorship criteria, and, if so, whether that determination was definitive and irrevocable.

144. The parties agree that, pursuant to the RFP, applications for sTLDs were to be dealt with in two stages. First, the Evaluation Panel was to review applications and recommend those that met the selection criteria. Second, those applicants that did meet the selection criteria were to proceed to negotiate commercial and technical terms of a contract with ICANN’s President and General Counsel. If and when those terms were agreed upon, the resultant draft contract was to be submitted to the Board for approval. As it turned out, the Board was not content with the fact that the Evaluation Panel positively recommended only a few applications. Accordingly the Board itself undertook to consider and decide whether the other applications met the selection criteria.
In the view of the Panel, which has weighed the diverse evidence with care, the Board did decide by adopting its resolutions of June 1, 2005, that the application of ICM Registry for a sTLD met the selection criteria, in particular the sponsorship criteria. ICM contends that that decision was definitive and irrevocable. ICANN contends that, while negotiating commercial and technical terms of the contract, its Board continued to consider whether or not ICM’s application met sponsorship criteria, that it was entitled to do so, and that, in the course of that process, further questions about ICM’s application arose that were not limited to matters of sponsorship, which the Board also ultimately determined adversely to ICM’s application.

The considerations that militate in favor of ICM’s position are considerable. They are summarized above in paragraphs 63, 65 and 66. ICM argues that these considerations must prevail because they are sustained by contemporary documentary evidence, whereas the contrary arguments of ICANN are not.

The Panel accepts the force of the foregoing argument of ICM insofar as it establishes that the June 1, 2005, resolutions accepted that ICM’s application met the sponsorship criteria. The points summarized in subparagraphs (a) through (i) of paragraph 63 above are in the view of the Panel not adequately refuted by the recollections of ICANN’s witnesses, distinguished as they are and candid as they were. Their current recollection, the sincerity of which the Panel does not doubt, is that it was their understanding in adopting the June 1, 2005 resolution that the Board was entitled to continue to examine whether ICM’s application met the sponsorship criteria, even if it had by adopting that resolution found those criteria to have been provisionally met (which they challenge). While that understanding is not supported by factors (a) through (i) of paragraph 63, it nevertheless can muster substantial support on the question of whether any determination that sponsorship criteria had been met was subject to reconsideration.

Support on that aspect of the matter consists of the following:

(a) The resolutions of June 1, 2005 (supra, paragraph 19) make no reference to the satisfaction of sponsorship criteria or to whether that question is definitively resolved.

(b) Those resolutions however expressly provide that the approval and authorization of the Board is required to enter into an agreement relating to
the delegation of the sTLD; that being so, the Board viewed itself to be entitled to review all elements of the agreement before approving and authorizing it, including whether sponsorship criteria were met.

- (c) At the meeting of the GAC in July, 2005, some six weeks after the adoption by the Board of its resolutions of June 1, in the course of preparing the GAC Communique, the GAC Chair “confirmed that, having consulted the ICANN Legal Counsel, GAC could still advise ICANN about the .xxx proposal, should it decide to do so.” (Supra, paragraph 24.) Since on the advice of counsel the GAC could still advise ICANN about the .XXX proposal, and since questions had been raised in the GAC about whether ICM’s application met sponsorship criteria in the light of the appraisal of the Evaluation Panel, it may seem to follow that that advice could embrace the question of whether sponsorship criteria had been met and whether any such determination was subject to reconsideration. In point of fact, after June 1, 2005, a number of members of the GAC challenged or questioned the desirability of approving the ICM application on a variety of grounds, including sponsorship (supra, paragraphs 21-25, 40).

- (d) At its teleconference of September 15, 2005, there was “lengthy discussion involving nearly all of the directors regarding the sponsorship criteria...” (supra, paragraph 32). That imports that the members of the Board did not regard the question of sponsorship criteria to have been closed by the adoption of the resolutions of June 1, 2005.

- (e) In a letter of May 4, 2006, the President Twomey wrote the Chairman and Members of the GAC noting

“that the Board decision as to the .XXX application is still pending...the Board voted to authorize staff to enter into contractual negotiations without prejudicing the Board’s right to evaluate the resulting contract and to decide whether it meets all of the criteria before the Board including public policy advice such as might be offered by the GAC... Due to the subjective nature of the sponsorship related criteria that were reviewed by the Sponsorship Evaluation Team, additional materials were requested from each applicant to be supplied directly for Board review and consideration...In some instances, such as with .XXX, while the additional materials provided sufficient clarification to proceed with contractual discussions, the Board still expressed concerns about whether the applicant met all of the criteria, but took the view that such concerns could possibly be
addressed by contractual obligations to be stated in a registry agreement.” (C-188, and supra, paragraph 37.)

- (f) At a Board teleconference of February 12, 2007, ICANN’s General Counsel asked the Board to consider “how ICM measures up against the RFP criteria,” a request that implies that questions about whether such criteria had been met were not foreclosed. (Supra, paragraph 41.)

- (g) ICM provided data to ICANN staff, in the course of the preparation of its successive draft registry agreements, that bore on sponsorship. It has not placed in evidence contemporaneous statements that in its view such data was not relevant to continued consideration of its application on the ground that it had met sponsorship criteria or that the Board’s June 1, 2005 resolutions foreclosed further consideration of sponsorship criteria. It is understandable that it did not do so, because it was in the process of endeavoring to respond positively to every request of the ICANN Board and staff that it could meet in the hope of promoting final approval of its application; but nevertheless that ICM took part in a continuing dialogue on sponsorship criteria suggests that it too did not regard, or at any rate, treat, that question as definitively resolved by adopted of the June 1, 2005 resolutions.

- (h) When Rita Rodin, a new member of the Board, raised concerns about ICM’s meeting of sponsorship criteria at the Board’s teleconference of February 12, 2007, she said that she did “not wish to reopen issues if they have already been decided by the Board” and asked the President and General Counsel to confirm that the question was open for discussion. There was no direct reply but the tenor of the subsequent discussion indicates that the Board did not view the question as closed. (During the Board’s debate over adoption of its climactic resolution of March 30, 2007, Susan Crawford said that opposition to ICM’s application was not sufficient “to warrant revisiting the question of the sponsorship strength of this TLD which I personally believe to be closed.”) (Supra, paragraph 52.)

149. While the Panel has concluded that by adopting its resolutions of June 1, 2005, the Board found that ICM’s application met financial, technical and sponsorship criteria, less clear is whether that determination was subject to reconsideration. The record is inconclusive, for the conflicting reasons set forth above in paragraphs 63, 65 and 66 (on behalf of ICM) and paragraph 149 (on behalf of ICANN). The Panel nevertheless is charged with arriving at a conclusion on the question. In appraising whether ICANN on this issue “applied documented policies, neutrally and objectively, with integrity and
fairness” (Bylaws, Section 2(8), the Panel finds instructive the documented policy stated in the Board’s Carthage resolution of October 31, 2003 on “Finalization of New sTLD RFP,” namely, that an agreement “reflecting the commercial and technical terms shall be negotiated upon the successful completion of the sTLD selection process.” (C-78, p. 4.) In the Panel’s view, the sTLD process was “successfully completed”, as that term is used in the Carthage RFP resolution, in the case of ICM Registry with the adoption of the June 1, 2005, resolutions. ICANN should, pursuant to the Carthage documented policy, then have proceeded to conclude an agreement with ICM on commercial and technical terms, without reopening whether ICM’s application met sponsorship criteria. As Dr. Williams, chair of the Evaluation Panel, testified, the RFP process did not contemplate that new criteria could be added after the [original] criteria had been satisfied. (Tr. 374: 1719). It is pertinent to observe that the GAC’s proposals for new TLDs generally exclude consideration of new criteria (supra, paragraph 46).

150. In so concluding, the Panel does not question the integrity of the ICANN Board’s disposition of the ICM Registry application, still less that of any of the Board’s members. It does find that reconsideration of sponsorship criteria, once the Board had found them to have been met, was not in accord with documented policy. If, by way of analogy, there was a construction contract at issue, the party contracting with the builder could not be heard to argue that specifications and criteria defined in invitations to tender can be freely modified once past the qualification stage; the conditions of any such modifications are carefully circumscribed. Admittedly in the instant case the Board was not operating in a context of established business practice. That fact is extenuating, as are other considerations set out above. The majority of the Board appears to have believed that was acting appropriately in reconsidering the question of sponsorship (although a substantial minority vigorously differed). The Board was pressed to do so by the Government of the United States and by quite a number of other influential governments, and ICANN was bound to “duly take into account” the views of those governments. It is not at fault because it did so. It is not possible to estimate just how influential expressions of governmental positions were. They were undoubtedly very influential but it is not clear that they were decisive. If the Board simply had yielded to governmental pressure, it would have disposed of the ICM application much earlier. The Panel does not conclude that the Board, absent the expression of those governmental positions, would necessarily have arrived at a conclusion favorable to ICM. It accepts the affirmation of members of the Board that they did not vote against acceptance of ICM’s application because of governmental pressure. Certainly there are those, including Board members,
who understandably react negatively to pornography, and, in some cases, their reactions may be more visceral than rational. But they may also have had doubts, as did the Board, that ICM would be able successfully to achieve what it claimed .XXX would achieve.

151. The Board’s resolution of March 30, 2007, rejecting ICM’s proposed agreement and denying its request for delegation of the .XXX sTLD lists four grounds for so holding in addition to failure to meet sponsored community criteria (supra, paragraph 47). The essence of these grounds appears to be the Board’s understanding that the ICM application “raises significant law enforcement compliance issues … therefore obligating ICANN to acquire responsibility related to content and conduct … there are credible scenarios that lead to circumstances in which ICANN would be forced to assume an ongoing management and oversight role regarding Internet content, which is inconsistent with its technical mandate.” ICM interprets these grounds, and statements of Dr. Twomey and Dr. Cerf, as seeking to impose on ICM responsibility for “enforcing restrictions around the world on access to illegal and offensive content” (supra, paragraph 66-67). ICM avers that it never undertook “to enforce the laws of the world on pornography”, an undertaking that it could never discharge. It did undertake, in the event of the approval and activation of .XXX, to install tools that would make it far easier for governments to restrict access to content that they deemed illegal and offensive. ICM argues that its application was rejected in part because of its inability to comply with a contractual undertaking to which it never had agreed in the first place (supra, paragraphs 66-71). To the extent that this is so – and the facts and the conclusions drawn from the facts by the ICANN Board in its resolution of March 30, 2007, in this regard are not fully coherent – the Panel finds ground for questioning the neutral and objective performance of the Board, and the consistency of its so doing with its obligation not to single out ICM Registry for disparate treatment.

PART FIVE: CONCLUSIONS OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL

152. The Panel concludes, for the reasons stated above, that:

First, the holdings of the Independent Review Panel are advisory in nature; they do not constitute a binding arbitral award.

Second, the actions and decisions of the ICANN Board are not entitled to deference whether by application of the “business judgment” rule or otherwise; they are to be appraised not deferentially but objectively.
Third, the provision of Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation prescribing that 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,” requires ICANN to operate in conformity with relevant general principles of law (such as good faith) as well as relevant principles of international law, applicable international conventions, and the law of the State of California.

Fourth, the Board of ICANN in adopting its resolutions of June 1, 2005, found that the application of ICM Registry for the .XXX sTLD met the required sponsorship criteria.

Fifth, the Board’s reconsideration of that finding was not consistent with the application of neutral, objective and fair documented policy.

Sixth, in respect of the first foregoing holding, ICANN prevails; in respect of the second foregoing holding, ICM Registry prevails; in respect of the third foregoing holding, ICM Registry prevails; in respect of the fourth foregoing holding, ICM Registry prevails; and in respect of the fifth foregoing holding, ICM Registry prevails. Accordingly, the prevailing party is ICM Registry. It follows that, in pursuance of Article IV, Section 3(12) of the Bylaws, ICANN shall be responsible for bearing all costs of the IRP Provider. Each party shall bear its own attorneys’ fees. Therefore, the administrative fees and expenses of the International Centre for Dispute Resolution, totaling $4,500.00, shall be borne entirely by ICANN, and the compensation and expenses of the Independent Review Panel, totaling $473,744.91, shall be borne entirely by ICANN. ICANN shall accordingly reimburse ICM Registry with the sum of $241,372.46, representing that portion of said fees and expenses in excess of the apportioned costs previously incurred by ICM Registry.

Judge Tevrizian is in agreement with the first foregoing conclusion but not the subsequent conclusions. His opinion follows.
Stephen M. Schwebel

Jan Paulsson

Dickran Tevrizian

Date: February 19, 2010

Date: 16 February 2010

Date: February 18, 2010
CONCURRING AND DISSENTING OPINION

I concur and expressly join in the Panel’s conclusion that the holdings of the Independent Review Panel are advisory in nature and do not constitute a binding arbitral award. I adopt the rationale and the reasons stated by the Panel on this issue only.

However, I must respectfully dissent from my learned colleagues as to the remainder of their findings. I am afraid that the majority opinion will undermine the governance of the internet community by permitting any disgruntled person, organization or governmental entity to second guess the administration of one of the world’s most important technological resources.

I

INTRODUCTION

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (hereinafter “ICANN”) is a uniquely created institution: a global, private, not-for-profit organization incorporated under the laws of the State of California (Calif. Corp. Code 5100, et seq.) exercising plenary control over one of the world’s most important technological resources: the Internet Domain Name System or “DNS.” The DNS is the gateway to the nearly infinite universe of names and numbers that allow the Internet to function.

ICANN is a public benefit, non-profit corporation that was established under the law of the State of California on September 30, 1998. ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation were finalized and adopted on November 21, 1998, and its By-Laws were finalized and adopted on the same day as its Articles of Incorporation.

Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation sets forth the standard of conduct under which ICANN is required to carry out its activities and mission to protect the stability, integrity and utility of the Internet Domain Name System on behalf of the global Internet community pursuant to a series of agreements with the United States Department of Commerce. ICANN is headquartered in Marina del Rey, California, U.S.A.

Article 4 of ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation specifically provide:

“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.”
ICANN serves the function as the DNS root zone administrator to ensure and is required by its Articles of Incorporation to be a neutral and open facilitator of Internet coordination. ICANN’s function and purpose was never meant to be content driven in any respect.

The Articles of Incorporation provide that ICANN is managed by a Board of Directors (“Board”). The Board consists of 15 voting directors and 6 non-voting liaisons from around the world, “who in the aggregate [are to] display diversity in geography, culture, skills, experience and perspective.” (Article VI, § 2). The voting directors are composed of: (1) six representatives of ICANN’s Supporting Organizations, which are sub-groups dealing with specific sections of the policies under ICANN’s purview; (2) eight independent representatives of the general public interest, currently selected through ICANN's Nominating Committee, in which all the constituencies of ICANN are represented; and (3) the President and CEO, who is appointed by the rest of the Board. Consistent with ICANN's mandate to provide private sector technical leadership in the management of the DNS, “no official of a national government” may serve as a director. (Article VI, § 4). In carrying out its functions, it is obvious that ICANN is expected to solicit and will receive input from a wide variety of Internet stakeholders and participants.

ICANN operates through its Board of Directors, a Staff, An Ombudsman, a Nominating Committee for Directors, three Supporting Organizations, four Advisory Committees and numerous other stakeholders that participate in the unique ICANN process. (By-Laws Articles V through XI).

As was stated earlier, ICANN was formed under the laws of the State of California as a public benefit, non-profit corporation. As such, it would appear that California Corporations Code Section 5100, et seq., together with ICANN’s Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws, control its governance and accountability.

In general, a non-profit director’s fiduciary duties include the duty of care, which includes an obligation of due inquiry and the duty of loyalty among others. The term “fiduciary” refers to anyone who holds a position requiring trust, confidence and scrupulous exercise of good faith and candor. It includes anyone who has a duty, created by a particular undertaking, to act primarily for the benefit of others in matters connected with the undertaking. A fiduciary relationship is one in which one person reposes trust and confidence in another person, who “must exercise a corresponding degree of fairness and good faith.” (Blacks Law Dictionary). The type of persons who are commonly referred to as fiduciaries include corporate directors. The California Corporation’s Code makes no distinction between
Directors chosen by election and directors chosen by selection or designation in the application of fiduciary duties.


The business judgment rule is codified in Section 309 of the California Corporations Code, which 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 with such care, including reasonable inquiry, as an ordinarily prudent person in a like position would use under similar circumstances.” Cal. Corp. Code § 309(a); see also Lee v. Interinsurance Exch., (1996) 50 CA4th 694, 714. Section 309 shields from liability directors who follow its provisions: “A person who performs the duties of a director in accordance with subdivisions (a) and (b) shall have no liability based upon any alleged failure to discharge the person’s obligations as a director.” Cal. Corp. Code § 309 (c).

II

THE ACTIONS OF THE ICANN BOARD OF DIRECTORS ARE ENTITLED TO SUBSTANTIAL DEFERENCE FROM THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL

ICANN’s By-Laws, specifically Article I, § 2, sets forth 11 core values and concludes as follows:

“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.”

The By-Laws make it clear that the core values must not be construed in a “narrowly prescriptive” manner. To the contrary, Article I, § 2, provides that the ICANN Board is vested with board discretion in implementing its responsibility such as is mentioned in the business judgment rule.

III
PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW DO NOT APPLY

Article 4 of the ICANN Articles of Incorporation does not preempt the California Corporations Code as a “choice-of-law provision” importing international law into the independent review process. Rather, the substantive provisions of the By-Laws and Articles of Incorporation, as construed in light of the law of California, where ICANN is incorporated as a non-profit entity, should govern the claims before the Independent Review Panel (hereinafter “IRP”).

Professor Caron opined that principles of international law do not apply because, as a private entity, ICANN is not subject to that body of law governing sovereigns. To adopt a more expansive view is tantamount to judicial legislation or mischief.

IV
THE ICANN BOARD OF DIRECTORS DID NOT ACT INCONSISTENTLY WITH ICANN’S ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION AND BY-LAWS IN CONSIDERING AND ULTIMATELY DENYING ICM REGISTRY, LLC’S APPLICATION FOR A SPONSORED TOP LEVEL DOMAIN NAME

On March 30, 2007, the ICANN Board of Directors approved a resolution rejecting the proposed registry agreement and denying the application submitted by ICM Registry, LLC for a sponsored top level domain name. The findings of the Board was that the application was deficient in that the applicant, ICM Registry, LLC, (hereinafter “ICM”), failed to satisfy the
Request For Proposal (“hereinafter “RFP”) posted June 24, 2003, in the following manner:

“1. ICM’s definition of its sponsored TLD community was not capable of precise or clear definition;
2. ICM’s policies were not primarily in the interests of the sponsored TLD community;
3. ICM’s proposed community did not have needs and interests which are differentiated from those of the general global Internet community;
4. ICM could not demonstrate that it had the requisite community support; and,
5. ICM was not adding new and valuable space to the Internet name space.”

On December 15, 2003, ICANN posted a final RFP for a new round of sponsored Top Level Domain Names (hereinafter “STLD”). On March 16, 2004, ICM submitted its application for the .XXX STLD name. From the inception, ICM knew that its .XXX application would be controversial. From the time that ICM submitted its applications until the application was finally denied on March 30, 2007, ICM never was able to clearly define what the interests of the .XXX community would be or that ICM had adequate support from the community it sought to represent.

ICM has claimed during these proceedings that the RFP posted by ICANN established a non-overlapping two-step procedure for approving new STLDs, under which applications would first be tested for baseline criteria, and only after the applications were finally and irrevocably approved by the ICANN Board could the applications proceed to technical and commercial contract negotiations with ICANN staff. ICM forcefully argues that on June 1, 2005, the ICANN Board irrevocably approved the ICM .XXX STLD application so as to be granted vested rights to enter into registry agreement negotiations dealing with economic issues only. The evidence introduced at the independent review procedure refutes this contention. Nothing contained in the ICANN RFP permits this interpretation.

Before the ICANN Board could approve a STLD application, applicants had to satisfy the baseline selection criteria set forth in the RFP, including the technical, business, financial and sponsorship criteria, and also negotiate an acceptable registry contract with ICANN staff. A review of the relevant documents and testimony admitted into evidence established that the two phases could overlap in time.

The fact that most ICANN Board members expressed significant concerns about ICM’s sponsorship shortcomings after the June 1, 2005,
resolutions negates any notion that the June 1, 2005, resolutions (which do not say that the Board is approving anything and, to the contrary, state clearly that the ICANN Board is not doing so) conclusively determined the sponsorship issue.

The sponsorship issues and shortcomings in ICM’s application were also raised by ICANN Board members who joined the ICANN Board after the June 1, 2005, resolutions. Between the June 2005 and February 2007 ICANN Board meetings, there were a total of six new voting Board members (out of a total of fifteen) considering ICM’s application.

Both Dr. Cerf and Dr. Pisanty testified during the evidentiary hearing that the ICANN Board’s vote on June 1, 2005, made clear that the Board’s vote was intended only to permit ICM to proceed with contract negotiations. Under no circumstances was ICANN bound by the vote to award the .XXX STLD to ICM because the resolution that the ICANN Board adopted was not a finding that ICM had satisfied the sponsorship criteria set forth in the Request for Proposal.

By August 9, 2005, ICM’s first draft of the proposed .XXX STLD registry agreement was posted on ICANN’s website and submitted to the ICANN Board for approval. ICANN’s next Board meeting was scheduled for August 16, 2005, at which time the ICANN Board had planned on discussing the proposed agreement.

Within days of ICANN posting the proposed registry agreement, the Government Advisory Committee (hereinafter “GAC”) Chairman wrote Dr. Cerf a letter expressing the GAC’s diverse and wide ranging” concerns with the .XXX STLD and requesting that the ICANN Board provide additional time for governments to express their public policy concerns before the ICANN Board reached a final decision on the proposed registry agreement.

The GAC’s input was significant and proper because the ICANN By-Laws require the ICANN Board to take into account advice from the GAC on public policy matters, both in formulation and adoption of policies. ICANN By-Laws Article XI, § 2.1 (j), provides: “The advice of the Governmental Advisory Committee on public policy matters shall be duly taken into account, both in the formulation and adoption of policies.” Where the ICANN Board seeks to take actions that are inconsistent with the GAC’s advice, the Board must tell the GAC why. Thus, it was perfectly acceptable, appropriate and fully consistent with the ICANN Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws for the ICANN Board to consider and to address the GAC’s concerns.

Further, throughout 2005 and up to the ICANN Board’s denial of the ICM .XXX STLD on March 30, 2007, a number of additional continuing concerns and issues appeared beyond those originally voiced by the evaluation panel at the beginning of the review process. Despite the best efforts of many and
numerous opportunities, ICM could not satisfy these additional concerns and, most importantly, could not cure the continuing sponsorship defects.

In all respects, ICANN operated in a fair, transparent and reasoned manner in accordance with its Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws.

V

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, I would give substantial deference to the actions of the ICANN Board of Directors taken on March 30, 2007, in approving a resolution rejecting the proposed registry agreement and denying the application submitted by ICM Registry, LLC for a sponsored top level domain name. I specifically reject any notion that there was any sinister motive by any ICANN Director, governmental entity or religious organization to undermine ICM Registry, LLC’s application. In my opinion, the application was rejected on the merits in an open and transparent forum. On the basis of that, ICM Registry, LLC never satisfied the sponsorship requirements and criteria for a top level domain name.

The rejection of the business judgment rule will open the floodgates to increased collateral attacks on the decisions of the ICANN Board of Directors and undermine its authority to provide a reliable point of reference to exercise plenary control over the Internet Domain Name System. In addition, it will leave the ICANN Board in a very vulnerable position for politicization of its activities.

The business judgment rule establishes a presumption that the directors' and officers' decisions are based on sound business judgment, and it prohibits courts from interfering in business decisions made by the management in good faith and in the absence of a conflict of interest. "Katz v. Chevron Corp., 22 Cal.App.4th 1352. In most cases, “the presumption created by the business judgment rule can be rebutted only by affirmative allegations of facts which, if proven, would establish fraud, bad faith, overreaching or an unreasonable failure to investigate material facts.” The record in this case does not support such findings. In addition, interference with the discretion of the directors is not warranted in doubtful cases such as is present here. "Lee v. Interinsurance Exch., 50 Cal.App.4th 694.

In Marble v. Latchford Glass Co., 205 Cal.App.2nd 171, the court stated that it would “not substitute its judgment for the business judgment of the board of directors made in good faith.” Similarly, in Eldridge v. Tymshare, Inc., 186 Cal.App.3rd 767, the court stated that the business judgment rule “sets up a presumption that directors' decisions are based on sound business judgment. This presumption can be rebutted only by a factual showing of fraud, bad faith or gross overreaching.” ICM Registry, LLC has not met the standard articulated by established law.
In the present case, regardless of how ICM Registry, LLC stylizes its allegations, the business judgment rule poses a substantial hurdle for ICM’s effort which I submit was never met by the evidence presented. The evidence presented at the hearing held in this matter disclosed that at every step the decisions made by the ICANN Board were made in good faith, and for the benefit of the continued operation of ICANN in its role as exercising plenary control over one of the world’s most important technological resources: the Internet Domain Name System.

Simply stated, as long as ICANN is incorporated and domiciled within the State of California, U.S.A., it is the undersigned’s opinion that the standard of review to be used by the Independent Review Panel in judging the conduct of the ICANN board, is the abuse of discretion standard, based upon the business judgment rule, and not a de novo review of the evidence.

JUDGE DICKRAN TEVRIZIAN (Retired)

Febuary 18, 2010